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Abstract:
Advertising avoidance today is so common that it has been concluded that ad avoidance nowadays is rather the norm than an exception (Chatterjee 2008). Due to the increasing amount of advertising avoidance online, there is a demand for understanding what could drive consumers to view ads online, in order to create pull effect in online advertising. Multiple studies have focused on how to reduce the amount of advertising avoidance. Even though reducing ad avoidance, and especially minimizing ad intrusiveness, is well studied, there has not yet been research studying how to actually remove the avoidance, by creating online advertising that the consumer himself chooses to view.

One of the major reasons for advertising avoidance is the perceived intrusiveness of the ad. Since, display advertising like pop-ups use the most intrusive methods to be viewed and therefore, cause high levels of ad avoidance and negative reactance, this advertising format has been chosen as the particular focus of this study.

With the uses and gratifications theory as a basis, this study attempts to find motivations and benefits that would drive consumers to view ads online. In order to answer the main research question “How to create pull effect in online advertising” a qualitative study has been conducted. Empirical evidence has been gathered from two sources, online-users and advertising agency experts.

This study indicates that in order for advertising to be acknowledged the aim should be to create advertising that the online user chooses to view, in other words create pull effect towards online advertising. By utilizing the six attributes based on utilitarian value found in this study, the possibility of online users choosing to view the ad increases and therefore the desired pull effect within online advertising can be reached.

Keywords: Pulled advertising, pushed advertising, online advertising, user-initiated advertising, advertising avoidance, reactance theory, intrusiveness, uses and gratifications theory
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1 INTRODUCTION

During the last decade online advertising has grown rapidly. Today it is commonly known that online platforms are effective as well within direct response advertising as within branding advertising (Flosi, Fulgoni & Vollman 2013). At the same pace that online advertising has cultivated, also advertising avoidance has become a known phenomenon. A lot of research has studied advertising avoidance, and it has been conducted that one of the main reasons for advertising avoidance is the perceived intrusiveness and forced exposure to the ad. In other words a lot of advertising avoidance occurs as a result of ads being pushed up on the user.

Intrusiveness has been defined by Ha (1996), as interruption of editorial content. Since the main intent of advertising, and the primary metric used to buy and sell online advertising, is delivered impressions (Flosi, Fulgoni & Vollman 2013), advertisement strives to interrupt editorial content. Even though many studies have contributed, with somewhat different angels to why ads are perceived intrusive, Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) states that the main reason for why an ad is perceived intrusive is the “degree to which advertisement interrupts a person’s goals”. According to Ducoffe (1995), the advertising value to the viewer represents the value of the advertising to that viewer. Based on Ducoffe’s research Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) suggest that the perception of an advertisement as intrusive can be altered if the ad offers the viewer “utilitarian or aesthetic value”.

Previous research has shown that, not all advertising is perceived as equally intrusive (Ying, Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Ha 1996), however, most ads still do interrupt the user experience to some degree. The psychological term, reactance theory, states “that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction” (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Therefore, many users who are forced to view an ad will feel that their freedom of choice has been deprived, and will therefore react negatively. Based on reactance theory it has been suggested that if a consumers’ reaction to advertising is defensive, the best practice for displaying advertising may not be to force the user to be exposed to it. The forced exposure will most likely result in harmful consequences for the advertiser (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a), and might even lead to negative consequences for the web page the ad is displayed on (Goldstein, Siddhart, Mcafe, Ekstrand-Abueg, & Diaz, 2014). Ying Korneliussen and Grönhaug (2009) highlights that even though the
degree of advertising avoidance depends on the content, execution or placement, the advertisement will primary be valued based on its level of intrusiveness.

The big remaining question is how to prevent this kind of reactance toward advertising. Countering to this Stephen Dahl wrote in his blog post “Push me and I’ll resist: reactance theory” (Dahl 2012), “Well the answer is remarkably straightforward: Do not remove the freedom”. In other words let the users themselves choose to see the ad and they will not react by avoiding it. Understandably, the difficulty with ad avoidance is not that evident, since the user motives for using specific media platforms do not build on seeing ads. However, by focusing on user demand there is a possibility to remove the heavy push effect and instead create a pull effect, resulting in user-initiated advertising.

Some display ads will most likely always be forced up on online users, to a certain degree, in order to be visible. However, if the ad serves one or some of the users motives and benefits the user might choose to consume the ad. Therefor, there is a possibility that if the user was presented with the opportunity to somehow benefit from watching an ad, it could result in him choosing to consume the ad himself, as a result of the gratifications gained from it.

Since, this kind of advertising has not been researched before, this study will take into consideration as well already existing advertising types that use customer motives and benefits as a trigger to see an advertisement, and also advertising types that do not yet use gratification as a trigger, but that could benefit from it. Reward advertising is one of the most common, and fast growing so called pulled advertising formats. The promotion is based on the consumer being offered a reward for watching an ad. Influential companies in the media business, like Rovio Entertainment Ltd. and Spotify, already use these kinds of reward placements. Rovio has displayed video rewards in its games as a tradeoff for gaining for example game currency or advance within the game. If the user chooses to watch the ad he will be rewarded, but if the user chooses to not gain the reward, he is not exposed to the ad either. Even though already existing pulled advertising will be taken into consideration, this study will focus even more on what further fulfillments could trigger the interest of consumers to view advertising online.

The study will be based on advertising avoidance theory and reactance theory, as a trigger for the need to create pulled advertising. Especially the intrusiveness factor will be examined, since it is the first impression the user gains from the ad. In order to find
motivations and benefits, the uses and gratification theory will be used. Uses and gratifications theory is originally a communication theory (Stafford & Stafford 1996), which has generally been used to identify what people do with media. Previous studies on this specific theory imply that consumers will use media content, based on motivational factors (Whiting & Williams 2013; Sundar & Limperos 2013; Yang 2004; Stafford & Stafford 1996). In order to deepen the theoretical framework on existing pulled advertising, and the opportunities and challenges that arise from user initiated ad formats, three advertising agency experts have been requested to give insights to the situation and share their thoughts and knowledge as a part of the empirical research.

1.1 Research area

Why is it important to study online advertising, and specifically how to create pulled advertising online? During the last decades many studies have focused on advertising avoidance. From print media to the growing online media, researchers have focused on how to reduce the amount of advertising avoidance. Even though advertising avoidance is a well-known and studied phenomenon, it is however increasing instead of decreasing.

Many studies have taken into consideration the intrusiveness of online advertising resulting in advertising avoidance, and have studied how to minimize the intrusiveness of the ad. Studies have considered different aspects of the advertising that may lead to ad avoidance. Ying, Korneliussen and Grönhaug (2009) and Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) have studied how placing the ad affects the feeling of intrusiveness, whereas as Ying, Korneliussen and Grönhaug (2009) and Chatterjee (2008) have focused on the advertising itself as the trigger of ad avoidance. Even though reducing ad avoidance, and especially minimizing ad intrusiveness, is well studied, there has not yet been research conducted on how to actually remove ad avoidance, by creating online advertising that the consumer himself chooses to see. Especially display advertising has been very exposed to ad avoidance (Chatterjee 2008).

Campbell, Cohen and Ma (2014) have defined display advertising as “Brand- or product related content created by a brand and that runs distinct from editorial content”. This study will particularly focus on this advertising format since these kinds of advertisements like, banners, interstitials and pop-ups use the most intrusive methods to be viewed and therefore, cause high levels of ad avoidance and negative reactance.
However, at the same time some display advertising like pop-ups are very successful in grabbing attention and generating recall and click through (Chatterjee 2008).

Research within reactance theory has conducted that the best practice of displaying advertising would not be to force it up on the user, due to the negative outcomes (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Therefore it would be valuable to find motivations and benefits that would lead to the users choosing to view an ad instead of being forced to see it. Motives and benefits behind using the internet (Sundar & Limperos 2013) and for example using social media (Whiting and Williams 2013) have been studied, but there has not yet been any studies focusing on the motives and benefits that drive the internet user to view advertising and especially displayed advertising online.

1.2 Research question

Due to the limitations in previous studies, described above, this study will focus on user motives and benefits behind voluntarily viewing an ad online.

The proposition of this thesis is that advertising that the user himself chooses to see will result in less advertising avoidance, and more positive reactions towards the advertisement. Therefore this research will attempt to find ways how to create advertising that is rather pulled by the user, than pushed up on him. Therefore the research questions are:

1. **How to create pull effect in online advertising?**

   a. **What drives consumers to view ads online?**

   b. **How do advertising experts strive to drive consumers to view ads online?**

The main research question has been divided into two smaller research questions based on from whom the information is gathered.

In order to answer the research question a. “**What drives consumers to view ads online**” six online users have been interviewed on their attitudes towards advertising online, and especially on what could drive them to view an ad online. These results will be presented later in the results section of this thesis.
In order to answer research question b. “How do advertising experts strive to drive consumers to view ads online” three experts from two advertising agencies have been interviewed on their thoughts on pulled advertising, and how they are utilizing or could utilize the format in their work. These results will be presented in the last section of the theoretical framework called “pulled advertising”. The theoretical framework presents previous research on online behavior in regards to advertising. Due to the limitations in previous research compared to the current actions and trends in online advertising and especially within pulled advertising, the inputs by the experts have been decided to be included in this part of this thesis, in order to give a broader base for the study on possible attributes driving consumers to view ads online.

Research questions “a” and “b” will be combined in the analysis chapter, in order to answer the main research question 1. "How to create pull effect in online advertising” based on motivations and benefits the user gain from online advertising.

1.3 Limitations

This study will only focus on online advertising, since the pull effect of seeing a specific ad may vary depending on the media where the ad is visible, due to the fact that user behavior varies a lot depending on the medium where the user is active. For instance do online users tend to be more goal-oriented than offline users, which means that the medium to some extension affect the motives and benefits gained from the content displayed there, and therefor do also the gratifications driving a consumer to use a specific medium vary. Therefore, all traditional media will be excluded.

In order to find what drives online users to view ads online only motivations and benefits that might trigger the pull effect will be taken into consideration. If the user would intend to watch an online ad for any other reason this will not be included in this thesis.

Due to the exploratory approach of this study, online advertising will include all devices, which are used for online activities, like mobile phones, computers and tablets. A distinction between computers and mobile devices could be useful, but as the main objective of the study is to give a more comprehensive view into creating pull effect yowards advertising displayed online, a division between these devices will not be looked at. Devices will however, be limited to ones than can be used for personal use; in other words, displays in for example public transportation will not be studied.
The empirical research and therefore the study will be limited to consumers and advertisers in Finland. Furthermore, all other age groups except young adults are excluded, due to this constraint the results in this study will not be generalized to other age groups.

This study will only give suggestions for possible ways to create pulled advertising, based on consumer motivations and benefits. Which advertising format may be most effective or produce the best results will not be distressed.

1.4 Definitions and key concepts

Following, the key concepts and definitions will be presented shortly. Most of the concepts will be described and presented further in the theoretical framework.

- **Advertising avoidance** – All action users take to reduce their exposure to ad content.
- **Traditional media** – Refers in this thesis to more conventional medias like print, radio and TV.
- **New media** – Refers in this thesis to content available on demand through the internet and that are accessible on different digital platforms like, computers and mobile devices.
- **Pushed advertising** – Advertising that is forced up on the user.
- **Pulled advertising** – User initiated advertising, where the users themselves choose to consume the ad.
- **Intrusiveness** - The degree to “which advertisements in a media vehicle interrupt the flow of an editorial unit”. (Ha 1996)
- **Motivation** – Reasons for acting in a specific way. In this thesis reasons for viewing or interacting with an advertisement online.
- **Benefit** – An advantage or profit gained from a specific action. In this thesis the advantage and profit gained from viewing an advertisement online.
• **Reactance theory** - Reactance theory is a social psychological theory that explains how a person reacts to the loss of freedom in a specific environment (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a).

• **Uses and gratifications theory** - The main objective of the uses and gratifications theory is to explain psychological needs that identify and shape why some people interact with a specific medium, and the motivations and benefits that explain the fulfillment of these needs (Ruggiero 2000).

• **Display advertising** - Brand- or product related content created by a brand that runs distinct from editorial content. (Campbell, Cohen & Ma 2014)

### 1.5 Structure of this thesis

The structure of this thesis is built on six main parts; (1.) introduction, (2.) theory, (3.) empirical research, (4.) results (5.) analysis and (6.) conclusion and findings.

In the introduction (1.) part of this thesis the focus and research area of the study are presented. Furthermore, the research questions and where in the thesis those will be answered are presented. The introduction part also includes the limitations of the study and definitions of the key concepts.

The theoretical framework (2.) is divided into four parts. The first part presents the current online advertising situation, focusing on advertising avoidance, and the reasons for why users tend to avoid ads online. The second part emphasizes the intrusiveness of the ad and how it can be combined to reactance theory and lead to advertising avoidance. The third part presents the uses and gratifications theory, underlining the uses and gratifications that arise from traditional media in comparison to new media. The last part presents existing knowledge on pulled advertising. This part will include the results from the empirical study based on the interviews with three advertising agency experts, representing two advertising agencies located in Helsinki. This part will also answer the research question b. “How do advertising experts strive to drive consumers to view ads online”.

The empirical research (3.) present the chosen research approach and chosen method practiced to answer the research question. The aim of the chapter is to outline the chosen research approach and method by introducing the stages of planning the
empirical research, present the collection of data from the chosen respondents, and enlighten the validity, reliability and generalizability of the study.

The results part (4.) presents the results from the second part of the empirical study that includes interviews with six online users. Furthermore, this part will combine and summaries the two empirical studies, one with the experts and one with the online users. In this part the research question a. “What drives consumers to view ads online” will be answered.

The analysis part (5.) will analyze the results gained from the empirical research. This part will also answer the main research question (1.) “How to create pull effect in online advertising”.

The last part (6.) discusses and outlines the findings from the analysis part, as well as concludes the thesis. This part will also include suggestions for managerial implications and future research.

Figure 1 visualizes the structure of the research questions within the thesis. Chapter one introduces the research questions, whereas chapters two and four presents results and answers one of the smaller research questions. Chapter five analyses the overall results and answers the main research question.
Figure 1  The structure of the research questions within the thesis
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2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter the main theories will be presented in order to provide a deeper understanding of the linkage between the main theories in this research. First a broader perspective of advertising avoidance will be presented, emphasizing the perceived intrusiveness of the advertisement leading to ad avoidance. Following, the perceived intrusiveness will be tied to reactance theory, and how intrusiveness affects advertising avoidance will be described. The uses and gratifications theory will be defined in order to propose a possibility for discovering motives and benefits for consumers to favor consuming advertisement online, instead of reacting negatively towards it. The final part of the theoretical framework presents the current pulled advertising situation. The final part will also include the results gained from the first part of the empirical study with three advertising agency experts.

In order to visualize the structure of the theoretical framework the red boxes in figure 2 envision the elements elevating advertising avoidance today and show how those elements are connected to each other. The green boxes on the other hand show possibilities to reduce advertising avoidance and create pull effect towards ads online.

Figure 2 The structure of the theoretical framework
2.1 Advertising avoidance online

Advertising avoidance is not a new concept. Since the beginning of advertising a common objection towards it has been the fact that advertisement interrupt the user (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b). Traditionally advertising has, among others, used TV and radio programs as platforms for exposing audience to advertisement. Traditionally, a simple advertising avoidance method has been to avoid TV ads by visiting the fridge during commercial breaks. However, due to the increasing amount of advertising online the phenomenon has developed rapidly, and more advanced advertising avoidance techniques have emerged. One technique exemplifying this is the ad blockers. The downloading of ad blockers online have expanded and today there has been more than 300 million downloads (AdBlockPlus, 2015). Advertising avoidance today is so common that it has been concluded that ad avoidance nowadays is rather the standard than an exception (Chatterjee 2008).

The main goal of advertisement is to produce positive effects and value to the advertiser and the consumer. However, as the main method for gaining the attention from the users have been interruption, such intrusiveness may raise annoyance and ad avoidance, which can lead to negative outcomes for both the advertiser and the consumer (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009). Even though annoying ads often gain user attention, the annoyance factor still leads to negative outcomes in the long run. Annoying ads can for example be perceived as desperate and awoke questions about a brands’ respectability (Goldstein et al. 2014). Additionally the common use of annoying ads does not only affect the annoying ads themselves, but may also lead to a decline in the overall effectiveness of all advertising (Goldstein et al. 2014). Furthermore, previous research has shown that advertising do not only affect the advertiser and the consumer, but may also affect the users intent to return to the specific website where the ad has been displayed (Goldstein et al. 2014). This shows that the negative outcomes do not only affect the two parties directly in contact with advertising, but also third parties, like the media platform displaying the ad. All of this results in many media platforms having unenthusiastic attitudes towards advertisements, since even though advertising is the major financial source for the publisher, the ad can possibly indirectly be unprofitable, when users abandon the site because of the advertising (Goldstein et al. 2014).
2.1.1 Advertising avoidance methods

It has been conducted that when consumers are given an opportunity to avoid seeing an ad they will most likely use the opportunity (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). This means that there is a big risk that the commercial messages will never reach its intended audience (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b).

