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ABSTRACT:

Due to the continuously increasing importance of differentiation in the marketplace, building a strong brand equity has become a crucial element of competition, and brands are constantly seeking unique methods of appealing to consumers. One available method is advertising utilising different forms of humour and satirical humour in television advertising has become particularly popular in modern South African advertising.

The contents of this research paper posit that satirical television advertising can be utilised as an effective brand equity building tactic. Furthermore; it is proven that satirical humour has a positive influence on numerous dimensions of brand equity including: brand awareness, brand associations and brand loyalty. With accurate and entertaining use of satire in television advertising a brand is effectively able to increase their brand appeal, brand perceptions and overall brand equity.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND

Humour has been a tactic utilised in advertising for over a century, and the consistently increasing prevalence and broad popularity of advertising humour appeal among advertisers and audiences worldwide confirms its contemporary attractiveness (Beard, 2005). Although the use of humour has become somewhat common practice in global advertising; knowledge regarding its’ influence on brands is relatively limited and largely unknown (Weinberger & Gulas, 1992).

South African citizens, and millennials in particular, are generally regarded as having a good sense of humour (Sheldon, 2016), which local brands have acknowledged and utilised to their advantage; with a large proportion of the country’s top 30 most valuable brands all utilising humour as an effective tactic in their advertising (Kantar Millward Brown, 2018). Research data by Kantar Millward Brown (2018) suggests that humour is one of the most fundamental characteristics for successful advertising in South Africa; with statistics indicating that the country’s engagement rate for humorous advertisements is roughly 20% higher than the global average.

An industry where humorous advertising is particularly prevalent is South Africa’s fast-food fried chicken industry; a highly profitable and competitive industry, with popular brands such as Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC), Chicken Licken and Nando’s (Chutel, 2018). With minimal variation prevalent between these three brands in terms of their product offering and pricing; competition is predominantly based on the use of different types of humour within their advertising (Chutel, 2018).

With these three brands essentially competing to produce the funniest and most memorable television commercials; the use of different forms of satire has become increasingly popular – a technique originally pioneered by Nando’s who have successfully utilised comical and controversial satirical advertisements to build a strong brand equity (Daniel, 2018). However; satirical advertisements often generate
a significant amount of public controversy with the Advertising Regulations Board (ARB) receiving numerous complaints citing stereotypical and offensive advertising (Hlalethwa, 2019).

This suggests that South African brands possess a relatively limited understanding of the complexities of satirical advertising, and existing literature involving humour in advertising largely excludes the concepts of satire and brand equity; with minimal research conducted on South African millennials (e.g., Chang and Chang, 2014; Hoang, 2013; McDougal, 2017; Khan and Khan, 2013).

The enclosed research study thus sought to address this identified dearth in literature, by examining how a satirical television commercial influenced Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials; in accordance with Aaker’s (1996) brand equity dimensions.

1.2. CONTEXTUALISATION

The Nando’s brand was recently ranked sixth in an annual research report on South Africa’s top 30 most valuable brands conducted by Kantar Millward Brown (2018). Roth (2018) attributes the brand’s high ranking to their consistently effective use of provocative satirical commercials; which appeal to South African consumers, and have contributed to the brand’s favourable overall health and strong brand performance.

Richardson (2018) reports that while many brands attempt to avoid the use of stereotypes in their advertising; Nando’s recently used satire to directly address South African stereotypes in their recent commercial titled: “You People.” The commercial satirically highlights the ways in which South African’s typically stereotype one another, and Nando’s received predominantly positive feedback; particularly from millennials (Grobler, 2018).

In contrast; one of Nando’s direct competitors – Chicken Licken also released a satirical commercial during the same period as Nando’s, however; their satirical
commercial titled: “Big John” was subsequently banned by the Advertising Regulations Board (ARB) as it was deemed as offensive advertising (Child, 2019). This initially provided the researcher with primary motivation to further investigate the brand-related influence of the satirical “You People” commercial.

1.3. RATIONALE

Due to the continuously increasing importance of differentiation in the marketplace, building a strong brand equity has become a crucial element of competition, and brands are constantly seeking unique methods of appealing to consumers (Klopper & North, 2016). Nando’s successful use of satirical advertising (Roth, 2018), suggests that this could be a unique and effective tactic which can be utilised by brands in developing a strong brand equity.

This provided the researcher with valid motivation to conduct a research investigation which sought to determine if satire has an influence brand equity amongst South African millennials – given that no similar investigations have previously been conducted.

