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Table 4 Measures of advertising effectiveness and covariates

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures** | **Items** | **Reference** |
| **The attitude  towards the ad** | How would you describe your  overall attitude towards the ad you have just watched? (1=I don’t like this ad at all - 7= I like this ad very much) | Derbaix (1995);  Morris et al., (2002) |
| **The attitude  towards the destination** | Based on this ad, how positive is  your impression of X (the advertised destination) as a tourism destination? (1=Not at all positive -7=Very much ) | Kim & Stepchenkova,  (2015) |
| **Visit intention** | Does this ad make you want to  visit the destination (advertised in the ad)? (1=Not at all’ - 7=Very much) | Kim & Stepchenkova, ( 2015) |
| **Pre-exposure  destination attitude** | How positive is your impression of  X as a tourism destination? (1=Not at all positive-7=Very much) | Kim & Stepchenkova,  (2015) |
| **Mood States** | ‘Currently, I am in good mood’;  ‘As I answer these questions, I feel cheerful’; ‘At this moment, I feel edgy or irritable’; ‘For some reason, I am not very comfortable right now’ (1=Strongly disagree -7=Strongly agree) | Peterson, (1983) |

Table 5 Mean score of perceived appeal in each tourism TVC category

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tourism TVCs  category | Intensity levels of advertising appeal (N=101) | | | | | | Friedman  test (χ2 value) |
| Romance | Adventure | Family | Rationality | Youth | Humor |
| Romance appeal | **8.92** | 5.16 | 3.61 | 4.41 | 5.01 | 2.91 | *χ*2 (5)=245.21\*\*\* |
| Adventure appeal | 2.97 | **9.28** | 3.42 | 4.78 | 7.69 | 3.21 | *χ*2(5)=341.731\*\*\* |
| Family appeal | 3.11 | 4.91 | **9.31** | 5.15 | 5.34 | 3.18 | *χ*2 (5)=271.427\*\*\* |
| Rational appeal | 3.21 | 4.7 | 5.84 | **7.64** | 3.43 | 2.26 | *χ*2 (5)=263.657\*\*\* |
| Youth appeal | 4.52 | 8.07 | 3.5 | 5.07 | **8.77** | 3.65 | *χ*2 (5)=297.248\*\*\* |
| Humor appeal | 4.18 | 5.53 | 3.93 | 4.63 | 4.31 | **7.94** | *χ*2 (5)=192.482\*\*\* |

Notes: \*\*\**p* <.0083 (two-sided test; sample size: 101)

Table 6 The Wilcoxon signed-rank test among TVCs with different emotional appeals

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comparison among five emotional appeals | | |
| Comparison | Physiological pleasure | Physiological arousal |
| Humor vs adventure | *Z*=-5.056\*\*\* | *Z*=-0.446 |
| Humor vs romance | *Z*=-5.759\*\*\* | *Z*=-3.066\*\*\* |
| Humor vs family | *Z*=-6.234\*\*\* | *Z*=-3.983\*\*\* |
| Humor vs youth | *Z*=-6.125\*\*\* | *Z*=-4.045\*\*\* |
| Adventure vs romance | *Z*=-1.782 | *Z*=-3.461\*\*\* |
| Adventure vs family | *Z*=-2.544 | *Z*=-3.943\*\*\* |
| Adventure vs youth | *Z*=-2.159 | *Z*=-4.476\*\*\* |
| Romance vs family | *Z*=-0.469 | *Z*=-0.721 |
| Romance vs youth | *Z*=-0.773 | *Z*=-1.396 |
| Family vs youth | *Z*=-0.321 | *Z*=-0.106 |

Notes: \*\*\**p*<.005 (two-sided test; sample size: 101)