There are different types of advertising avoidance. One main reason for the large amount of advertising avoidance methods is the “cluster-bomb approach” many advertisers practice. This trend attempts to serve as many ads as possible, in order for some to be noticed and acted up on. Due to the large amount of advertising the consumer is exposed to, this approach has resulted in high levels of perceived ad clutter, which lead to ad avoidance and decreasing click through rates (Cho & Cheon 2004). Blindness towards the ad also affects the value advertisers gain from their advertisement. The primary metric for advertisement transactions is delivered impressions. Delivered impressions are counted based on how many times the ad has been visible on the web page, not how many times a user has actually seen the ad. According to the average in-view rate, users tend to see one in three impressions (Flosi, Fulgoni & Vollman 2013). Meaning that most ads will never be consumed and a large amount of advertisements that were displayed on the web page were wasted, since the ads were visible, but did not make the desired impact.

Cognitive ad avoidance

Broadly, ad avoidance can be divided into two separate groups, cognitive ad avoidance and physical ad avoidance. The ad avoidance technique occurring from cognitive ad avoidance is automatic or in other words unconscious, whereas physical ad avoidance is deliberate and conscious (Chatterjee 2008). Cognitive ad avoidance occurs subconsciously when consumers avoid ads in their visual field, leading to them not noticing the ad (Chatterjee 2008). An exemplifying cognitive ad avoidance behavior is banner blindness. Banner blindness refers to the users tendency to avoid anything that looks like an ad (Cho & Cheon 2004). Banners today are so common that some users may not even notice them. For example participants in Truong and Simmons (2010) study admitted that they rarely look at banners at all.
Physical ad avoidance

Physical ad avoidance is a procedure (Brehm 1989), where the user intentionally seeks to avoid advertising due to perceived loss of freedom. Consumers will employ the physical ad avoidance technique when the cognitive ad avoidance technique is not achievable, in other words, if the user is exposed to forced advertising, like pop-ups (Chatterjee 2008). The user will also engage in physical ad avoidance when he is actively trying to avoid ads (Chatterjee 2008). In traditional media physical ad avoidance can be combined to “zipping (fast-forwarding through pre-recorded programming) and zapping (switching channels during commercial breaks)” in order to ignore TV commercials (Stafford & Stafford 1996), whereas in modern media the same mechanical ignorance can be gained by deliberately closing ads instantly when they appear. Physical ad avoidance may lead to psychological reactance, which will be presented later down this theoretical review.

Ad avoidance occurring from display ads is especially tricky due to the cognitive and physical ad avoidance. Banners and text ads that do not force the user to consume the ad are probable to be cognitively avoided, since they appear parallel to other editorial content and do not demand any behavioral action from the user. On the other hand ad formats like pop-ups, are likely to be physically avoided, since users tend to close them as a result of the forced interruption of browsing activity and requirement of immediate response. (Chatterjee 2008)

2.1.2 Reasons for advertising avoidance online

Cho and Cheon (2004) conceptualized three arguments for why the Internet users avoid advertising. According to the authors ad avoidance can be caused by (1) the large volume of advertisements getting in way of goal-oriented behavior, (2) the perceived amount of ad clutter, and (3) prior negative experiences. Likewise the third argument of prior negative experience, Cronin and Menelly (1992) presented that TV viewers avoided ads, due to the recognition of the ad being an ad, not actually taken into consideration the content of that specific ad. Based on these findings it can be concluded that often there may not be a specific ad being avoided, instead all ads are avoided equally based on how they are presented to the user. On the other hand ad irritation, which often leads to ad avoidance can, according to Edwards, Li and Lee (2002b) (based on Bauer and Greyser (1968)), be classified into three categories, where
the two first categories take the content itself into consideration and the third one emphasizes the placing of the ad.

The first category highlights the content of the ad and states that the content is seen as annoying if it is insulting, untruthful, exaggerated or confusing. The second category focuses on the execution of the ad, and concludes that ads that are badly executed, due to for example sound, length and size, can lead to avoidance of the ad. The third category conceptualizes, in accordance to the two first arguments of Cho and Cheon (2004) presented above, that ad irritation is developed by the ad placement, and especially by displaying many ads to the user and/or, displaying the same ad too frequently (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b). Congruently Lee and Lumpkin (1992) discovered in their study that informative ads were less likely to be avoided. Also co-creation, in other words advertising focusing on a interactive relationship between the customer and the advertiser in order to create value, has been found to evoke enthusiasm towards advertising (Truong & Simmons 2010). However, it is important to bear in mind that interactive advertising can only be considered useful when the user is willing to interact with advertisement (Yang 2004).

Whatever, the reason may be for ads to ultimately be found irritating, and awaken ad avoidance, the first irritations towards advertisements arise from ads being intrusive (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b).

2.2 The perceived intrusiveness of online advertising

While advertising may be considered annoying based on the content, execution, or how it is placed, it is first and foremost evaluated based on how it interrupts the users (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b). Advertising that interrupt the user can be called pushed advertising, since the user does not choose to see the ad himself. In traditional advertising the push approach was the customary method, where one promotion was sent to several recipients. However, today the push approach is becoming less effective since consumers start to react more severe towards the perceived intrusiveness of advertising (Truong & Simmons 2010)

In comparison to general ad intrusiveness, the intrusiveness factor online may lead to even more ad avoidance than it would in traditional media. Some even believe that the negative consumer perceptions of intrusiveness online are compromising the added-value advertisers gain from new media, in comparison to traditional media (Truong &
Simmons 2010; Chatterjee 2008). Truong and Simmons (2010) found that pushed advertising on the Internet and other mobile digital formats are largely perceived as intrusive. According to their study users would form negative brand associations as an outcome of the intrusiveness, which result in negative impacts upon brand equity. On the contrary Truong and Simmons (2010) also found that positive brand associations were awoken when the users had control over what, when, and how they found product or service information.

Ha (1996), defined advertising intrusiveness as the degree to “which advertisements in a media vehicle interrupt the flow of an editorial unit”. In other words, advertising intrusiveness emerges when something the user has not chosen to see appears on the screen, while he is interacting with the content. Edwards, Li and Lee (2002b) additionally developed the definition by stating that it is not the ad itself within the editorial content that is intrusive, rather the intrusiveness factor emerges once the ad is perceived as interrupting the goals of the user. This means that even though the ad itself might be of interest to the user the fact that the ad is pushed up on him might lead to negative outcomes, that the ad itself would not have led to.

As the Internet has become more accustomed, and ad avoidance has grown, interfering advertising is perceived even more intrusive. In order to increase ad effectiveness by confirming that the ad will be viewed, and therefore give advertisers more value, ads have become larger and placements have become more intrusive. Ads are for instance made to float on the browser without disappearing, or displayed as full-screen, preventing the user to access the editorial content. (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009) One of the most common forced advertising types is the pop-up ad. Pop-ups are displayed on top of the editorial content the user is consuming, therefore forcing the consumer to see it (Chatterjee 2008). This kind of displayed advertising are often possible to remove by closing the pop-up. However, many displayed advertising, like videos, do force the user to at least watch the ad for a certain amount of time, before providing the consumer with the close button (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009).

Based on previous studies Morimoto and Chang (2006) divides the perceived ad intrusiveness into three dimensions; interference with privacy, interference with task performance, and interference with the media content. The first dimension consists of interference with a consumer’s privacy. This dimension is most applicable on for example telemarketing, unwanted direct mail and spam, where unwanted advertising is intruding directly on a users private space. The second dimension considers
interference with the cognitive process. This dimension has to do with task performance, where a user's cognitive process or activity is disturbed by the appearance of an ad (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b). The third dimension is interference with the media content. Consumers use a specific media in order to consume the editorial content presented in that medium (Ha 1996). Advertising and especially displayed advertising is often interfering with the consumption of the preferred editorial content online.

The second dimension, interference with one's task performance or goal-oriented performance, conversely with one's cognitive process, has been emphasized as the dimension that arises most irritation towards the ad, since it raises high feelings of intrusiveness (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Morimoto & Chang 2006; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Today the Internet can be used like traditional media, for example by watching broadcast programs or listening to radio, which then leads to more traditional behavior against intrusiveness, comparable to zipping and zapping. However, online users tend to be more goal-oriented than offline audience (Cho & Cheon 2004; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b), which may lead to intrusiveness affecting the online user more severe. For example in comparison to traditional media, the Internet is more commonly used for task-performance, then only for pure enjoyment of the entertainment content available. For instance if the second dimension is combined with the third dimension, interference with the media content, the reason for why the interference is irritating is because it interrupts the original goals of the user, to interact with the media content. The goal-oriented behavior of online users, results in most users taking an active role instead of a passive, and therefore finding the interruption of an ad as highly intrusive. Intrusiveness is ultimately a perception, or in other words, a psychological consequence that will arise when the cognitive process is interfered, therefore as long as an interference with the cognitive process occurs, the perception of intrusiveness is probable (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b). Task-performance can also be combined to limited time (Cho, & Cheon 2004), which leads to the appearance of an intrusive ad affecting the effectiveness and time utilization of the online user.

In their studies on perceived intrusiveness Edwards, Li and Lee (2002b) identified seven components through which the perceived intrusiveness of an ad across media could be measured. These components are: “distracting, disturbing, forced, interfering, intrusive, invasive and obtrusive”. However, the authors point out that an interruption does not seemingly mean intrusiveness, but the intrusiveness factor can be diminished by other factors in the ad, which limit the perception of the ad being intrusive. Even
though, it has been concluded that online users tend to be more goal oriented than offline users it is important to bare in mind that not all user activity online is goal-oriented, which means that the level of intrusiveness might vary depending on the users purposes to use the internet.

It has been indicated that not all ads are found to be equally intrusive (Ying, Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Ha 1996). The level of intrusiveness depends on how the ad is displayed in the online environment, and the perceived value of the ad to the user. One of the most intrusive ad formats online is the pop-up ad, since it directly interferes with the users online behavior. The user is forced to consume the ad, which means that he either has to consume the ad or close the ad. There are studies, like Chatterjee (2008), suggesting that the pop-up effect leads to higher levels of ad perception, ad recall, and CTR (click-through rates) in comparison to the outcomes of for example a banner ad. However, there are also several studies revealing the negative consequences of pop-ups, like ad irritation and ad avoidance (Truong & Simmons 2010; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002b). Furthermore, Ying et al. (2009) stated that even though irritating and intrusive ads may result in higher levels of recall, the impression the user has of the ad might be related to annoyance. Nonetheless, a remark about the objective of the ad still needs to be made. If only recognition is a goal for the advertiser, an intrusive ad could be more effective than a non-intrusive, even though it might lead to less positive or even negative attitudes towards the ad.

Even though there are ads that might not be perceived as intrusive as others, most ads visible today are to some degree intrusive and there has not yet been studies showing how to remove ad intrusiveness. Research has shown that users perceive different amounts of intrusiveness depending on their information search behavior and phase in their decision making process (Truong & Simmons 2010). Users tend to become more irritated when the ad interrupts goal-oriented behavior, like information seeking, than when the ad appears during entertainment. Ying, Korneliussen and Grönhaug (2009) on the other hand suggested that the perception of ad intrusiveness might be altered if the ad gives the viewer utilitarian and/or aesthetic value. In their results the authors found that an ad that provides the user with informational value or entertainment value can minimize the perceived intrusiveness of the ad. Furthermore, Phillips and Noble (2007) suggests that ads, which are consistent with the web site should increase the informativeness of the ad, and lead to increased ad value and less irritation towards the
ad, since the user experience will be met to a higher level. Relating to the placement of the ad, ads that do not directly and immediately interfere with the users online behavior are found to be less intrusive (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009). For example pop-ups displayed on top of the editorial content are found more intrusive than pop-under ads displayed under the editorial content, visible only once closing the other windows. Finally, Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) assembled three variables that can limit the perception of intrusiveness, “targeting viewers when their cognitive effort is low”, “increasing the relevancy of the advertising” to the user, and “providing value to viewers”.

2.3 Reactance theory

Reactance theory is a social psychological theory that explains how a person reacts to the loss of freedom in a specific environment (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). The fundamental idea behind the reactance theory is “that people become motivationally aroused by the threat to, or elimination of behavioral freedom” (Brehm 1989). Therefore, an elimination of freedom will drive them to restore that specific freedom.

Generally persuasive communication can lead to two opposite outcomes. Either the result can be positive, changing the behavior in accordance to the influence attempt, or the outcome can be negative, leading to resistance towards the influence, in the form of reactance (Mann & Hill 1984).

Reactance can occur in two different ways. Either the person, whose freedom has been threatened or eliminated, will try to restore his freedom, or the lost/threatened freedom will be found to be even more attractive than before. The level of reactance will also be affected by previous events. If a persons’ freedom has been threatened before it implies that, the freedom, or similar kinds of freedoms, might be threatened in the future as well, which leads to a large amount of reactance. Based on reactance theory, empirical demonstrations have shown that in the meantime while a lost choice tends to become more appealing, a forced “attitudinal position” becomes less appealing. This means that the social influence attempt pursued may easily hit back. (Brehm 1989)

This signifies that even though the specific freedom that originally was threatened would not have been that important, the importance of it will increase due to the perceived loss of freedom, and the reactance towards it (Edwards, Li & Lee, 2002a).
Therefore, physical ad avoidance is a deliberate decision to ignore ads and will lead to psychological reactance.

### 2.3.1 Reactance theory and online advertising

Reflecting the reactance theory to the intrusive manner of advertisements online, and especially the forced exposure, these kinds of ads will lead to negative outcomes. As presented in the previous section on perceived intrusiveness of advertisements online, users will react negatively to the deprived freedom of choice, and will as a result value the possibility not to see ads even more. Today, advertisers are more and more seeking for advertising opportunities online that cannot be cognitively avoided (Chatterjee 2008). Pop-ups appear on top of the editorial content, which means that the user has to interact with the ad to some extent, either by consuming it or closing, in other words physically avoiding it. This means that even though physical avoidance, most likely resulting in reactance, have occurred the user attention has been focused on the ad, and the ad has possibly influenced the consumer. Even though advertisers may prefer pop-ups, because of the possibilities for higher levels of recognition and recall (Chatterjee 2008), consumer will react by physically avoiding the intrusive ad. This reactance will most likely also result in users seeking possibilities to avoid advertising online more radically.

*Reactance theory and ad intrusiveness*

Like presented in the previous section, perceived loss of freedom can be combined to three dimensions of ad intrusiveness; interference with privacy, interference with task performance, and interference with the media content. The perceived intrusiveness prevent the users from having their own privacy, performing their cognitive processes, and enacting with the chosen editorial content, which they normally would be free to choose for themselves.

First and foremost the intrusiveness of the ad will affect the freedom of choice not to see the ad. However, the forced exposure will as well attempt to change the behavior of the consumer persuading him into a certain decision (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Even though the ad attempts to persuade a consumer into taking a specific action, the consumer still has the option to choose not to be persuaded. Consequently consumers do not have the same choice for viewing the ad, which is why the freedom of
noninterference can be seen as more sensitive loss of freedom, resulting in more negative consequences, than the persuasive ad itself.

Forced exposure to ads may also result in users feeling they’ve lost their freedom to be engaged in some specific behavior (Morimoto & Chang 2006). Online that specific behavior would be to engage with the editorial content they are consuming, either for entertainment purposes or in task performance purposes. Due to the perceived loss of control over ones own behavior, the forced exposure to the ad may result in different levels of reactance. One probable reactance towards an ad that the consumer feels has deprived his freedom to engage with editorial content is the removal of that ad, in order to restore the freedom to engage with the content. In other words clicking the ad away as fast as possible. The attempt to restore ones freedom rapidly, could also be an indicator to the declining click through rates (Cho & Cheon 2004). Instead of focusing their attention towards the content of the ad, users might focus their attention on removing the ad as fast as possible, not actually viewing the ad enough in order to be interested to click even further. This statement is supported by Truong and Simmons (2010) research, which found that users systematically close pop-up ads when they appeared.

At the same pace that media advertising has increased, the users have more actively pursued to restore the freedom they feel they have lost due to the forced exposure to ads. An example of traditional media users trying to restore their freedom once it has been eliminated are the so called zippers who are likely to switch channels responsively to advertising (Stafford & Stafford 1996). Online the increased downloading of ad blockers confirms users pursuance to get rid of forced advertising (AdBlockPlus 2015), Hence, “if consumers reactions to advertising are defensive it may not be an effective strategy to force them to view advertisements” (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a).

2.4 Uses and gratifications theory

Uses and gratifications theory has its roots in psychological communication. The main objective of the theory is to explain psychological needs that identify and shape why some people interact with a specific medium, and the motivations and benefits that explain the fulfillment of these needs (Ruggiero 2000). Fundamentally, this means that gratifications are seen as needs that have to be satisfied. These needs are satisfied ones they are met with certain types of expected media sources (Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch, 1973-1974).
Uses and gratifications theory examines what gratifications drive consumers to a specific media. Previous studies have shown that consumer motives trigger how users will use media content (Yang 2004). Ko, Cho and Roberts (2005) implied that users with a certain high motivation tend to more likely actively be in contact with messages, advertisers, and consumers in order to fulfill their fundamental motivations.