1.4. PROBLEM STATEMENT

With the use of satire becoming increasingly popular in South African advertising (Chutel, 2018); coupled with the increase in complaints about satirical commercials being offensive and stereotypical (Hlalethwa, 2019) – the researcher has deduced that South African brands appear to have a relatively limited understanding of the complexities of satirical advertising, and there is minimal existing research regarding its’ brand-related effects.

1.4.1. Research Questions

1. How do South African millennials respond to the satirical “You People” television commercial by Nando’s?
2. How does the satirical “You People” television commercial influence South African millennials’ perceptions of the Nando’s brand?


1.4.2. Research Objectives

a. To analyse South African millennials’ responses to the satirical “You People” television commercial by Nando’s.

b. To determine how the satirical “You People” television commercial influences South African millennials’ perceptions of the Nando’s brand.

c. To ascertain the contribution made by the satirical “You People” television commercial to Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials. (According to the brand equity dimensions provided by Aaker’s (1996) Brand Equity Theory).

1.5. PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of this research investigation is to generate knowledge regarding satirical humour in television advertising; in order to ultimately develop a conclusive understanding of its’ influence on brand equity specifically amongst the South African millennial consumer segment.

1.6. CONCEPTUALISATION

According to Allen (2017) conceptualisation refers to the process of identifying and defining the concepts or phenomena that are under investigation during a specific research study. This process of conceptualisation is conducted to provide a holistic understanding of the concepts contained in a specific research study. The concepts and phenomena pertaining to the researcher’s study are identified and conceptualised in the subsequent sections below:
1.6.1. Key Concepts

i. Satirical Advertising
ii. South African Millennials
iii. Brand Equity
iv. Brand Associations
v. Brand Image
vi. Perceived Quality
vii. Brand Loyalty

1.6.2. Theoretical Definition of Key Concepts

i. Satirical Advertising:

Speck's (1991) Humorous Message Taxonomy identifies satire as a type of humour and thus the researcher has deemed it necessary to firstly define the broader concept of humour in advertising, prior to defining the concept of satire in advertising.

Warren and McGraw (2016) note that there is no singular universally accepted definition of humour in advertising; however, their literature states that humour in advertising broadly refers to a consumer's psychological response, which is characterised by the appraisal that a certain brand’s advertising message is funny or amusing; as well as the stimuli utilised by the brand to elicit this response.

With reference to the above definition of humour in advertising; satirical advertising is defined by LeBeouf (2007) as a specific type of humorous advertisement which contains the following characteristics: critique, irony and implicitness. Essentially; a satirical advertisement is a critique of some form of human behaviour or social problem that uses irony to implicitly highlight the issues that are being critiqued (Lebeouf, 2007).
ii. South African Millennials:

Millennials are alternatively referred to as Generation Y, which is defined as the generational group which comprises of all individuals born between the years 1977 and 2000 (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010). However; there proves to be a general lack of definitive consensus regarding the exact dates of the millennial generation (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010). As a result, the researcher has decided to follow a more recent age parameters provided by Nielsen (2014), which defines millennials as the generation of individuals born between 1977 and 1995.

iii. Brand Equity

Aaker (1991) defines brand equity as a set of assets and labilities linked to a brand; such as its name, slogan, logo and other symbols; which may either add to, or subtract from, the value created by the brand. According to Kotler and Keller (2012) brand equity from a consumer’s perspective essentially refers to the value bestowed on a brand’s products and services by individual consumers, which is reflected in the manner that they think, feel and react to the particular brand. In essence; brand equity can be understood as an intangible brand asset that contributes to the overall value generated by a brand.

iv. Brand Awareness

Brand awareness is recognised by Aaker (1991) as a primary determinant of brand equity. Kotler and Keller (2012) define the concept of brand awareness as a consumer’s ability to recall or recognise a specific brand, and their products or services, during a specific consumption or purchase situation.

v. Brand Associations

Brand associations are identified by Aaker (1991) as a crucial component of brand equity, which is defined by Klopper and North (2016) as the secondary thoughts or feelings that consumers possess about between a specific brand. These associations are reflected in the individual consumer’s perceptions of a specific brand.
vi. Brand Image

Zhang (2015) recognises brand image as a key driver of brand equity, which is defined as consumers’ general perceptions and feelings about a specific brand. Zhang (2015) further identifies that brand image essentially influences consumer purchasing behaviour, therefore also influencing a brand’s sales, market share, and ultimately brand equity.

vii. Perceived Quality

Perceived quality refers to the value of a brand that is perceived by a consumer (Klopper and North, 2016). Aaker (1991) states that a brand’s quality is reflected in the extent to which the brand is considered able to provide consumers with good value products or services. Aaker (1991) further identifies that the quality of a brand that is perceived by a consumer is dependent on various criteria including: personal needs, financial factors and social trends.

viii. Brand Loyalty

Keller (2001) regards brand loyalty as the most fundamental determinant of customer-based brand equity, and he states that its’ existence provides conclusive evidence of the equity created by a brand from the consumer’s perspective. The definition of brand resonance by Kotler and Keller (2012) states that brand loyalty is reflected by a psychological or emotional connection between a consumer and a specific brand; as well as the consumer’s active engagement with the brand.