Table 7 Results of PLS path model estimation across different emotional appeals (direct effects)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Attitude towards the advertisement** | | **Attitude towards the destination** | | **Visit intention** | |
|  | Path coefficienta | t-valuea | Path coefficienta | t-valuea | Path coefficienta | t-valuea |
| **Romance appeal** | | | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | ns | 1.398 | ns | 0.361 | ns | 1.468 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 0.227 | ns | 0.343 | ns | 1.53 |
| **Mood** | ns | 0.171 | ns | 0.176 | ns | 0.109 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | 0.224\* | 2.253 | ns | 1.52 | ns | 1.646 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.686\*\* | 12.358 | na | na |
| **Attitude towards the destination** | na | na | na | na | 0.791\*\* | 17.999 |
| **Adventure appeal** | | | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | 0.222\*\* | 3.348 | ns | 1.365 | ns | 1.255 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 1.898 | ns | 0.166 | ns | 0.168 |
| **Mood** | ns | 0.926 | ns | 0.351 | ns | 1.809 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | ns | 0.53 | ns | 1.615 | 0.081\*\* | 0.835 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.736\*\* | 10.437 | na | na |
| **Attitude towards the destination** | na | na | na | na | 0.776\*\* | 16.853 |
| **Family appeal** | | | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | 0.246\*\* | 3.229 | ns | 1.591 | ns | 0.44 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 1.271 | ns | 0.702 | ns | 1 |
| **Mood** | ns | 1.117 | ns | 0.219 | ns | 0.573 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | 0.326\*\* | 3.902 | ns | 1.193 | ns | 1.987 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.652\*\* | 7.503 | na | na |
| **Attitude towards the destination** | na | na | na | na | 0.783\*\* | 13.759 |
| **Youth appeal** | | | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | ns | 0.503 | ns | 1.576 | ns | 1.082 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 0.697 | ns | 0.521 | ns | 0.102 |
| **Mood** | ns | 1.233 | ns | 1.23 | ns | 0.332 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | ns | 1.02 | ns | 0.01 | ns | 1.213 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.681\*\* | 9.776 | na | na |
| **Attitude towards the destination** | na | na | na | na | 0.771\*\* | 13.66 |
| **Humor appeal** | | | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | 0.313\*\* | 3.83 | ns | 0.044 | ns | 0.126 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 1.434 | ns | 0.616 | ns | 0.419 |
| **Mood** | ns | 0.899 | ns | 0.703 | ns | 1.13 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | ns | 1.707 | ns | 0.304 | ns | 1.313 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.802\*\* | 15.985 | na | na |
| **Attitude towards the destination** | na | na | na | na | 0.838\*\* | 24.116 |

Notes: b= path coefficient, ns-not significant, \**p*<.05, \*\**p*<.01 (two-sided test; sample size: 101)

R2 value for different emotional appeals: 1. Romance appeal (0.072 for Aad, 0.519 for Adp and 0.689 for VI). 2. Adventure appeal (0.129 for Aad, 0.549 for Adp and 0.642 for VI). 3. Family appeal (0.239 for Aad, 0.533 for Adp and 0.692 for VI). 4. Youth appeal (0.056 for Aad, 0.569 for Adp and 0.620 for VI). 5. Humor appeal (0.126 for Aad, 0.651 for Adp and 0.722 for VI)

a: we apply a nonparametric bootstrapping route to test the significance of the PLS path modelling results.

Table 8 Indirect effectson Adp and VI across different emotional appeals

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Attitude towards the destination** | | **Visiting intention** | |
|  | ba | t-valuea | ba | t-valuea |
| **Romance appeal** | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | ns | 1.359 | ns | 1.374 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 0.225 | ns | 0.507 |
| **Mood** | ns | 0.17 | ns | 0.017 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | 0.153\* | 2.177 | 0.2058\*\* | 2.765 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.5425\*\* | 9.611 |
| **Adventure appeal** | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | 0.164\*\* | 2.905 | ns | 0.103 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 1.936 | ns | 1.639 |
| **Mood** | ns | 0.906 | ns | 1.012 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | ns | 0.531 | ns | 1.714 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.571\*\* | 7.968 |
| **Family appeal** | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | 0.161\*\* | 2.898 | 0.191\*\* | 3.797 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 1.256 | ns | 1.19 |
| **Mood** | ns | 1.111 | ns | 0.868 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | 0.213\*\* | 3.438 | 0.243\*\* | 3.29 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.511\*\* | 6.567 |
| **Youth appeal** | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | ns | 0.499 | ns | 1.705 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 0.693 | ns | 0.21 |
| **Mood** | ns | 1.186 | ns | 1.403 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | ns | 1 | ns | 0.94 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.525\*\* | 6.869 |
| **Humor appeal** | | | | |
| **Pleasure** | 0.251\*\* | 3.783 | 0.207\*\* | 2.933 |
| **Arousal** | ns | 1.449 | ns | 1.392 |
| **Mood** | ns | 0.9 | ns | 0.355 |
| **Pre-exposure attitude** | ns | 1.779 | ns | 1.333 |
| **Attitude towards the advertisement** | na | na | 0.672\*\* | 11.838 |

Notes: b= path coefficient, ns=not significant, \**p*<.05, \*\**p*<.01 (two-sided test; sample size: 101)

a: we apply a nonparametric bootstrapping route to test the significance of the PLS path modelling results.