During the last decade the role of the media consumer has changed significantly. In comparison to traditional media, new media requires a higher level of interactivity from the user. The user also tends to use the Internet more intentionally in the sense that he or she will make purposive choices about which sites to visit (Rayburn 1996). Since, the object of this study is to find what motivations and benefits could trigger users to pull advertising, in other words choose to see it for themselves, the uses and gratifications theory which, seeks for motivations and benefits for media use, has been chosen as a valuable foundation for finding triggers for the pull effect. Furthermore, advertising seeks to communicate with the consumer, which makes it appropriate to use a theory with its foundation in psychological communication.

2.4.1 Research within uses and gratifications theory

Traditionally, users and gratifications theory has suggested that the gratifications a user gain from a specific media are based on pre-existing needs (Sundar & Limperos 2013). Based on earlier research, Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch (1973-1974) stated that audience gratification could be gained from at least three different sources. These sources are; the media content as such, how the audience is exposed to the media, in other words which media platform provides the content, and the social context that exemplifies how the audience is exposed to different media, meaning where the media platform is used. Cutler and Danowskis (1980) also theorized two similar sources for gratifications based on how media is used. The first type is content gratification, which implies that the individual gains gratification from the content itself, like a program or a commercial. In other words it is the message the media user is exposed to that give them direct fundamental value. The second type is process gratification, which indicates that the individual gains satisfaction from being a part of the communication process or the media itself. That is, gratification is gained from external values that cannot be combined to the media message itself.

Traditional outcomes within U&G research
Uses and gratifications theory has been studied broadly across, as well traditional media, as new media. During the last decades the attention has shifted from the more traditional offline media towards new media, like the internet. Even though, the media and audience has changed the uses and gratifications still somewhat reflects the motivations and benefits once used to explain usage of offline media (Sundar & Limperos 2013). Based on Sundar and Limperos (2013) study, uses and gratifications theory has studied different media platforms, however concluding that mostly the same motives and benefits can be found in many of them. For example, information seeking has been found as a gained gratification from as well traditional media like television and radio talk shows, as from newer media like the Internet, You-tube, social media, online newspaper and Twitter. Furthermore, entertainment has been a source for gratifications in most traditional and newer medias studied. Additionally to information and entertainment, Sundar and Limperos (2013), assembled a figure of variables occurring in many gratification studies. These variables are; social, information, emotional, escape, competition, connection, social status, entertainment, convenience and time related. Similarly, Korgaonkar and Wolin (1999) implied that Internet is used in order to retrieve information, seek entertainment, and escape. Also Whiting and Williams (2013) research studying why people use social media concluded ten uses and gratifications themes much alike the ones already mentioned above. These are “information seeking, pass time, entertainment, relaxation, expression of opinions, communicatory utility, convenience utility, information sharing, and surveillance/knowledge about others”. Based on this it is clear that even though the media has changed rapidly, uses and gratifications theory strongly lies on the same motives and benefits throughout different medias and different time periods. Undoubtedly many of these motives and benefits do still apply, and lead to user gratification. However, Sundar and Limperos (2013) suggest that the theory needs to be somewhat broadened as a result of the ever growing opportunities to consume and interact with media.

New possibilities within U&G research

One of the prime changes during the transformation from traditional media to new media, are the people. People in traditional media used to be referred to as audience, while people interacting with new media are most often referred to as users. The difference between these is precisely the usage of the media, in other words the interaction, and the way the user utilizes the medium.
Based on the move towards new media Sundar and Limperos (2013) stated that technology should also be considered as a source of gratification. However, Sundar and Limperos (2013) are not the first ones to take the technology aspect into consideration. Stafford & Stafford (1996) suggested in their research on traditional media, that some people take part in zapping, while watching TV due to that the process of zapping itself is gratifying. In other words, those who like the medium or technology like using it. The media platform has yet developed considerable, which means that the technology aspect could be even more current today. As an outcome of new media, users have obtained new rituals and new instrumental activities. As new features have been developed new user processes have emerged, which have resulted in new gratifications.

Based on Sundars’ (2008) MAIN model, Sundar and Limperos (2013) present four types of technological affordance, which may lead to new recognizable gratifications; modality, agency, interactivity, and navigability. Modality refers to different ways of presenting content online, like text, audio, pictures, and video, which may lead to gratifications like realism, coolness, novelty, and being there. Agency refers to enabling all users to be sources of information in other words create information and content online. This affordance may lead to gratifications like agency-enhancement, community building, bandwagon, filtering/tailoring, and “ownness”. The third affordance, interactivity signifies users possibility to interact with and through media. The gratifications gained from this affordance can be interaction, activity, responsiveness, and dynamic control. The last affordance, navigability, allows user movement through the medium, and raises gratifications like, browsing/variety seeking, scaffolds/navigation aids, and play/fun. It is important to acknowledge these new arising gratifications when considering how to create motivations and benefits for consuming an ad online. Bearing also new gratifications in mind the exposure to ads online can be moved forward from more traditional gratifications to including new gratifications and new opportunities for creating pull effect towards ads.

Other researchers have also taken into consideration new media and the high level of interaction it enables. Ko, Cho and Roberts (2005) studied “the causal relations among motivations for using the Internet and major interactive advertising variables”. In their study the authors divided interaction into two separate groups based on the parties interacting. The human-message interactions, studies users interacting with the content presented to them, like advertising messages. For example within interactive advertising human-message interaction can be clicking a series of hyperlinks in order
to deliberately be exposed to more information by the advertiser. On the other hand the human-human interaction refers to communication between a sender and receiver, for example between an advertiser and consumer. The human-human interaction can for instance take place in forums, or by giving feedback. Ko, Cho and Roberts (2005) found that the interactions users chose to consume were based on their corresponding motivations. For example a high level of information motives will more likely lead to human-message interaction, whereas users with high convenience and social interaction motives tend to choose human-human interaction. The findings also showed that users who interact either on a human-message level or human-human level find the advertisers web site more positive.

One gratification that was mentioned already 1996 by Stafford and Stafford, but has not been stated as a separate one from the other gratifications mentioned, is curiosity. Stafford and Stafford found that viewers gained gratification from zapping to see what else is on other TV channels. Even though the situation itself is somewhat outdated and the media different, it may be valuable to mention this gratification, since the authors already then concluded that the curiosity factor gives advertisers a unique opportunity to create commercials viewers do not want to miss.

The importance of considering different motives and benefits for traditional media and new/modern media does not end with these two distinctions. It is essential to keep in mind that when different content is displayed in the same media the same motives and benefits may not generate in user engagement within both contents. Yang (2004) concluded that it is probable that users treat the Internet and Internet advertising as two different entities, with different motives. That is even though escape might be a motive for using the Internet it may not be a motive for consuming an ad.

2.5 Pulled advertising

Truong and Simmons (2010), found positive brand associations among consumers when they had the power of what, how and when they obtained product and service information from the Internet. In other words as long as the users themselves have the possibility to pull the advertising, the reactions will be more positive.

In the following chapter pulled advertising will be presented. Due to the limitations to this specific topic in current research, existing literature will be complemented with the results from the interviews with three advertising agency experts.


2.5.1 Pulled advertising based on existing literature

As implied in the introduction chapter, there already exist advertising that utilizes the possibility for consumers themselves to pull the ad, as a result of for example information need. One of the most commonly used user initiated advertising is SEO and SEM. Search engine optimization (SEO) and search engine advertising (SEM), both apply the pull technic by giving the users the power to choose to either click on the ad or not. The ad is also insured to be relevant to the users by keywords that indicate what the ad is about (Truong and Simmons 2010).

Since, online behavior and online possibilities have resulted in users becoming more and more empowered (Truong & Simmons 2010), some advertisers have attempted to create pull effect utilizing this method. The more empowered the user feels, the more he also feels that he should be the one deciding on what he is exposed to. Apart from exchanging information with other users and especially companies, some advertising methods like co-creation of value are also empowering the user even further (Truong & Simmons 2010). These methods are especially difficult to apply to display advertising, due to the intrusiveness of its push factor. However, creative advertising approaches globally still support the need for displayed advertising online, currently being pushed up on the consumer. For example, whereas co-creation methods are a good way of communicating with the consumer and empowering him, these methods usually reach the brands current customer group, whereas displayed advertising has a bigger opportunity to reach future customers (Truong and Simmons 2005). Truong and Simmons (2005) exemplify this based on Datta, Chowdbury and Chakbortys (2005) research. According to the research AOL wanted to change the common opinion of its brand in order to attract new consumers that customarily would not have interacted with such an established and mainstream Internet brand. In order to do so the company used display advertising among other medias online, with the text “What do you think?” by changing the perception of the displayed advertising from intrusive persuasion to, a request for opinion, the company succeeded in decreasing the intrusiveness factor of the display ad.

2.5.2 Pulled advertising based on expert interviews

As stated in the beginning of the pulled advertising part of this thesis, three advertising agency experts were interviewed in order to gain deeper insight into the current situation of existing pulled advertising that may not yet have been studied. These
insights will be presented in the following section. This section of the thesis will also answer the research question (b) “How do experts strive to drive consumers to view ads online”.

All together insights were gained from three advertising agency experts representing two advertising agencies in Helsinki. Expert one (1) is a creative and strategist, expert two (2) is a managing director, and expert three (3) is a content planner at their respective advertising agencies. A broader description of the expert respondents can be found in the research method chapter, following this chapter.

2.5.2.1 Existing attempts and current possibilities to create pulled advertising

Based on the discussions with three advertising agency experts it is clear that the basis for creating pull effect has to be on focusing and allocating ads to the proper consumer group. In other words the basis to create pulled advertising is segmentation and targeting. Without proper segmentation and targeting, consumers will not pull ads, since the ads are not in their interest. Expert one points out that once the target group is identified, creating added value for the target group through the ad can create a pull effect. Expert three underlines that when using the Internet you are surrounded by knowledge that you choose to consume, therefore also the ads should support that.

As stated earlier in the theoretical framework one of the main problems is that ads, especially banners are pushed on a large volume of users without proper segmentation, which has lead to display advertising in a way becoming poisoned by badly executed ads, says expert one. According to him the problem is that digital advertising today is not properly focused, leading to users almost detesting advertising, because of the way it is pushed up on them.

The basis for creating pulled advertising is to offer the user added value by viewing the ad. The added value can be gained through humor, by empowering the user, through entertainment, or for example exclusivity, says expert one. Expert three supports this statement by indicating that most consumers are intrigued by good stories, that entertain, in other words if advertising would be more entertaining the pull effect could be reached and the ad could be more effective.

According to expert two there is no pure pulled advertising existing today. However, there are some advertising formats that come close to creating pulled advertising.
(1.) Native

According to expert two the only format that comes close to pulled advertising today is native advertising. Native advertising supports the editorial context and is placed within the context itself. Expert 2 exemplifies this with an ad they created in the format of an article, which was placed in The City magazine that was popular among their campaign target group, youngsters. Also expert one underlines this kind of advertising that attempts to create pull effect by placing the ad where the target group is active. According to him advertisement in the online game Habbo Hotel and more currently advertising for the TV show Temptations Island, where the advertisement was placed within the Tinder app, have used this specific tactic. These ads are not typical display ads, but rather ads that are done by placing some kind of complex in the media in order to interact with users.

(2.) Sponsorship

According to expert one a popular way of attempting to create pull effect towards ads are different kinds of co-operations with popular blogs. However, the effectiveness of this form will weaken once it is frequently used. Also the distinction between whether it is ethically and legally correct is vague, since it might not be stated clear enough that it is an ad. Another popular way is to collaborate with celebrities and create pull effect through the interest people have in a specific person. Expert three also underlines this sponsorship kind of advertising as a current technique of attempting to make ads more appealing. However, in these cases the pull effect is rather created towards the media site itself, whereas the advertising only utilizes the pull effect, instead of actually creating the pull effect.

(3.) Feel good

Another way of creating pull effect is to create value by empowering the consumer and creating “feel good”. Expert one exemplifies this by illuminating the Dove advertisement that boosts women’s confidence.

(4.) Humor

According to expert one added value can also be created through humor. An important basis is that when talking about added value it should be something else than only buying a product, it should be something that the brand per se can bring to the
consumer and by that create added value, like humor. A very good way of creating humorous advertisement is to show the ad in video format, which is also the trendiest way of advertising today according to expert one. Expert three also emphasizes the importance of entertaining the online user in order to get the user to choose to view ads online.

(5.) Reward

The only clear pull effect used in display advertising today is the so-called reward ad placement. Expert one states that this kind of advertising works because the user gains something from the media itself, like extra points while playing a game. Expert three also emphasize that most reward advertising that works efficiently are the ones that offer a reward that is linked to the media or the specific site the user is using. According to him one way of utilizing this kind of advertising could be to offer more news articles in for example Helsingin Sanomat once you have watched an ad. However, it is important to remember that reward ads should not be used as ransom. In other words, an ad that requires you to watch it in order enact with the desired content does not work in the same way as a reward gained from watching an ad.

(6.) Exclusivity

Pulled advertising can also be created through exclusivity. Expert one exemplifies this with an advertising campaign where a popular Finnish artists’ new album was exclusively presented in a display ad on a web site. This resulted in users actually coming to the web site in order to see the display ad, and spend a long time within the ad listening to music.

(7.) Service

Expert two points out that added value could be reached by offering the user service. In another words, if the ad could provide additional service to the consumer the possibility to create pulled advertising would be improved. Therefore, the ad should support the context likewise native advertising currently does. Expert 2 speculates whether display advertising could also be more attractive if it would not require a click, but the action would take place within the ad itself. This could be combined with providing service by for example being able to order straight from the pop-up. Expert three supports this by exemplifying that for example Veikkaus and Lotto could benefit from this kind of
advertising by providing the user with the possibility to choose the lottery numbers in the display advertising, without having to click further. This would leave the user feeling that he was provided with a service instead of directly with an ad.

Similarly, expert one reflects existing pulled advertising to online shop ads. Today many online shops use successfully user-initiated ads by advertising products under “you could also be interested in” or “others also viewed” categories, which serves the user with further similar options to what they are currently looking at. These kinds of promotions have shown that when the ad is placed correctly and it is the correct kind of ad, it performs. In this case the combination of proper segmentation and native placing can create the desired pull effect towards the ad.

(8.) **Teasing**

Also a site specific teasing could work. Expert two exemplifies this by an imaginable situation where the user would already be on his way to a specific site, for example to view 10 best goals by the football player Zlatan, and then Zlatan pops-up in an ad. This could grasp the user attention and interest more efficiently. On the other hand if a Fairy ad would pop-up on the same site that would most likely not create a pull effect, due to it not being of interest to the online users on the site.

(9.) **Control**

As the experts were very much against pushed advertising and forcing the ad up on users, they were asked what they would think about giving the user the control whether or not to see an ad online. According to expert 2 giving the user the option to view an ad would definitely work. According to her banners have pretty much destroyed the image of targeting, therefore asking the customer whether he would like to see an ad that has been selected precisely for him could work. Similarly to expert two, expert one does also believe that control could work, as long as it supports the current behavior of the online user.

### 2.5.2.2 Challenges and possibilities with pulled advertising

According to expert one pulled advertising is something everyone is hoping to create and the possibility to create pull effect within advertising instead of pushed advertisement is something worth striving for. However, the question, what kind of content would make this possible, remains. One fundamental start point is that for
different segments there are different kind of pulled advertising possibilities. The most common mistake today is that the target group is presented with wrong messages, products and services, says expert one.

Also expert two states that online advertising today is too homogenous. Advertisers do not consider the target group and message enough, but tend to push the same ad to the same places, where the ad reaches a specific effectiveness, without really considering how to improve further by creating more special solutions. By creating new kinds of display advertising based on the online media, superior results could be reached, at this point online advertising reflects traditional print advertising, the media is just different.

All three experts agreed that even though the ad would be properly segmented and therefore more likely to create pull effect, there is currently a resistance against this kind of segmentation, which creates challenges for the whole online advertising industry. The resistance is due to the gathering of user information, which many users are skeptic towards.

Also the industry raises challenges. According to expert two display advertising is usually sold as a package with a very low price. In order to change the system and create new display advertising there needs to be co-operation between advertising agencies and media agency. At the moment one of the biggest challenges is to prove to the client that new ways of advertising online work. Online advertising today is linked to metrics and especially impressions, clicks, and conversions are measured, which means that new formats are faced with the challenge of proving their effectiveness.

However, if pulled advertising is achieved there is a good possibility that the user will share it. According to expert one many advertising agencies today attempt to create goodwill, so that the word of mouth would start to flow, by careful targeting and producing extra value to the online user, goodwill could be achieved.

Conclusively, there is no clear way how to create pulled advertising online today, except rewards, SEM and SEO. Experts do attempt to create pulled advertising through for example native placing, but the knowledge on what motivations and benefits would drive the consumer to view ads online is still limited. All together the experts mentioned nine advertising formats or attributes that they either use to drive online users to view advertising online or that they feel could drive users to view ads online.
These were native placing, sponsorship, feel good, humor, reward, exclusivity, service, teasing and control.

2.6 Summary

This study attempts to find motivations and benefits that could drive consumers to view ads online, in other words create user initiated pulled advertising.

The theoretical framework has outlined previous studies within advertising avoidance, which is one of the main reasons for why there is a need for pulled advertising. According to previous studies advertising avoidance, especially within display advertising, arise from the perceived intrusiveness of the ad and the reactance towards it.

Advertising avoidance has mainly been studied based on possibilities to minimize it. Therefore, there is no existing theory on what could drive online users to choose to view an ad online. In order to gain insights to the media usage of online users and especially the reason to why they spend time online uses and gratifications theory was presented. The uses and gratifications theory implies some gratifications for media usage, but requires further research focusing on advertising and taking into consideration the shift towards new media. Moreover, there has not either been studies directly reviewing how uses and gratifications are affected when the online environment is not a specific medium, but the so called medium is instead advertising displayed in a specific medium.

Finally, research within pulled advertising was presented shortly. Due to the limitations in previous research on this specific subject, the results form the interviews with advertising experts on pulled advertising and its possibilities were included in this part of the thesis. There clearly is a possibility and a craving for user initiated advertising, however, the motivations and benefits driving consumers to pull the ad are still somewhat unknown.
3 RESEARCH METHOD

The chosen method is defined by the main research question “How to create pull effect in online advertising”. In order to gain deep insight into online users attitudes towards online advertising and advertising agency experts’ knowledge and thoughts on user initiated advertising, the appropriate methodology for this study is a qualitative research approach.

The aim of this chapter is to outline the chosen research approach and method by introducing the stages of planning, collecting and analyzing qualitative data.

3.1 Empirical research

The theoretical part of this thesis has focused on creating a framework of the current situation within advertising avoidance online and the possibilities for using uses and gratifications theory as a foundation for a solution to the ever-growing advertising avoidance phenomenon. The theoretical part has also presented pulled advertising based on interviews with three advertising agency experts. This part of the thesis focuses on the collection of reliable data from online users and advertising agency experts in order to comprehend whether there is a possibility to create pulled advertising by focusing on the user motivations and benefits behind seeing an ad online.

The research is exploratory (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, s. 139), since the study is among the first to invert the ad avoidance phenomenon, and instead of studying how to minimize ad avoidance, strive to find motivations and benefits that would initiate the consumer himself to choose to view the ad online.

The empirical part of this study strives to fill the information gap many advertising professionals are struggling with, how to create pulled advertising online. Data will be collected through qualitative interviews, where after data will be carefully analyzed and compared to the theoretical framework.

3.2 Research design

The research approach of this study is abductive, as the study goes back and forth between empirical observations, research and the theoretical framework, and aims to
understand online advertising from a new perspective. Likewise the abductive research process presented by Kovács and Spens (2005) this study starts out with close to null prior theoretical knowledge of pulled advertising, where after theory is matched to the real-life observations of advertising avoidance and demand for user initiated advertising. In other words suitable theories are searched to match the observation of a need of user-initiated advertising. Thereafter theory is suggested and final propositions concluded. Finally, the found conclusions are applied to the real-life observations made.

The exploratory nature of the study means that there is three principal ways of conducting the research. The research can study existing literature, interview experts, or conduct focus group interviews (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, s. 140). In regards to this study there is minor existing literature on the specific phenomena of pulled advertising. As the focus of the study is consumers, the proper method is to conduct focus group interviews. However, as explained earlier also experts have been interviewed in order to get deeper insights to pulled advertising as research within this topic is limited. Their thoughts have been presented in the theoretical part of this thesis.

A qualitative research method has been chosen since, respondent may be more deeply introduced to the subject, and therefore greater insight into the purpose of the study can be reached (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2007, s. 482). The purpose of this empirical research is to get an authentic understanding of the respondents’ experiences, which is why the non-standardized questions used in qualitative studies are suitable for this study. The non-standardized questions will support the aim to collect rich and detailed data. The interview will be conducted with a small sample of the desired population (Silverman 2011, s. 110).

Qualitative inquiry tends to use purposeful sampling. The intent of purposeful sampling is to choose “information rich cases”, from which insight and in-depth understanding can be drawn (Patton 2002 s. 242). The chosen information rich cases in this qualitative study are young adults. Young adults represent a part of the digital native population, which has grown accustomed to the digital world, and are active users of it.

Considering the time horizon of the thesis, this study will be a cross-sectional study, as it represents a so-called snapshot of the current situation and thoughts of advertising
Online (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, p. 155). Digitalization has grown rapidly and changed consumers considerably, during a short period of time. Therefore, it can be stated that the rapid change in possibilities and behaviors within the subject will continue to evolve. Thus, will also opinions towards online advertising and advertising techniques advance even further.

The interview will be semi-structured, that is, a non-standardized interview, as the interview questions will be determined in advance, but also further questions and discussion will be included in the interview (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009, p. 320). The chosen approach for the interview is therefore the interview guide. An interview guide will be pre-planned in order to ensure that the same topics are covered with all respondents. However, the interview questions are not strict questions, which will give the interviewer space to explore, probe and ask questions in order to deepen insights and clarify answers. The advantage of the interview guide is that questions have carefully been weighted before the interview in order to use time as effective as possible, and make the interview complete by gaining case-specific answers (Patton, 2002, p. 339).

Patton (2002, p. 379) emphasizes the effectiveness of recording the interview, however not forgetting about taking notes. Notes will be helpful both, after the interview during the analysis process, as well as during the interview in order to keep track of follow-up questions as well as to emphasize specific citations. After the interview has been conducted, it needs to be transcribed. Silverman (2011, p. 287) points out the significance of transcribing everything that happened during the interview, not forgetting about pauses, overlapping speech, turn-takings, etc. In that way the analysis will deepen as different word choices or pausing at a specific time will give insight to the opinions of the respondent. Based on this, raw data will be captured by recording the interview. The interviews will be transcribed immediately after the interview.

### 3.3 Data collection and respondents

In this research empirical data was collected through qualitative interviews. The qualitative interviews took place in Helsinki metropolitan area between 11.4.2015 and 31.5.2015.

The appropriateness of the location (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, p. 329) during the data collection was taken into consideration. The locations were chosen based on it
being convenient for the participants, and quiet enough in order to be able to record the interviews. The interviews with the experts were conducted in a meeting room at their respective office. This was found to be appropriate as the field of study was closely related to their work. Respectively, the interviews with the online users were conducted at each respondent's home, in order to make the respondent feel as comfortable as possible.

### 3.3.1 Advertising agency experts

In order to gain deeper insight into the possibilities of pulled advertising and answer the research question “how do experts strive to drive consumers to view ads online” three advertising agency experts were interviewed. The experts were chosen based on the criteria that they are all active in the digital advertising scene and have knowledge on the current online advertising situation.

Expert one is the creative and strategist at an advertising agency located in Helsinki. He has over 14 years of experience within marketing communication. During that time he has seen various stages and challenges within marketing communication advertising. He currently also blog about the turning point and challenges within marketing communications, for the online community Digitalist Network.

Expert two and expert three are working at the same advertising agency in Helsinki. Expert two has worked within digital marketing for 10 years, working with both Finnish and international customers. Experience has been gathered from the agency side as well as from the client perspective. Leading projects has always been her passion, and still is. All though today content marketing and building a seamless customer experience is her main focus. Expert three has worked in advertising agencies, digital agencies and even in a design agency as a creative for over 10 years. His responsibilities have ranged from copywriting to creative direction. A dream project for him would be something that would create a paradigm shift in the way people act or see the world: an innovation in the lines of Uber or Airbnb.

Before the interviews the respondent were sent an email asking them whether they would like to contribute to the theoretical framework of a master thesis studying how to create pull effect in online advertising. The respondents were explained the limitations of current research within advertising and the interest to include expert insights to the theoretical framework in order to give a deeper basis for the topic of pulled advertising.
All expert interviews were conducted and transcribed in Finnish, but for the purpose of this study they were translated into English, before presented here.

**Table 1 Advertising expert respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Advertising agency located in</th>
<th>Time and Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Strategist</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>14.4, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>15.4, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Content Planner</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>15.4, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the expert interviews are presented in the pulled advertising section in the theoretical framework. The results will be further analyzed and combined to the results from the online user interviews in the results analysis section of this thesis.

**3.3.2 Online users**

In order to answer the research question “what motivations and benefits drive consumers to view ads online”, six online users were interviewed.

Respondents were chosen based on the criteria that they are so called information rich cases. Therefore, the most important criterion was that the respondents would be accustomed with the Internet and active online users. In order to ensure this young adults were chosen as the appropriate group of respondents. Young adults have grown up accustomed to the digital world, and are therefore likely to be active users of it.

All respondents are aged 23-29, living in Helsinki metropolitan area. Due to the exploratory nature of the study, it is important to gather general data from the specific respondent group in order to gain a more comprehensive view into creating pull effect towards advertising displayed online. Therefore, in order to reflect the overall population of young adults a variety in the respondents’ occupation was strived for by choosing respondents with different backgrounds, educations and professions. In other words the respondents do not only represent a specific group of students or professionals, but the intention is to have variety. Therefore, some respondents are students and some have already graduated and started their professional carriers.
Three respondents were female and three male, in order to gain data from both gender groups. The female respondents were slightly older as they are aged between 26-29 years, whereas the male respondents are aged between 23-26. To sum up, the respondents represent a variety of young adults living in Helsinki metropolitan area.

The respondents were contacted by phone or through Facebook. They were asked whether they would like to contribute to a master thesis on online advertising. The purpose of the study and the attempt of finding attributes that may create pull effect in online advertising were not shared in order to get more genuine attitudes on advertising.

The interviews were conducted in either Swedish or Finnish in order for the respondent to use the language he or she felt most comfortable with. The interviews were transcribed in the language the interviews were conducted in, but translated to English for usage in the thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Time and place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Junior analyst (Finance)</td>
<td>11.4, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chemistry student</td>
<td>5.5, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Professional athlete</td>
<td>16.4, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Movie and TV production student</td>
<td>16.4, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>VD (Sports and wellness services company)</td>
<td>21.5, Espoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Flight attendant</td>
<td>31.5, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviews conducted in this thesis were recorded with an iPhone 5s, and transcribed within one day of the interview. During the interview process, the interviewer also took notes in order to provide back up in case there would have been problems with the audio recording, and in order to keep follow-up questions in mind,
without having to interrupt the respondents with a follow-up question while responding to another question.

### 3.4 Creating the questionnaire and planning the interview process

As already mentioned the chosen type of interview is the semi-structured one. Therefore, the interviews are non-standardized and the interview guide consists of a list of themes and questions to be covered (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, s. 320).

Even though the reliability of the study may be somewhat jeopardized by the semi-structured interviews, the value gained from the semi-structured format overcomes the risk. As the studied topic is complex, a semi-structured interview will give more flexibility to explore the topic (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, s. 328).

While assembling the interview guide, Paynes' (1951) view presented by Patton (2002 s. 339) where it is stated that good questions should at least be “open-ended, neutral, singular and clear” has been taken into consideration. Furthermore, the guide was structured in order to encourage deep answers. Therefore, background questions where left till the end of the interview, in order to not get the respondent into the habit of answering short and shallow, as well as to make the interview more conversational.

According to Saunders et al. (2009, s. 329) suggestions the interview will start out with more general questions relating to the research topic, followed up by further questions in a logical order.

The questions have been designed and introduced to the respondent in order to reduce bias and increase the reliability. To do so questions were phrased clearly and asked in a neutral tone of voice. The main questions were phrased more openly, like “what do you think about online advertising”, and followed up by more probing questions in order to gain more depth to the information, like “why do you feel that online advertising is irritating”, “what do you mean with informative advertisements”. Saunders et al. (2009, s. 332) also point out the importance of asking questions that are grounded in the respondents real life experiences, this strategy was utilized in questions like “Can you recall an online advertising that you have liked/chosen to see?”. In order to make sure the interviewer understood the respondent correctly some specific and closed questions like “to sum up, you feel that informative ads motivate you to view the ad?” were used after the open and probe questions.
Overall the interviews with the online user respondents were a bit more structured, than the interviews with the advertising agency respondents. The aim was to give all online users included in this study the same possibility to answer the interview guide questions, despite what their earlier knowledge on the subject was. On the other hand the interviews with the advertising agency experts were more open. This was strived for in order to give them more space to share their expertise and acknowledge areas significant to the topic that might not have been included in the interview guide.

The interview process started out by first interviewing one of the online user respondents, respondent 1. This interview also functioned as a pilot interview, where after the interview process was a bit modified. The biggest modification was how typical advertising and marketing synonyms were presented and explained to the respondents. This, due to the acknowledgement of misunderstandings that occurred between the interviewer and the respondent during the pilot interview. By explaining the synonyms from the beginning, a more positive interview process was gained, as the respondent did not need to ask what a specific synonym meant. After the first online user interview all advertising agency experts were interviewed in order to give an even broader basis for the interviews with the online users.

The online user interview guide can be found as appendix 1 and the advertising agency expert interview guide can be found as appendix 2.

3.5 The quality of the research

In order to enhance the quality of the study a good and thorough research design has been built. The most common failure to the quality of the data is to get the answer wrong, in order to reduce the risk, extra attention has to be given to the reliability and validity of the study (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill 2009, s. 156-157). This part of the methodology section will consider the risks to the quality of the research.

3.5.1 The reliability of the study

In order to strengthen the reliability of the study and reduce the scope of bias, the questions themselves as well as the interviewer asking them has to be neutral. According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009, s. 156) reliability can be strengthen by confirming that the same results would be gained on another occasion, in a study made by another researcher, by confirming the transparency of the study. In order to
do this the different stages of the empirical research have been explained to detail and
the interview guide used, added to the appendix section.

Furthermore, Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009, s. 156) described four threats to
reliability. The first threat “participant error” has been removed by choosing a neutral
and comfortable time and space for the interviews with each respondent. Keeping the
respondents anonymous in order to exclude the possibility of respondents answering
according to what they think is correct, instead of answering based on their real
assumptions and thoughts, has minimized the second threat “participant bias”. The last
threat, observer or interviewer error and bias, was minimized by the fact that all
interviews where conducted by the same person, and therefore the same interview
process was obtained with all respondents.

3.5.2 The validity of the study

The validity of the study is concerned with whether the results and findings really are
about what they seem to be about, in other words, do the measures really measure what
was intended to (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2009, s. 157). Hence, validity is
concerned with how well the researcher have been able to choose proper respondents,
how well the interview guide has been constructed, how successful the interview
process have been, and the ability to gain access to the respondents experience on the
topic. In order to ensure validity the chosen respondents were confirmed to be
information rich cases for this specific study. Furthermore, the interview guide was
accurately formed and the interviews were conducted face to face, in order to grasp the
respondents thoughts more accurately, and be more involved in the interview process,
in order to ask more detailed questions based on the answers, and explain for example
unknown definitions to the respondents.

3.5.3 The generalizability of the study

The generalizability of the study determines whether your study is valid among others
than the particular respondents you interviewed (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill 2009,
s. 157). In this thesis the generalizability concerns whether the results are applicable on
other Internet users as well. The findings in this study are restricted to the Finnish
population, as well as to young adults. Therefore, the study will not be applicable to all
Internet users. Furthermore, due to the exploratory manner of the study, as well as the
study being the first attempting to find attributes based on user motivations and
benefits that could drive users to view ads online, the prime goal with the study is not to conclude generalizable results to a specific population. Rather, the study attempts to build a basis and obtain attributes that might result in user-initiated advertising among young online user adults in Finland.
4 RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the gathered empirical data.

This chapter will begin by presenting the results from the interviews with the online user respondents. First, the respondents’ current thoughts on online advertising, and especially their considerations on display advertising online will be presented. Following, the experienced positive attributes and possible motivations and benefits considering the opportunity to create pulled advertising will be explained. This section of the thesis will also answer the research question (a.) “What drives consumer to view ads online”.

In the summary part of this chapter the empirical data from the interviews with the online users, and the interviews with the advertising agency experts, presented in the last part of the theoretical framework, will be combined and summarized.

4.1 Results from the consumer interviews

4.1.1 Online advertising and user behavior

In order to gain an understanding of the respondents’ opinions on online advertising, the respondents were asked to describe their current thoughts on the format. There was a clear variety in how the respondents perceived online advertising. Some had very negative attitudes towards it, whereas some just felt it being a part of the online scene today.

The negative attitudes varied from total dislike, to disliking some parts of advertising, or feeling that ads are not of value to the online user.

“I don’t like online advertising in any way” (Respondent 1)

“Okay, but often quite unnoticeable” (Respondent 3)

“Irritating” (Respondent 2)

Some respondents had a somewhat more positive view on advertising online, mostly these respondents had faced the reality of ads being a part of the Internet, but one respondent even countered that she thought advertising online was beneficial for her.
“I think print advertising is about to wear away, so it (online advertising) is what applies right now, so you just have to live with it ” (Respondent 5)

“I think it is just a part of the Internet, obviously they do sometimes irritate, but not in a huge way, since they are a part of it and belong there” (Respondent 4)

“It’s a good thing. As people use the Internet ads, and other new things appear that you might not have come over before” (Respondent 6)

Of all online advertising formats display advertising and especially pop-ups were found to raise most negative feelings and irritation. All respondents indicated dislike towards pop-up ads, and felt that it is the most irritating advertising format live today.

“It irritates more people than anything” (Respondent 3)

“Irritating, because most ads that are displayed to me on web sites are pop-ups and those irritate” (Respondent 2)

“Pop-ups are a bit... when you bump into them online you sometimes loose your nerve because those just appear all the time, and then you are not able to close them in any way, and they just are there, so you are more likely to loose your nerve with those, banners are a lot better because if you are interested then you can give them some attention” (Respondent 6)

“I think online advertising is good. As a consumer I react pretty heavily on advertising, so all in all I think it is good, but then there is also annoying factors, and that is precisely pop-ups” (Respondent 5)

“The fact that you can’t choose for yourself, but they are pushed up on you” (Respondent 4)

4.1.1.1 Advertising avoidance

As the attitudes towards online advertising and especially pop-up advertising were mainly negative it can be presumed that advertising avoidance is a big part of the respondents Internet usage and something actively strived for.

“I ignore it (advertising) entirely” (Respondent 1)
“I kind of get the feeling that they are trying to push and intrude... therefore it comes pretty automatically that I just close it (pop-up)” (Respondent 6)

One major reason for ignoring ads is the heavy amount of it being pushed up on online users frequently.

“There is so much of it (advertising), and something will all the time be displayed, so mostly you just ignore it” (Respondent 4)

All respondents stated that they were aware of ignoring ads online as well as did it unintentionally as a habit, depending on the advertising format. The respondents tend to ignore banners and other advertising that do not require any action cognitively. On the other hand ads that require action, like pop-ups, and are therefore not possible to ignore cognitively, are physically ignored.

“I shut it down (pop-up), without ever looking at them.... well, just filter them (banners) straight off” Respondent 4

“Banners and such you do not notice, they just sink in” (Respondent 3)

Annoying, mostly because the ones that are displayed to me online are pop-ups, which jump in front of the web site and irritate... pretty much the ones that do not irritate will be ignored...you don't pay attention to them, they just disappear into the site, of course you notice them, but they do not disturb what you are doing at the moment. Basically when you scroll down they will go away” (Respondent 2)

“The only thing my eye is searching for is the x, where you close the ad, you don’t even have time to look at the ad, because the only thing you are searching for is the x” (Respondent 1)

The main reason for physically avoiding ads appeared to be the feeling of irritation the advertisements arise. Following the advertisement attributes that are perceived as irritating will be presented.

4.1.1.2 Negative online advertising attributes

One of the mains reasons for advertising avoidance is the perceived irritation ads arise. The irritation occurs for different reasons depending on the user, however there is
clearly some advertising formats or ways of displaying the ad that are perceived irritating by most respondents.

**Poor Segmentation**

Clearly one of the most irritating elements that raise irritation is poorly segmented online advertising. Most respondents feel that the ads that are displayed to them online do not benefit them in any way or meet their preferences or activities. There are two main groups of poorly segmented ads, of which the first one is ads that are not properly segmented based on the interests of the user.

“I think it is such advertising which has nothing with my interests to do” (Respondent 1)

“Sometimes some ads are a bit useless, like diet pills, or magazines like “Seiska now only half price”, or others. The kind that does not interest you” (Respondent 6)

“When pop-up or the ones that open up under appears, those irritate...especially when it is sites that do not interest me” (Respondent 2)

The second option is that even though the ad would be properly segmented in accordance with the users interests, the irritation factor arises from poor segmentation in comparison to the cognitive behavior of the user at that time. In other words the ad is not combined to the current action of the user.

“I want to do what I'm doing on my computer and not suddenly start to shop anything” (Respondent 1)

Even though segmentation would be properly done based on the interests of the user, the segmentation might in some cases be perceived as intrusive. Today many users are anxious about the information gained and stored from their Internet usage, and feel that the ad is intruding their private space. Meaning that the ad itself is not perceived as intrusive, but the way it gains the information in order to be displayed to a specific user raises the feeling of intrusiveness. However, these feelings are more common among advertising that is segmented according to user interest, but not according to the current online behavior. Meaning that for example travel ads on Facebook are perceived as more intrusive than travel ads on a travelling site.
“Maybe, the fact that someone stores the information, I kind of feel like someone is intruding my personal life, it’s maybe not the ad but the way they pick up the information that makes me feel insecure” (Respondent 1)

“I think it is called re-targeting or something, which I think is odd at the same time as it is exiting and a bit scary... I don’t think it is irritating, but it is a bit scary... the fact that someone trails you at all times when the computer is online someone knows at all times what you are doing, you are not really secured ” (Respondent 6)

However, there are also users that do not mind the fact that information is gathered and stored, but feel that it simply is a part of the Internet today.

“No, they will still do it, so why would it matter.... Or I do not know if it is a good thing, but it is not a thing that I would fight against. It is not that remarkable. They are just able to give you better ads so why would it matter” (Respondent 3)

**Interruption**

Another key reason to the perceived irritation towards the ad is based on the way the ad is displayed. Undoubtedly, the placement that is found more irritating than others is the pop-up. This placement raises a lot of irritation, since it interrupts the user behavior and requires action from the user.

“For a long time I had pop-up ads blocked on my computer, now I think there is a virus so they do appear all the time, but I never look at them, I always just close them right away” (Respondent 4)

Based on the interviews made in this study, the feeling of irritation arises because the ad interferes with what the user intended to do online. Instead of enacting with the chosen content the users have to stop what they are doing and somehow react to the displayed ad.

“Those that pop-up so that I have to do something, I have to close them, the ones that are only visible on the side of the site I do not need to do anything to except not look over there or otherwise react, so the ones that I have to do something to are most (irritating)” (Respondent 1)

“All browsing gets interrupted and then you will have to press the x” (Respondent 2)
The two dimensions that were found to raise most irritation due to the interruption were interference with task performance and interference with the media content.

“Because you have to close them, or if a site with an ad appears when you are in your way to another site, it is damn annoying... those (pop-ups) are irritating because you have to do something to them”. (Respondent 3)

“Somehow when the pop-up appears, kind of in the middle, I get a kind of “get rid of it fast” feeling, like I just want to get on with my own stuff” (Respondent 6)

“It always pops up at the wrong time” (Respondent 5)

It is not only specifically the pop-up placement and the way in which that specific ad format disturbs the user that create irritation. Moreover, it is the actual interruption the ad creates that causes annoyance. In other words, also other ad formats may be perceived as irritating even though the interruption would not be conducted through a pop-up design. Of non pop-up ads, the one that was mentioned as irritating most frequently among the respondents, was ad formats that through audio tries to catch the users attention. In this study badly executed ads and especially the audio execution was combined to interruption. Even though the loud audio itself was found annoying, it was in the end the interruption, and required action from the user that raised irritation.

“I usually listen to music or might watch a video or something, and then music starts to play in the background, and then I have to react to that... You don’t have the possibility yourself to choose whether you watch the ad, but the ad is pushed on you, like a pop-up, it creates irritation. The fact that someone attempts to force up on you something ” (Respondent 4)

And then there is the videos that start to run automatically, those are even more irritating than pop-ups...since you try to focus on something and then suddenly there starts to for example play music, and the video starts to run on full volume, and you can almost not make it stop without closing the page... it disturbs what I’m doing. (Respondent 2)

Frequency

The level of irritation towards the ad also depends on the frequency of it appearing. The respondents in this study found pop-ups that appear many times in a row or continuously when entering a web site very annoying.
“Sometimes you lose your nerve when you try to open a website and then the same (ad) appears all the time...usually it doesn't just appear once and then you close it, but it appears again and again, for example when you enter another website where you read something and then enter another it appears again” (Respondent 6)

“In the long run it would be good to remember that it (the ad) would only appear once or twice, and not so that every time you enter a specific website the same ad appears, then it will definitely start to irritate” (Respondent 4)

On the contrary one respondent also stated that tight frequency capping was the reason for him remembering a specific online advertisement.

Even though online advertising raises a lot of irritation, there are also attributes that the respondent named as somewhat positive or useful. In the following part these attributes will be presented.

4.1.2 Positive online advertising experiences

Even though online advertising raises a lot of negative thoughts and feelings, there are some advertising formats that do create content that the respondents find valuable or likeable in some way. In this section these attributes that the online users have found as valuable within already existing ads will be presented.

The respondents in this study found some advertisement positive due to the specific qualities of the advertisement. An advertisement was perceived as positive based on what the user gained from it. The respondent mentioned both utilitarian and aesthetic values as positive. Utilitarian value was more often mentioned, but some respondents did mention aesthetic value as an attribute they like in online advertising as well.

4.1.2.1 Aesthetic value

Based on the respondents' replies aesthetic qualities were found in either static or video advertisement that were nice to look at, but the respondent also appreciated advertisements that looked nice due to what it indicated about the advertisers.

Aesthetic value was found in advertisements that were graphically well executed and according to the respondent looked nice.
"If there is an ad that is particularly fine... Graphically sleek, with cool colors and contrast, or some stylish animation to it. Not the traditional rainbow colors that make your eyes bleed" (Respondent 4)

“It can be a picture of a nice car for example, or nicely filmed nature or anything. It doesn't really matter, as long as it is well done” (Respondent 3)

Also video ads that were visually nicely filmed were found valuable and were more likely to be watched.

“Kudos to video ads, more of those (!)... It’s the visuals, maybe, or then animation, so that something occurs” (Respondent 4)

“If it's nicely and well filmed and entertaining. Primary if it is funny, then I watch it, and after that if they have filmed some nice places or cool stuff” (Respondent 3)

Product placement was also mentioned as an ad format the user did not feel negatively towards, as long as it was placed nicely inside the video. Additionally to the nativity an additional requirement was aesthetic value, since the respondent mentioned that the brand should be nicely filmed, and not just added there, but rather be a part of the context.

“Well, if it (ad) is well placed in a video, then it doesn’t bother me. Like if some brand is nicely filmed there, then it doesn’t bother me. As long as it looks good” (Respondent 3)

Overall respondents appreciated advertisements that looked like they had been given some thought and effort, and that somehow were able to stand out from the mass of advertising online.

“I notice banners simply if they are not boring, if there is something special with them and then you also know that the company has made more of an effort, it can be a color or some kind of a shape that does it... if the text and the ad looks different it speaks to me” (Respondent 5)

“That you try to stand out from the crowd in some way is always good” (Respondent 4)
4.1.2.2  Utilitarian value

In comparison to aesthetic value all respondent found that online advertisement in someway had brought him or her utilitarian value

Utilitarian value was found in advertisements that were designed to be useful or practical, and provided the user with service that were fit with the site the user was interacting with at that time.

“If I’m, for example, looking at shoes and then it gives you on the bottom of the page “you may also be interested in these shoes” and they are the same kind of shoes I’ve just looked at, than I think it is really good, because it is precisely what I am doing at the moment. “ (Respondent 1)

Also reward videos were positively perceived, as the user was able to benefit from them.

“In Spotify if you click on a ad you get to listen to half an hour of music without ads... I wouldn’t watch it (the ad) without the reward” (Respondent 2)

“When I still used to play mobile games, I did click to choose to see ads in order to gain something game-related when I watched the ad” (Respondent 4)

Furthermore, a kind of teasing online advertising was indicated as an interesting commercial. One respondent exemplified this with a Samsung commercial before the World Championship competitions. The ad was based on someone doing a bunch of crazy stuff that were published, but nowhere was it mentioned that it actually was a Samsung commercial, only in the advertiser was revealed. Also the fact that the advertisement was presented as native, in other words, it was placed as a part of the website, made the respondent more positive towards it.

“The ads (Samsung ads) were visible on goal.fi as articles and those had a lot of readers” (Respondent 2)

Other respondents also pointed out advertising formats that have the same kind of native affect to them as good advertisements. For example one respondent did enjoy sponsorship advertising by bloggers. However, there was a difference whether the ad was displayed just as a banner on the blog site, or within the text, written by the blogger herself.
“There is a difference, since the banner only shows the product, whereas within the bloggers own text the bloggers own pictures the blogger herself says that she uses the product. So if I follow and I’m interested in the blogger, it brings more security to the product, kind of like a friend would tell you that hey, I’ve used this product and it is good, it makes the product more trustworthy and you want to try it…” (Respondent 6)

Also the possibility of finding what you are looking for was mentioned as a utilitarian value gained from advertising.

“The fact that you will find the answer or what you are looking for quickly. There is not the possibility that you would not find what you are looking for. Usually there is millions of advertising and I do not know how they do it but, or does it have to do with re-targeting, but what I’m thinking about or have been thinking about pops up to me.” (Respondent 6)

4.1.3 Attributes behind the possible pull effect

In the following section the motivations for why some advertising was experienced as positive will be presented and reflected up on. Due to the limited amount of pulled advertising live today the respondents’ reflections towards why he or she might want to see an ad online were limited. Therefore, the respondents were requested to consider what could make them want to see an ad online. In order to gain more insight and depth to the responses some suggestions of pulled advertising based on the theoretical framework and the expert insights were presented.

Before mowing forward to the actual attributes mentioned in this study one fundamental requirement for the creation of user-initiated ads will be presented. Even though segmentation per se is not a motivation or benefit it is crucial to bare in mind before moving forward to the actual attributes for choosing to view an ad online. All respondents mentioned that the one thing that motivates him or her to watch an ad is that it somehow has to do with him or her. It can either be interesting to them due to their personal preferences, or based on what they are doing online at the moment.

“An advertising about Swedish speaking Finns are always funny, because it is something that has to do with me, it touches me.” (Respondent 1)
“Well if it has to do with my own needs somehow, that is probably the biggest (motivation)... if it has to do with something that I might be a consumer of, a very very likely consumer of” (Respondent 4)

“If it has to do with my needs in some way, then that is the biggest (motivation)... Like if there is some movie you would like to see or you are about to get some clothing and there is some kind of a clothing store with my style of clothing, anything, it basically depends on the time and what your own needs are” (Respondent 4)

“Those that directly relate to what I’m doing, so basically not in the way that I’m for example on a tabloid and then something pops up that I’ve searched for to eat tonight...but if I enter a site where I will buy a trip then it is very much okay if it (the ad) has to do with the trip” (Respondent 5)

In order to create pull effect in online advertising the attributes have to support the interest of the user. For example, a reward gained form watching an ad is of no good if the reward presented is something the user does not desire.

Segmentation also has its down sides. As explained above, online users mentioned the fear of someone following their every step online as something that worried them. However, there seems to be a difference to the level of resistance depending on whether the segmentation only follows the users interests or if the segmentation also takes into consideration the current actions of the user. One respondent said that she strongly disliked ads following her based on what sites she had visited, but when an ad was displayed to her based on what she was doing at the moment and especially if it brought here added value, she did not feel the same resistance towards the advertisement, instead she felt that it gave her added value.

According to the respondents the most irritating ads were the ones that popped up based on online search history.

“I notice that some ads pop-up because I have just searched for a site that would have the information that I would have been interested in, and that makes me irritated” (Respondent 1)
However, the same respondent also stated that what she likes the most with ads is that they support what she is doing at the moment.

“Well probably, if it has something to do with what I’m doing at the moment” (Respondent 1)

Following, attributes that may or may not exist, but are possible to create pull effect will be presented.

(1.) Reward

Like mentioned in the introduction section, reward advertising is one of the most certain ways to get the user to actually choose to view an ad online. Many respondents either liked the reward advertising they had experienced, or felt that gaining a reward would make them more likely choose to view an ad online.

“Yes it (reward advertising) would be pretty good. Would definitely work” (Respondent 6)

However, one crucial requirement is that the benefit, in other words the reward gained, is trustworthy, if not the ad will be found irritating.

“I don’t really believe in that, I don’t think you really get something, I just simply think it is misleading. It depends a lot on what you gain. I would say that it is never shown what you will gain. Based on what I have seen, it just says you could win and you might win, which doesn’t mean that you will win” (Respondent 6)

Also, the respondents who felt that rewards would make them view the ad stated that the reward should be beneficial for them in some way. The respondents would be happy to receive a reward that somehow benefited their actions on the specific site they were enacting with at the moment.

“If you go to a web shop site where it pops up that you will get free shipping with this code or -10% if you use this code” (Respondent 2)

“In that case I would probably watch the ad. Except if it would appear many times in a row that it doesn’t give me anything. That it is not just ”hey watch this and you will gain something; wow you gained a cyber kiss on the cheek”, thanks a lot (!). In other
words so that I do not feel that I have been fooled, so that it really is something that can help what I am doing” (Respondent 1)

“If I get money or some kind of a discount, than it would be good” (Respondent 3)

The video rewards that were mentioned and used by the respondents did give the user extra value based on the site he or she was enacting on. The respondent who mentioned that he likes reward advertising on Spotify gained 30 minutes without ads interrupting his music experience, and the respondent that had watched reward advertising while playing a game gained power ups or other game specific attributes that helped him to proceed in the game.

All respondents felt that a main motivation would be gaining some kind of value. In other words getting a coupon or discount for watching the ad. Even though most respondents felt that they would like to watch an ad that they benefitted from, one respondent (6) disliked the fact that a company would promote you a product or service through discounts, and felt that discounts made the company seem desperate. However, one reason for the negative attitudes was most likely the uncertainty of whether she actually would receive the reward.

“What I have seen it always says, you can win or you may win, which doesn’t mean that you actually will win” (Respondent 5)

(2.) Native

As explained above in the section on negative advertising attributes, interruption is one of the main attributes raising irritation and resulting in advertising avoidance. The interruption attribute has to do with the placing of the ad. In order to create pulled advertising the interruption effect needs to be minimized.

All respondents indicated that native advertising, in other words advertising that is placed within the editorial content was more likeable than pure display ads that floated separately from the editorial content, and for example popped up.

One respondent exemplified the placing of the ad by stating that the same website could have both advertising she wanted to consume and advertising she did not. The main difference between these ads was the placing of them. One ad was a banner
whereas one ad was natively placed within the content, in this case within the bloggers text she had chosen to consume.

“Clearly there is a difference between them, the banner is only the product whereas within the text and in the bloggers own picture she says that she uses it herself...just a banner is just some advertising” (Respondent 6)

Even though the native placing of the ad within the blog affected how the ad was received the blog itself played a big part in the creation of pulled advertising. In the following section this kind of blog and sponsorship advertising will be more closely presented.

(3.) Sponsorship

Sponsorship advertising utilizes pull effect towards a person or a celebrity. By sponsoring a followed person the brand or the product can create interest towards itself.

One of the main sponsorship advertising formats online today is blogs. Advertising on blog sites can be placed in various formats, but the one mainly utilized for sponsorship advertising and the one creating most pull effect towards the ad itself is the native advertising explained above, which is placed within the bloggers text. Apart from the native placing discussed above this form of sponsorship advertising also creates pull effect due to the admiration towards the sponsored person and the liability he or she creates towards the product or the brand.

“If you are interested in some blogger and follow her it kind of brings more assurance, a bit like a friend would tell you that hey I used this product and it is very good. It creates a kind of reliability, so that you want to try it yourself as well” (Respondent 6)

(4.) Service

The interviewed respondents felt that if they could benefit from the advertising service wise, they would be more likely to view it. One respondent exemplified this by explaining the product promotion many clothing web shops offer their clients. When the client is looking at a specific product, the website can for example present him with clothes that are the same kind of style by offering them with the promotion “you might also like” or the website might present the promotion by stating, “others also bought”.
“If I’m for example looking at shoes and then it says down on the site “you might also like these” and they are pretty much the same as the ones I’m looking at, then I think it is really good because it is exactly combined to what I’m doing at the moment” (Respondent 1)

“Maybe also stuff that I know less about, like electronics, so there I would probably need help, then it would be a positive thing that it says that hey, did you know about this and this enhancement that might have to do with the camera you bought” (Respondent 5)

The respondents also found other sites that use the same kind of service valuable.

“What comes to for example Netflix... there I think it is super nice with “you might also like”, because there are so many millions of videos, that I think it’s nice that I don’t myself have to, but they check and look for them on behalf of me. I have found many videos that I really want to watch, so there it works really well” (Respondent 5)

“If I had a trip coming up and I needed a hotel or something alike then of course it works that someone has for example recommend something. Everything that... if you for example have booked flights, than there could at the same time be a possibility to rent a car, book a hotel, what attractions there is close by. These things always help, it does work. I myself would look at everything, get to know the place and view everything” (Respondent 6)

One respondent who strongly dislike ads that popped up, actually came to like a weather report ad due to it being of service to her.

“Well it was a good thing because then I got an answer to my question” (Respondent 5)

(5.) Information

Positive associations towards the ad were also found if the ad provided the online user with information. One respondent indicated that the best thing with online advertising is the information it provides to the online users.

“The thing that you will find an answer fast or overall what you are looking for. There is not a possibility that you would not find what you are looking for” (Respondent 5)
(6.) Humor

Entertainment was identified as an attribute that might create pull effect towards the ad. The level and kind of entertainment varies a lot depending on the person. However, the one element that was most often found entertaining, especially by male respondents, was humor.

“Maybe a super bowl ad or alike. If there really is funny advertisements than those might be nice to look at, but otherwise most are boring. If there is funny advertisements then it is fun to look at them“ (Respondent 3)

During the interview all respondent were requested to recall one ad they had found nice in some way. Many respondents were unable to recall any specific ad. However, respondent 2 did recall an old TV commercial for “Nyt liite” utilizing humor as the base of the commercial.

There is a possibility that humorous ads are able to create pull effect, however the placing of it and the awareness of the ad does affect the pull effect as well. One respondent stated that you might look for entertaining ads yourself, but you might not choose to see it if it pops up.

“I find them myself... usually it is funny videos that people have linked” (Respondent 3)

(7.) Teasing

Teasing like advertising refers to advertising that intrigues the user, so that he or she chooses to view the ad. A couple of the respondents had either experienced this kind of advertising or felt that it could make them choose to vie an ad online.

“What Samsung did before the world championships... First they did stuff outside. It started with them reflecting images on to a mountain in Brazil during the night, so that the whole village was in the news for that, but nowhere was Samsung mentioned. After that there were people in black clothing with their faces painted in the audiences of champions league and premier league games, just being silent with their fist up in the air or something equally weird, and then it again was published online that this thing continues. After that practice football fields were made to look like footballs had landed from outer space all over the field, they had basically destroyed the fields, and
then there were some more alike happenings. Only finally it was revealed that Samsung did it all. These so called ads were visible on goal.fi in the format of articles and they had a lot of readers” (Respondent 2)

“A cool slogan or could work or then just “hey, if you are interested in this, click on me” because then you get curious like “hey, I’m a bit interested in this, I’ll click to see”” (Respondent 5)

(8.) Control

All respondent were asked what he or she would feel about the possibility to choose to view an ad. In other words would the ad be more appealing if the user himself was able to choose whether to view the ad or not. This question was exemplified by asking whether the respondent would be more likely to view a display advertisement if they were asked, “would you like to view the following ad”. Most respondents felt that the power this opportunity would give them would make them more likely to choose to view the ad.

“I would like that! It could pop-up and say “hi if you are interested in seeing an ad about health, we have chosen this specific one for you, based on your online behavior, please click yes or no, and thank you for your time”. Just very briefly, then I would probably choose to view it, or almost certainly I would” (Respondent 5)

However, it is very important to somehow indicate that the ad will be beneficial for the user. In other words, that the ad either supports the interests of the user or the user is able to gain something from it.

“If the question would only be would you like to watch an ad, without any reward, I would not choose to see it” (Respondent 2)

“How many people isn’t it that have chosen not to get print advertising home, I think it would be many people who would choose not to view it...On the other hand it would be much better to be asked, some stuff you have to see without choosing to see them, but some stuff get better because you are able to choose, for example if you would get the possibility to view a trailer after you have already gained information on the movie” (Respondent 1)
(9.) Charity

The last attribute is charity. One respondent mentioned that if watching the ad would serve some kind of greater good he would possibly choose to watch the ad.

“Well okay if it really serves a greater good, that you can basically take advantage of that, some charity raises some kind of money or something like that, than it could be okay” (Respondent 3)

Even though this statement was only done by one of the respondent it is a well known and much used marketing and advertising characteristic and therefore also worth mentioning here.

4.2 Summary

The results in this empirical study indicate that there are attributes that do raise positive feelings and are valuable to the online user, and may therefore create pull effect towards online advertising. Which attribute will be the most effective and make users take the initiative to view an ad depends a lot on the online user and the site he or she is enacting on.

Some of the online user respondents mentioned both aesthetic and utilitarian values during the interviews. Also advertising experts touched up on the topic by specifying that advertising should visually be so attractive that the consumer wants to consume it. Aesthetic value was mostly gained from ads that were well executed and talked to the graphic preferences of the user.

Both the online user respondents and the advertising expert respondents mentioned utilitarian value attributes that create positive feelings towards the ad and are possible to create a desire to view an ad online. Both online users and experts mentioned nine online advertising attributes that bring the online user utilitarian value. Table 3 shows these utilitarian attributes, and whether they were emphasized by online users or by advertising experts.
### Table 3  Utilitarian value attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Online users</th>
<th>Advertising experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel good</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two attributes that stand out are the reward attribute and the service attribute. Most respondents found these attributes to create pull effect towards the ad. Both attributes are clearly beneficial for the online user and can therefor be seen to create utilitarian value for them.

Following native placing was very much emphasized by the experts. Also some respondent felt that native placing made them view the ad, but in those cases native placing was often combined to the sponsorship attribute where the users where very interested in the opinions of the ones producing the editorial content. Therefore native placing is more likely to be appreciated as long as it provides the online user with desired content.

The control attribute is commonly combined to the reward attribute as the user chooses whether he or she would like to view the ad and gain the reward. However, many online
users that were not familiar with the reward attribute did feel that control over whether to view or not view an ad would more likely make them choose to view it. Also experts emphasized the possibility of giving the user the alternative of either viewing the ad or not.

The charity attribute was only mentioned by one of the online users and the feel good attribute was only mentioned by one of the advertising experts. Both of these attributes create a positive feeling to the viewer based on how it if makes the user feel about themselves. The attribute can either be external, were the feel good is created by helping others or internal were the feel good is created by feeling better about oneself.

Information per se was not specifically mentioned by many of the respondent, but based the other attributes for why online users choose to see an ad, information plays a key role in many of them.

The advertising experts mentioned exclusivity as a possible attribute for creating pulled advertising. This attribute was not mentioned by the online users, however the teasing attribute mentioned by both advertising experts and online users, does touch up on exclusivity a bit as well, as bot attributes attempt to create a somewhat of a hassle and interest towards the ad and therefore pull the users to view the ad.

Humor, was exemplified by both online users and advertising agency experts. The focus of this attribute is to entertain and delight online users. In this study only male respondents mentioned humor as an attribute, for watching an ad online. Overall, male respondent felt that advertising should entertain them, whereas female respondents emphasized the possibility of the ad benefitting them in some way. However, there is no clear female attributes or clear male attributes, but the attributes preferred are rather more individual specific and based on the online users virtual behavior.

Based on the interviews there is a difference between, ads that online users react positively towards and that are appreciated, and ads that actually create a pull effect. Even though many online users appreciate the attributes above, all of them do not generate the desired pull effect this study attempts to uncover. Therefor, the following analysis section will take a closer look at the motivations and benefits behind the attributes and analyze which ones actually have potential and are likely to create pull effect towards online advertising.
5 ANALYSES OF THE RESULTS

The purpose of this study is to create an understanding of how to create pull effect in online advertising by studying what drives consumers to view ads online.

In the previous chapter, the results based on online user interviews were presented and combined to the results of the expert respondents interviews, presented earlier. In this chapter the results will be analyzed. The analysis will start out by studying the current online advertising situation, and whether there is a need for pulled advertising. Nevertheless, the emphasis of the analysis will be on how to create pull effect in online advertising based on motivational and beneficial attributes. This part will also answer the main research question (1.) “How to create pull effect in online advertising”.

5.1 Analyses of the current online advertising situation

This part of the chapter will analyze the current online advertising situation, and combine the results from the interviews to current literature presented in the theoretical framework of this thesis. Online advertising and online user behavior will be reflected towards the theories on ad intrusiveness, reactance theory and theory on advertising avoidance presented in the theoretical framework.

The interviews conducted in this study clearly show that advertising avoidance today is growing. This finding is supported by Chatterjee (2008) who stated that advertising avoidance today is rather the norm, than an exception among online users. All consumers stated that they to some degree do avoid advertising online, and the experts indicated that advertising avoidance is one of the biggest challenges they face in their day-to-day work.

In accordance with previous research by Truong and Simmons (2010), Chatterjee (2008), and Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) also this study found that most people do ignore advertising online, and a big reason for the ignorance is the large amount of advertising displayed online. This has also been referred to as the “cluster-bomb approach” (Cho & Cheon 2004). According to the experts advertisers today are keener on delivering impressions than focusing on how the consumer reacts on the ad. This leads to a large amount of ads being displayed continuously and through placements that are most likely to gain a delivered impression. This means that ads are
continuously pushed up on online users resulting in online users avoiding them actively.

In order to ensure delivered impressions, many companies today prefer display advertising, also the experts stated that a combination of different display advertising today is very common. However, based on the interviews with online users display advertising are precisely the ad formats that raise most negative attentions. In accordance with previous research within intrusiveness of online advertising by Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug (2009) and Edwards, Li & Lee (2002b) the online users in this study stated that they first and foremost feel annoyed by the ad due to the interruption it causes. As all online users mentioned pop-ups as the most annoying ads without specifying the content of the ad itself, this study confirms the definition of Edwards, Li & Lee (2002b) that it is not the ad itself within the editorial content that is intrusive; rather the intrusiveness factor emerges once the ad is perceived as interrupting the user. However, Edwards, Li and Lee (2002b) also found that an interruption does not seemingly mean intrusiveness, but the intrusiveness factor can be diminished by other factors in the ad, which limit the perception of the ad being intrusive. The same finding was made in this study as the respondents indicated that some display ads and even pop-up ads had been beneficial to them due to for example the information the ad provided. Ultimately, Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) assembled three variables that could limit the perception of the ad intrusiveness, “targeting viewers when their cognitive effort is low”, “increasing the relevancy of the advertising” to the user, and “providing value to viewers”. This study found that “increasing the relevancy of the advertising” and “providing value to the viewers” could limit the perception of the ad as intrusive and even create pull effect towards the ad. In this study there was no clear confirmation that "targeting viewers when their cognitive effort is low” would create the desired pull effect. However, the possibility of consumers using the Internet like TV, in other words for watching series or movies, and therefore utilize a lower level of cognitive behavior, which could affect the perception of the ad as intrusive, is possible.

Based on the interviews with the online users this study found, in accordance with previous research on advertising avoidance, that there is broadly two main ways of avoiding ads. Ads are either avoided cognitively (Truong & Simmons 2010; Chatterjee 2008) or physically (Chatterjee, 2008; Stafford & Stafford 1996; Breahm 1989). Online user respondents tend to ignore banners and other advertising that does not require
any action cognitively. On the other hand, ads that require action, like pop-ups, and are therefore not possible to ignore cognitively, are physically ignored. In order to decrease the possibility of online users cognitively avoiding ads many advertisers have chosen to show their ads as pop-up ads (Chatterjee 2008). However, as mentioned above all respondents stated that specifically the pop-up ad placement is the most annoying one and raise a lot of negative attitudes, as the users are forced to see something they have not chosen. Advertisers often choose the pop-up format, since it forces the user to at least somehow acknowledge the ad, and therefore the ad might be able to influence or grab the interest of the user. However, as the advertisers practice this placement they remove the freedom of choice of the online user which in accordance to reactance theory by Brehm, (1989) can lead to two possible outcomes, either the one affected will try to restore the freedom, or the lost/threatened freedom will be found to be even more attractive than before. Based on the interviews in this study the users tend to react by restoring their freedom. Therefore also this study found that the removal of the freedom of choice results in advertising avoidance online (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a; Brehm 1989). As a result from this pop-ups today tend to be more and more similarly avoided as banners. The clear majority of the respondents stated that they immediately search for the close button without even looking at the ad. The shutting action is closely related to the behavior of cognitively avoiding banners, as online users tend to do it more and more unconsciously when the ad appears.

There have been several studies researching why users avoid advertising online. The one reason continuously repeated in previous research within reactance theory and theory on intrusiveness is the interference with ones goal oriented behavior (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Morimoto & Chang 2006; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Likewise, also this study found that interference with ones cognitive behavior is the one interruption factor that raise most irritation towards an ad. Compared to other media, online users tend to be more goal-oriented, and therefore the interruption is more heavily reacted up on online than in more traditional medias. During the interviews the respondents repeatedly stated that the most annoying feature with ads online was that the ads somehow interrupted what the online user was doing at the moment. Presumed, respondents found ads that blocked their interaction with the editorial content annoying, however the study found that not only pop-ups that block the user behavior are found disturbing, rather any kind of stimuli that distracted the users attention raised annoyance. The respondents for example stated that an ad, that started to play loudly when opening a web site, did disturb their behavior as they had to go and
adjust the audio or close the ad in order to proceed with their chosen behavior. Even though the ad per se did not block their online behavior it did interrupt their cognitive behavior. Apart from the two main reasons for advertising avoidance, intrusiveness and interruption with one's cognitive behavior, the attributes found to lead to advertising avoidance in this study are in line with previous research by Cho and Cheon (2004), Edwards, Li & Lee (2002b), Cronin and Menelly (1992). In accordance with this study the studies state that advertising avoidance is due to the large amount of advertising clutter online, previous advertising experiences, badly executed ads, like too loud ads or in this study ads that start to run by themselves, untruthful ads, and the placement of the ad.

Earlier research by Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) have found that the perception of an advertisement as intrusive can be altered if the ad offers the viewer utilitarian or aesthetic value. Both the experts and the online users support this statement. Based on the studies ads are more positively experienced and might even be pulled if the user finds that the ad might bring him or her some kind of value. In accordance with previous theory by Sundar and Limperos (2013) within uses and gratifications theory, also this study found that the modality factor in new uses and gratifications research did bring online users aesthetic value. Online user respondents expressed positive thoughts towards ads that they experienced as nice looking or cool. However, this study found that not all attributes that create gratifications and value for online users do affect the possibility of the ad being pulled. Even though the ad would give the respondent aesthetic value it is less likely to create pull effect than an ad that brings the user utilitarian value.

Based on the interviews aesthetic value increases the approval and satisfaction of the ad, whereas the possibility of creating pull effect towards the ad is mostly gained through attributes that provide the online user with utilitarian value. In other words aesthetic value might bring the user added value and raise more positive feelings towards the ad, however based on this study, display advertisement that offer the user utilitarian value is more likely to be pulled.

Even though aesthetic value might not be enough to create pull effect towards the ad all respondents mentioned some sort of a utilitarian value that could be gained from an ad and that would make them watch the ad online. Following the motivations and benefits behind these attributes will be analyzed more closely.
Motivations and benefits that drive consumers to view ads online

In this part of the chapter the motivational and beneficial attributes leading to pull effect will be analyzed and combined to previous research.

According to Sundar and Limperos (2013) uses and gratifications theory has traditionally suggested that the gratifications gained from a specific media are based on pre-existing needs. Since uses and gratifications theory in this study is used as a basis for finding motivations and benefits that would make an online user pull online advertising, the decision to use a specific media or in this case “use” advertising will be much more fast paced. Therefore this study found that the gratifications gained are not only based on pre-existing needs, but also on needs that arise as a result of the media being used.

Roughly, previous research has made a distinction between whether the gratifications are gained from the content itself or the media process (Cutler & Danowskis 1980; Katz, Blumler and Gurewitch 1973-1974), this study found that motivations and benefits are mainly gained from the advertising content as long as it supports the media process performed by the online user.

Based on the empirical study six motivations and benefits behind the attributes that were presented were identified as likely creators of pull effect towards advertising online. All these attributes bring utilitarian value to the online users and are therefore likely to create a desire to view the ad. In this part of the chapter, these attributes will be presented and analyzed.

Before presenting and analyzing the attributes that could create pull effect towards an ad online, it is important to highlight one crucial element for the creation of pulled advertising. As can clearly be seen from the results from both the expert interviews and the online user interviews, the ad has to be properly segmented and targeted in order to create a pull effect. Once the target group is known, the ad can be presented to them as valuable and is therefore more likely to be voluntarily viewed by the online users. Despite the attribute used to create value, value cannot be reached without displaying the ad to an online user finding value in that specific ad at that specific moment. Therefore, targeting and segmentation based on both the online user and the web site are crucial for the creation of pulled advertising.
Motivation and Benefit 1: Reward

The one attribute that most clearly brought something to the table for its viewers was the reward attribute. Respondents stated that they were likely to choose to see an ad if it was clearly stated that they would gain something from it. The preferred reward depends on the user, but if the reward is combined to the website the user interacts with it is likely to be found valuable. For example gaining game currency for a game the user is playing or getting a discount coupon to a web shop the user is browsing, would give the user utilitarian value that could make him or her choose to view an ad. By focusing both on the user and the editorial content the ad supports the “increasing the relevancy of the advertising to the user”, and “providing value to viewers” attributes assembled by Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a).

However, some respondents expressed a concern with whether they really would gain the reward they were promised, therefore, it is important to make the ad as truthful as possible and really meet the expectations of the user. The experts also highlighted another risk with rewards. According to them rewards do work, however, the reward should really be a reward and not a ransom. In other words the reward has to be something of additional value. An advertising required to be viewed in order to, for example, get through to a website would according to experts raise negative thoughts towards the ad.

The reward attribute is the one attribute that already fully exists as online advertising that utilizes the pull effect. All respondents were to some degree positively settled towards rewards, however it is important to keep in mind that some respondent had already experienced the pull effect from the reward, which to some degree might have had an affect on their answers. However, the fact that reward is an existing and to some degree known attribute does not change its usefulness, rather it emphasizes the effect of the attribute.

Motivation and Benefit 2: Service

This study found that if the ad in some way functioned as additional service to the user he or she was likely to choose to view the ad due to the utilitarian value gained from it. Many respondents considered web shop advertising that promotes additional items to the user by presenting them through the statement “you may also like” useful. Also travel tips on for example an online travel service site, were found beneficial.
Correspondingly, the experts addressed service, as a possibility to create user-initiated advertising. Furthermore, experts emphasized the possibility of specifically using service within the display ad, meaning that the online user would not have to click any further, but could be provided with service right away.

According to one expert all online advertising today should be beneficial for the user by offering him or her some kind of additional service. Likewise the reward attribute, the interviews clearly indicate that the service attribute is effective when the service is provided based on the site the user is active on. In other words also this attributes supports the two variables “increasing the relevancy of the advertising to the user”, and “providing value to viewers” assembled by Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a). Therefore service like advertising based on retargeting may not in the same amount raise the desired pull effect towards the ad, as ads that are targeted based on the web site would.

In this study reward and service were found to be most beneficial and valuable to the user and therefore, also have the best potential for creating pull effect on their own, whereas in order to create pull effect through some of the other motivations and benefits below the attributes might have to be combined with each other.

**Motivation and Benefit 3: Information**

Ying, Korneliussen and Grönhaug (2009) and Lee and Lumpkin (2002) have found in their studies that informative ads were less likely to be avoided. Likewise this study found that providing the user with needed information might create a desired pull effect towards the ad.

Native advertising was very much highlighted by the experts as the form of advertising that could and to some amount already does create pull effect towards online advertising among online users. Also online users had positive experiences of native advertising. However, native placing itself is not a motivation or benefit for someone to view an ad. Uses and gratifications theory has suggested that the gratifications a user gain from a specific media are based on pre-existing needs (Sundar & Limperos 2013) therefore, native advertising attempts to create pull effect by using the interest towards a specific web site and place something within the site context that is of interest to the user. This means that the motivation for viewing an ad that is natively placed is the information it provides to the online user. Similarly to this, both research within traditional media and new media in uses and gratifications theory has found
information to be one of the motivational factors to interact with a specific media (Sundar & Limperos 2013; Whiting & Williams 2013; Korgaonkar & Wolin 1999). Furthermore, Ko, Cho and Roberts (2005) found that a high level of information motives will more likely lead to human-message interaction, whereas users with high convenience and social interaction motives tend to choose human-human interaction, which means that information could be especially motivating within display advertising, since display ads utilizes the human-message interaction.

While native advertising utilizes the interest an online user has in a specific site to create pull effect towards the ad, similarly advertisers seek to create pull effect towards an ad, by having it promoted by individuals consumers are interested in. These sponsorship promotions are very common among bloggers today, and create truthfulness towards the ad as the person an online user follows promotes the ad himself. Also the pull effect blog sponsorship utilizes is based on the value online users gain from the information provided within the blog.

Conclusively, the nativity of the placement itself does not create pull towards the ad, rather the information the properly segmented and placed native advertising brings the user is what creates pull towards the ad, as well as the site. The need for specific information brings the user to a specific site; if the ad within the site supports the information it is likely to be pulled, since it brings utilitarian value to the user by fulfilling the need for information.

One of the experts exemplified native advertising by explaining how they had embedded an advertised article on an online tabloid that was commonly visited by their target group. Also the online user respondents exemplified how the information combined to native placing made her choose to view the ad. One of the online user respondents explained how she do like the blog advertising that is a part of the blog text, but ads displayed as for example banners on the same blog site did not create the same effect as they did not to the same amount support the context.

Therefore, as already stated, native placing solely is not an attribute rather it excludes the intrusiveness factor, and most likely results in more positive brand associations, but by providing the user with for example desired information within the ad, a pull effect can be created. Conversely, just placing information within for example a pop-up, without combining it to the site like native advertising, may not create pull effect towards the ad. Correspondingly, all of the respondents highlighted that the most
annoying thing with online advertising is the way in which it disturbs their cognitive behavior online. As this thesis focuses on display advertising the preference of nativity indicates that even display advertising should be placed as natively as possible in order to not get physically avoided. However, the placing should suit the overall context and not only be banners floating on the sides or on top of the site in order to minimize the possibility of the ad getting cognitively avoided.

Motivation and Benefit 4: Curiosity

Both the teasing attribute and the exclusivity attribute discovered in this study create utilitarian value based on the same motivation for pulling the ad, curiosity. Early research within media gratification and usage by Stafford and Stafford (1996), found that curiosity raised gratification among TV users. Similarly, this study found that curiosity does create pull effect towards online advertising as well.

The curiosity motivation attempts to create attention and interest towards the ad, and thereby get the user to choose to view the ad. The interest can be awoken by for example offering something unique in the ad placement, or create a hassle around a specific topic, which awakens the target groups interest to seek material on the topic or consume material found. According to one of the experts this attribute was used to promote a famous Finnish artists new album. Before the album was released it was only available in a displayed ad. This made the fans attend the specific site with the ad, to enact with it through listening to the music offered in it. Additionally, one of the respondents exemplified a Samsung ad were the advertiser created a lot of hassle around one event, which raised questions and confusions, and only in the end was revealed to be an ad. By teasing or providing something exclusively online users might get curious about the ad and the advertisers may be able to provide users with an ad they do not want to miss. Therefor are not exclusivity and teasing brought up as separate attributes but included in the curiosity motivation.

Even though curiosity can be seen as a potential attribute to drive users to view ads online. It is not as straightforward as the other attributes discussed. The other attributes highly depend on the site they are visible on, whereas the curiosity attribute requires additional promoting and marketing by the advertiser in order to create an awareness of the ad, so that users then can choose to view it. In other words the curiosity attribute does supports the two variables “increasing the relevancy of the advertising to the user”, and “providing value to viewers” assembled by Edwards, Li
and Lee (2002a), but the increasing relevancy of the advertising to the viewer is not created in the same way as it is within the other motivations and benefits, since it might not be able to only be supported by the specific site the online user is active on.

**Motivation and Benefit 5: Power**

Research by Truong and Simmons (2010) found that positive brand associations were awoken when the users had control over what, when, and how they found product or service information. Also this study found that by giving the user full control over whether he will view an ad or not the push effect could be minimized and even removed.

Many respondents indicated that they would be more likely to choose to view an ad if they were given the opportunity to choose whether to view it or not. Some users said that if the placement would simply start by telling what the ad is about and then ask whether the user would like to view the ad or not, the respondent would most likely choose to view the ad as long as it was targeted properly, in other words as long as the ad benefitted the user somehow. The control attribute per se do not directly give the user utilitarian value, however the power it provides the online user with compared to the disruption of the cognitive behavior push ads practice, do give the user the value of control and decision making, in other words the freedom of choice (Morimoto & Chang 2006) the reactance theory (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a; Breahm 1989) emphasizes is highly retained.

Even though control may result in pull effect towards the ad, some respondents indicated that they would not choose to view the ad only based on the given control, without benefitting from it somehow, meaning that in order to create pull effect the control attribute may need to be combined to other attributes like reward or service.

**Motivation and Benefit 6: Humor**

Some respondent mentioned humor as a motivation for viewing ads online. One respondent even mentioned that he precisely searched for funny ads online. However, there were also respondents that clearly indicated that humor would not make them choose to view an ad online.

Even though humor per se has not largely been found as a motivator within uses and gratifications theory, entertainment has been indicated as a gratification gained from
media (Sundar\& Limperos 2013; Whiting & Williams 2013; Korgaonkar \& Wolin 1999). Likewise power humor utilizes the "providing value to the viewers" variable Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a), whereas the relevancy can be useful, but is not certainly always utilized.

The difference between the ones, who found humor motivational to pull an ad and the ones that did not, was their goal-oriented behavior online. Respondents appreciating humor used Internet more for entertainment purposes, whereas the behavior of the respondents not appreciating humor enough to pull advertising were more task-oriented online. Both the expert respondents and the online user respondents that mentioned humor were male. However, due to the small focus group of this study no gender specific generalizations can be drawn based on this.

5.3 Summary

In this chapter the results from the empirical study have been analyzed. The chapter starts out by analyzing the advertising avoidance situation today, both from an online user perspective and advertising professional perspective and combining these to theories presented in the theoretical framework. Based on the results and the analyses, advertising avoidance today is ever growing, largely due to the push effect of the ads. Therefore, there is a clear need for understanding how to create pulled advertising online that the online users themselves choose to view.

In the second part the six motivations and benefits that were found to create pull effect in online advertising were presented and analyzed. These motivations and benefits are reward, service, information, curiosity, power and humor. All of these attributes create some kind of utilitarian value for the user, which could make the online user choose to view the ad. Furthermore, these attributes support at least one of the three variables Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) assembled that can limit the perception of intrusiveness of an ad “targeting viewers when their cognitive effort is low”, “increasing the relevancy of the advertising” to the user, and “providing value to viewers”.

Two utilitarian values were excluded from the motivations and benefits for watching an ad online. Feel good was excluded due to it being to broad of an element that was not mentioned by the online users and therefore was not found to actually create pull effect in online advertising, even though it certainly can contribute to positive brand and product associations. Charity was excluded due to only one respondent briefly
mentioning it and therefore the support for the attribute was not seen strong enough to indicate it as a motivation and benefit in this study. Even though there is a possibility that charity might create pull effect within some advertising campaigns, the financial state of the young age of the respondents or other causes might have excluded the possibility of actually indicating charity to be a motivator to see an ad in this particular study.

Some attributes may be powerful on their own, but in most cases it is more likely to drive consumers to view ads online when combining the proper attributes together, not forgetting about segmentation taking in consideration both the online user and the site he or she is using.
6 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the contribution this thesis provides to existing studies and practice, by discussing the main arguments for how to create pull effect in online advertising. Finally, the last part of the thesis offers suggestions for managerial implications and future research.

6.1 General discussion and overall comments

The purpose of this study is to understand what drives consumers to view ads online, especially what motivations and benefits could be found to enhance the pull effect towards online advertising. By creating a theoretical framework and conducting the empirical study the goal of this thesis was to find how to create pull effect in online advertising.

As stated in previous studies by Ying, Korneliussen and Gronhaug (2009) and Ha (1996) also this study found that the level of intrusiveness can be modified based on how the ad is placed and the perceived value of the ad to the user. Earlier studies suggested that the perceived value could be either aesthetic value or utilitarian value. Based on this study the ad is more likely to be pulled when it brings the user utilitarian value, whereas aesthetic value resulted in more positive associations towards the ad, but did not really affect the likelihood of the online user actually choosing to view the ad. However, this doesn’t mean that the aesthetic value couldn’t be utilized within user-initiated online advertising. By additionally offering the online user aesthetic value once the ad has been pulled the brand and product associations can be enhanced even further.

Independent of which motivational and beneficial element is chosen in order to create pull effect towards the ad there are a few fundamentals that have to be taken into consideration. In order for the ad to bring the user utilitarian value it has to be properly targeted. However, targeting that only takes into consideration the online user, like re-targeting, rarely creates pull effect towards the ad and can even lead to hesitations on what it implies about gathering user information online. In order to create pull effect the ad should not only be targeted based on the user, but also based on the site he or she is active on. Even though this requires even more information to be gathered about the user, this study found that when an online user is presented with an ad that is coherent with the site he or she is visiting, it minimizes the sensitivity towards
obtaining user information, and instead increases the utilitarian value the ad triggers. By offering the online user ads that are consistent with the web site the user is visiting, the goal-oriented behavior will not be disturbed to the same amount as it would if the ad would not be consistent with the web site.

The purpose of this study was to establish how to create pull effect towards online advertising. Based on the empirical study six attributes were emphasized, as those where seen to strengthen the possibility of the user wanting to view ads online. These six attributes were chosen as they in accordance with the research question indicated how to create pull effect in online advertising based on what motivations and benefits drive consumers to view ads online, also taking in consideration what experts do to drive users to view ads online. Some of the attributes, like reward and service, where seen to more likely create user-initiated advertising online. However, due to the exploratory nature of this study all attributes that were found to possibly create pull effect towards online advertising were analyzed. Therefore the six attributes identified as likely to create pull effect towards online advertising are; reward, service, information, curiosity, power and humor.

This study is among the first to invert the ad avoidance phenomenon, and instead of studying how to minimize ad avoidance, strive to find attributes based on online users motivations and benefits, which would create pull effect towards online advertising. Therefore, will the six attributes presented function as a base for how to create pull effect in online advertising. However, these attributes do not exclude the possibility of various other motivations and benefits, or probable attributes creating pull effect as well.

As the main motivation for using various online platforms, is not to view ads, and due to most online users preconception of ads being negative, one of the biggest dilemma in creating pulled advertising, especially within displayed advertising, is how to present the option of viewing an ad to the user without already creating the push effect at this point. By focusing on creating utilitarian value as well as consider the three variables for limiting the perception of intrusiveness by Edwards, Li and Lee (2002a) pull effect can even be achieved online, even in display advertising. Additionally, this study found that the nativity of an ad increased the likelihood of a pull effect. Even though native advertising is not a form of display advertising, since the ad is displayed as part of the editorial context, whereas display advertising floats separately from editorial context, there are elements that display advertising possible could and also should adapt from
native advertising. Currently display advertising functions in the same way as it once did in traditional media, by focusing on new media and user behavior and values within it, display advertising can be placed more user friendly on the web site preferably supporting the context instead of interrupting it. By doing this the main goal of advertising, producing positive effects to the advertiser and the consumer can be reached.

### 6.2 Managerial implications

As indicated by the advertising agency experts the emphasis within online advertising today is on delivered impressions. However, a big portion of the delivered impression counted have actually not been viewed by the online user, or even worse might have raised negative feelings towards the brand, as well as the site the advertising was displayed on. As advertising avoidance is ever growing the actual profit gained from displaying ads online decreases. This study indicates that in order for online advertising to be acknowledged the aim should be to create advertising that the online user chooses to view for himself, in other words create pull effect towards online advertising.

The six attributes presented in this study can create the desired pull effect. As indicated as long as the ad bring the online user utilitarian value the possibility of the consumer actually wanting to view the ad increases.

As the online advertising industry today is usually based on three parties, the client, the advertising agent, and the media platform delivering the ads, there is a need for stronger communication and cooperation among these three. The essential challenge is that what the client request and what media platforms gain most of their revenue from is delivered impressions, often without acknowledgement to how noticed and influential these ads have actually been.

### 6.3 Future research

As this study is one of the first to invert the advertising avoidance phenomenon, and instead study how to create pull effect towards online advertising, the results from this study can only be seen as a basis for future studies.

This study only included young adults who have grown accustomed with using the Internet daily. Future research should take in consideration the general population. It
would especially be interesting to study the middle aged and older consumer group who are the ones that from a financial perspective would be more profitable, but also are the ones who may not feel as accustomed with the Internet as young adults do.

Furthermore, in order to get generalizable result a quantitative study could be useful. A quantitative study could ensure that the results gained in this thesis are generalizable as well as on a bigger scale find even more possible attributes for the creation of pulled advertising.
7 SWEDISH SUMMARY OF THE THESIS (SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING)


Tidigare forskning har påvisat att trots att inte all reklam uppfattas som lika påträngande (Ying, Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Ha 1996), avbryter dock de flesta reklamer användaren till en viss grad, vilket leder till motreaktioner. Forskning utifrån motreaktionsteori (eng. reactance theory) hävdar att ifall konsumentens reaktion mot reklam är defensiv är eventuellt den bästa lösningen inte att tvinga konsumenten att exponeras för reklam. I syftet att förhindra denna form av beteende och reaktion, gäller det att skapa reklam som onlineanvändare väljer att se i stället för att tvingas se.

1.1 Problemformulering, syfte och avgränsningar

Forskning inom undvikandet av reklam har huvudsakligen koncentrerat sig på hur reklam tränger sig in på onlineanvändaren och hur graden av intrånget kan minimeras. Ying, Korneliussen och Grönhaug (2009), samt Edwards, Li och Lee (2002a) har studerat hur placering av reklam kan minimera intrånget, medan Ying, Korneliussen och Grönhaug (2009), samt Chatterjee (2008) har ha betonat att reklam utlöser undvikande av reklam eftersom det är frågan om reklam. Trots att ämnet har undersökts tidigare, begränsar sig forskningen till dessa områden. Än finns det inte forskning om hur känslan av intrång kan elimineras eller forskning som koncentrerar sig på att skapa onlinereklam som användaren själv väljer att se.

det gäller att fånga uppmärksamhet, samt lämna minnesspår och klickar (Chatterjee 2008).

Mitt förslag är att reklam som onlineanvändaren själv väljer att se kommer att leda till att reklam undviks mindre, samt att reaktionerna mot reklam är positivare. Därmed är syftet med denna studie att utreda vad som kännetecknar webbreklam som drar konsumenter till sig, snarare än stöter bort, och hur sådan reklam kan utformas. I och med det är forskningsfrågorna:

1. **Hur skapa dragkraft mot onlinereklam.**
   
   a. **Vad lockar onlineanvändare till att se reklam på nätet?**
   
   b. **Hur försöker reklam experter locka onlineanvändare till att se reklam på nätet?**

Huvudforskningsfrågan har delats upp i två underfrågor utifrån varifrån empiri samlats in. Forskningsfråga (a.) besvaras utifrån intervjuer med onlineanvändare i resultatkapitlet medan forskningsfråga (b.) besvaras utifrån intervjuer med reklambyråexperter i slutet av teorikapitlet. Dessa kommer att kombineras i analyskapitlet där huvudforskningsfrågan (1.) besvaras.

Denna studie beaktar endast onlinereklam, därmed kommer traditionella medier att exkluderas. Vidare kommer endast motivationsfaktorer och fördelar att uppmärksammas. Ifall onlineanvändare väljer att se reklam på grund av någon annan orsak kommer det inte att ingå i studien. Eftersom denna studie är explorativ kommer alla apparater som används för onlineaktiviteter att inkluderas, dock är apparaterna avgränsade till sådana som kan användas för personligt bruk. Denna studie är även begränsad till unga vuxna onlineanvändare i Finland. Slutligen kommer denna studie endast att ge förslag till möjligheter att skapa reklam som onlineanvändare väljer att se. Denna undersökning tar inte ställning till vilken reklamform som är effektivast.

1.2 **Avhandlingens struktur**

Denna avhandling är uppdelad i sex kapitel. Inledningen introducerar ämnet, diskuterar problemområdet, framställer syftet, presenterar centrala begrepp, avgränsar studien, samt påvisar studiens struktur. Den teoretiska referensramen består av fyra delar. Den första delen presenterar situationen för onlinereklam idag, den andra delen betonar intrånget av reklam som leder till undvikandet av reklam, medan den tredje

2. Teoretiska referensramen


2.1 Undvikandet av reklam online


2.2 Motreaktionsteori

Motreaktionsteorin är en socialpsykologisk teori som förklarar hur en person reagerar på förlust av frihet i en specifik miljö (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Inom undvikandet av reklam kombineras motreaktionsteorin ofta med intrånget av reklam, eftersom
intrånget gör att användaren inte själv kan välja om hon vill se reklamen (Edwards, Li & Lee 2002a). Därmed kommer onlineanvändaren på basis av motreaktionsteori att antingen nöja sig med förändringen eller försöka hindra förändringen (Mann & Hill 1984). För att undvika reklam är den vanligaste lösningen att hindra förändringen, det vill säga stänga reklamen.

2.3 Teori om användning och tillfredsställelse


2.4 Reklam som användaren själv väljer att se (eng. pulled advertising)

Truong och Simmons (2010) fann positiva varumärkesassociationer då konsumenter själva hade kontroll över vad, hur och när de erhöll produkt- och serviceinformation på nätet. Detta påvisar att då konsumenten själv har kontroll över hur hon erhåller
reklam, kommer reaktionerna att vara positivare. Idag är den vanligaste formen av reklam som användaren själv väljer att konsumera sökmotoroptimering (SEO) och sökmotorannonsering (SEM), vilka erbjuder användaren relevant reklam utifrån sökord.

På grund av begränsningar inom tidigare forskning har litteraturen kompletterats med resultaten från intervjuerna med tre reklam experter. I denna del av studien kommer även forskningsfråga (b.) "Hur försöker reklam experter locka onlineanvändare att se reklam på nätet?" besvaras.

Utgående från intervjuerna med reklam experterna finns det ett starkt behov av reklam som användaren själv väljer att se. Utmaningen är dock att skapa sådan reklam. Utifrån expertintervjuerna lyfts åtta attribut fram vilka expertern antingen använder för att locka onlineanvändare att se reklam eller som de anser kunde användas för att skapa reklam som onlineanvändaren själv väljer att se. Dessa attribut är annonsering som följer samma beteende som övrigt innehåll och är utformad så att användaren upplever det som en naturlig del av plattformen (eng. native advertising), sponsorering, bra känsla (eng. feel good), humor, belöning, exklusivitet, service, nyfikenhet (eng. teasing) och kontroll.

3. Metodologi

För att nå djupare förståelse av onlineanvändares attityder till onlinereklam, samt reklambyråexperternas kunskap och tankar om reklam som användaren själv väljer att se, är den lämpliga metoden för denna studie en kvalitativ forskningsansats.

Denna forskning är explorativ (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009 s. 139), eftersom studien är bland de första som försöker vända på fenomenet att undvika reklam. I stället för att undersöka hur minimera undvikandet av reklam, strävar denna studie till att hitta motivationsfaktorer och fördelar som kunde få onlineanvändaren att välja se reklam. Forskningsmetoden i denna studie är abductiv (Kovács and Spens, 2005), eftersom studien kombinerar empiriska observationer, forskning och den teoretiska referensramen, samt eftersträvar att förstå onlinereklam från ett nytt perspektiv. Syftet med denna empiriska forskning är att få en giltig förståelse av respondenternas erfarenheter, således är de kvalitativa icke-standardiserade frågorna lämpliga för denna studie. Intervjun kommer att genomföras med ett litet urval av den önskade populationen. Vidare kommer intervjun att vara semistrukturerad, eftersom frågorna
kommer att baseras på en intervjuguide, men även tilläggsfrågor kommer att utnyttjas under intervjuens gång (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009 s. 320).

Patton (2002, s. 379), betoner betydelsen av bandas in intervjuerna, medan Silverman (2011 s. 287) poängterar vikten av att transkribera intervjun. Därmed har intervjuerna i denna studie bandats in, samt transkriberats utförligt efter intervjun.


Intervjuprocessen började genom att först intervjuva en av respondenterna (respondent 1). Intervjun fungerade även som pilotintervju, varefter intervjuguiden modifierades. Den största förändringen var hur typiska reklam- och marknadsföringstermer presenterades och förklarade för respondenterna. Intervjuguiden för onlineanvändare kan hittas som bilaga 1 och intervjuguiden för reklamexperter som bilaga 2.

3.1 Studiens kvalitet


Enligt Saunders, Lewis och Thornhill (2009, s. 156) kan tillförlitlighet stärkas genom att bekräfta att samma resultat skulle erhållas vid ett annat tillfälle, i en studie gjord av en annan forskare. I denna studie har tillförlitlighet stärkts genom att försäkra insyn i studien, därmed har de olika stadierna av den empiriska forskningen förklarats i detalj och intervjuguiderna lagts till som bilaga.

Giltigheten av studien handlar om huruvida resultaten verkligen är vad de verkar vara, med andra ord, visar resultaten verkligen vad som mätts (Saunders, Lewis och Thornhill 2009, s. 157). Således avser validitet i denna studie hur väl forskaren har kunnat välja rätt respondenter, hur väl intervjuguiden har byggts upp, hur framgångsrik intervjun har varit, samt möjligheten att få tillgång till respondenternas erfarenheter inom ämnet i fråga.
Generaliserbarheten av studien avgör ifall studien är giltig bland andra onlineanvändare än de som intervjuats (Saunders, Lewis och Thornhill 2009, s. 157). Eftersom studien är explorativ är inte det främsta målet med studien att nå generaliserbara resultat, snarare har studien en praktisk förankring och tillämpning genom att den försöker bygga en grund för hur det går att locka onlineanvändare att se reklam på nätet i Finland.

4. Resultat

I detta kapitel presenteras resultaten från intervjuerna med onlineanvändare. Detta kapitel besvarar även forskningsfrågan (a.)”Vad lockar onlineanvändare till att se reklam på nätet?”. I den sammanfattande delen av detta kapitel kommer empiri från intervjuerna med onlineanvändare, och intervjuerna med reklam experter att kombineras och sammanfattas.

4.1 Onlinereklam och användarbeteende

Det fanns en tydlig variation i hur respondenterna uppfattade reklam på nätet. Vissa hade mycket negativa attityder gentemot reklam, medan vissa kände att reklam enbart är en del av internet idag.

Utan alla onlinereklamformer framkallade skärmreklam och speciellt extrafönster mest negativa känslor och irritation. Alla respondentar uppgav motvilja mot denna form av reklam, och ansåg att formatet är det mest irriterande reklamformatet idag. Eftersom reklam ansågs irrriterande var även undvikandet av reklam en stor del av respondenternas internet användning och något de aktivt strävade efter. Den största orsaken till undvikandet var att reklam tvångsvisas till användaren. Alla respondentar uppgav att de medvetet ignorerar reklam, samt gjorde det oavsiktligt som en vana. Respondenterna tenderar att ignorera webbannonser som inte kräver någon åtgärd kognitivt, medan reklam som kräver åtgärder, som till exempel extra fönster, ignoreras fysiskt. Den främsta orsaken till att fysiskt undvika reklam var känslan av irritation som reklamen framkallar. De attribut som respondenterna ansåg att framkallar irritation var dålig segmentering, avbrytandet, och reklamfrekvens. Även om reklam på nätet väcker en hel del negativa tankar och känslor, var vissa reklamer kapabla att ge användaren endera praktiskt eller estetiskt värde. Sammanlagt förekom nio reklamformer som skapar värde för användare och kan därmed locka användaren att se reklam på nätet. Dessa reklamformer är belöning, annonsering som följer samma
beteende som övrigt innehåll och är utformad så att användaren upplever den som en naturlig del av plattformen, sponsorerings, service, information, humor, nyfikenhet, kontroll, samt välgörenhet.

Resultaten i denna empiriska studie är tecken på att det finns attribut som leder till positiva känslor och är värdefull för onlineanvändare, och kan därmed skapa dragkraft till onlinereklam. Estetiskt värde erhölls oftast från annonser som var välgiorda och som grafiskt tilltalade användaren. Även om estetiskt värde ökar acceptansen och tillfredsställelsen av reklam, var praktiskt värde mer sannolikt att skapa dragkraft till reklamen. Sammanlagt nämnde onlineanvändare nio reklamattribut som leder till praktiskt värde. Samma antal för reklam experter var åtta. Av dessa nämndes belöning, service, annonsering som följer samma beteende som resterande innehåll och är utformad så att användaren upplever det som en naturlig del av plattformen, sponsorerings, kontroll, och nyfikenhet av både onlineanvändare och experter. Information och välgörenhet nämndes endast av onlineanvändare, medan bra känsla och exklusivitet endast nämndes av reklam experter.

5. Analys


Utifrån tidigare forskning är avbrytandet av den kognitiva processen en av de största orsakerna till irritation mot reklam (Ying Korneliussen & Grönhaug 2009; Morimoto & Chang 2006; Edwards, Li & Lee 2002). Denna studie bekräftar detta påstående. Förväntat fann respondenterna reklam som blockerade deras interaktion med det redaktionella innehållet irriterande, men även annan form av stimuli som distraherade användarens beteende uppfattades irriterande.

Utifrån den empiriska studien är det möjligt att användaren väljer att se reklam då den ger henne praktiskt värde. De motivationsfaktorer och fördelar som låg bakom de reklamformer som ansågs ge onlineanvändaren praktiskt värde var belöning, service, information, nyfikenhet, och kontroll.

Vissa motivationsfaktorer och fördelar kan vara effektiva på egen hand, men i de flesta fall är det mer sannolikt att konsumenten väljer att se reklam på nätet ifall rätta attribut kombineras, till exempel kontroll och belöning. För övrigt måste reklamen vara segmenterad både med tanke på onlineanvändaren, samt det redaktionella innehåll hon eller han sysselsätter sig med.

6. Diskussion


Syftet med denna studie var att fastställa hur man skapar dragkraft till onlinereklam. Baserat på den empiriska studien betonades fem motivationsfaktorer och fördelar, eftersom de ansågs stärka möjligheten till att användaren själv skulle välja se reklamen online. Dessa fem element valdes eftersom de i enlighet med forskningsfrågan angav hur man skapar dragkraft i onlinereklam baserat på vilka motivationsfaktorer och fördelar som lockar onlineanvändare att se reklam online. Dock utesluter inte dessa attribut andra möjliga attribut som kunde skapa dragkraft till onlinereklam.

Utgående från intervjuerna med reklam experterna ligger tyngdpunktens inom bildskärmreklam idag på levererade visningar, dock går en stor del av de levererade visningarna förlorade på grund av kognitivt och fysiskt undvikande av reklam. Eftersom reklamundvikandet enbart växer minskar själva nytan av onlinereklam. Utifrån denna studie borde reklam skapas så att användaren själv väljer att vilja se reklamen för att verkligen få reklamen sedd.
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Appendix 1: Interview guide for online user respondents

1. What do you think about online advertising?
   a. Specifically display advertising (pop-ups, banners?)
      i. How does this kind of advertising make you feel?
2. What do you feel is the most irritating part of online advertising?
   a. What kind of advertising do you feel is most irritating (placement, content)
   b. What do you feel is irritating about display advertising?
      i. Which display advertising do you feel is most irritating
      ii. Why is the placement irritating
3. What do you like about online advertising?
   a. Is there any kind of online advertising you prefer above another?
   b. Do you prefer any placement above another?
   c. Do you prefer any content above other?
      i. Why...
4. Can you recall an online advertising that you have liked/chosen to see?
   a. Why did you like/choose to see the ad?
5. What would motivate you to view an ad online?
6. How could the ad be displayed so that you would choose to see it?
7. How could the ad be presented so that you would choose to see it?
8. Does something come to mind that you would like to add?
Appendix 2: Interview guide for advertising expert respondents

1. What is the current online advertising situation?
2. What do you think about avoiding online advertising?
3. Is there currently pulled advertising/Does pulled advertising currently exist?
   a. How could pulled advertising be created?
   b. What do you think about existing reward advertising?
   c. What do you think about giving the user control to view an ad?
4. Is there any other possibilities to get users to view ads online?
   a. What motivation or benefit could make the user choose to view an ad?
      i. For example reward/entertainment?
5. Have you used pull effect within your advertising campaigns?
6. What does your clients want/require from online advertising?
7. How could online users be motivated to view display ads like pop-ups?
8. Is there any other possibilities to get users to view ads online?
9. How do you feel about display advertising?