1.7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

The research study contained in this report utilised a qualitative research approach that was exploratory in nature. This qualitative exploratory investigation followed a phenomenologist research design and the data was collected by means of a focus group that was conducted on millennials in Johannesburg, South Africa.
The focus group participants were selected using the purposive non-probability sampling method and the qualitative data generated was analysed using the thematic content data analysis method. A comprehensive description of the study’s research methodology is provided and discussed in Chapter 3.

1.8. FORTHCOMING CHAPTERS

i. Chapter 1: Introduction
ii. Chapter 2: Literature Review
iii. Chapter 3: Research Methodology
iv. Chapter 4: Findings and Interpretation
v. Chapter 5: Recommendations and Conclusions
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Creswell, Ebersohn, Eloff, Ferreira, Ivanka, Jansen, Niewenhuis, Pietersen & Plano Clark (2016) identify that a literature review is necessary when conducting a research study, as it provides a comprehensive understanding of the related phenomena and their significance to the particular research topic. With reference to the proposed research study; the researcher is interested in exploring the influence of satirical television advertising on brand equity amongst South African millennials.

This chapter commences with a discussion of the study’s research paradigm the context of how knowledge will be generated regarding the concepts contained in the subsequent literature review section. The concepts that form the basis of the literature review include: humour in advertising, television advertising; as well as brand equity and these concepts are elaborated on in detail the forthcoming sections.

2.2. RESEARCH PARADIGM

A research paradigm essentially refers to the researcher’s worldview which is informed by specific belief systems and philosophies (Sakyi, 2017). The research paradigm dictates the perspective adopted by the researcher and governs how knowledge is generated and interpreted during a specific research study (Rehman and Alharthi, 2016).

Mackenzie and Knipe (2006) identify that the selection of a research paradigm is largely dependent on the overarching methodological orientation; as well as the nature of the research problem involved in the research study. Mackenzie and Knipe (2006) further identify that three dominant research paradigms exist, namely: positivism, critical realism and interpretivism. The interpretivist paradigm proved to be the most appropriate research paradigm for the researcher’s investigation as Sakyi (2017) identifies that this paradigm is associated with qualitative research studies involving social sciences and the investigation of human behaviour.
2.3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of brand equity was initially introduced by Aaker (1991) who formulated a theory identifying the explicit dimensions of brand equity as: brand awareness, perceived quality, brand associations, brand loyalty, and other proprietary assets such as brand image and competitive advantage. Aaker's (1991) theory and dimensions have become well-associated with the concept of brand equity and have been widely tested empirically in related studies (e.g. Nel, North, Myburg & Hern Bastian, 2009, & Boo, Busser and Baloglu 2009).

Following further investigation into the concept of brand equity; Aaker (1996) subsequently theorised and published the brand equity ten model. This model is essentially an extension of his initial brand equity theory (Aaker, 1991) and provides a method of measuring brand equity by considering ten concepts spread across the five aforementioned brand equity dimensions. (Please refer to Appendix A for a visual depiction of the model).

Lee (2014) describes Aaker’s (1996) brand equity ten model and identifies the ten sub-components of the five brand equity dimensions as: brand recognition, brand recall, perceived quality, brand leadership, brand attitudes, differentiation measures, price premiums, consumer satisfaction; and lastly market performance measures such as market share and distribution levels. Lee (2014) further notes that Aaker's (1996) brand equity ten model provides a standard method to measure brand equity across different products, brands, and markets. The model essentially provides an indication of the concepts that contribute to the equity generated by a brand amongst consumers; and has thus been selected by the researcher based on its' suitability to the nature of the research problem and questions contained in this research study.

Aaker’s (1991, 1996) theories were expanded on by Keller (1998, 2001) who developed a customer-based approach to understanding and measuring brand equity, which he formally theorised as Keller’s (2001) customer-based brand equity (CBBE) model or pyramid. Keller’s (2001) CBBE model outlines a pyramid of brand equity comprising of six brand equity building blocks which correspond with four stages of brand equity development and four branding objectives at each stage. (Please refer
to Appendix B for a visual depiction of the model). Keller’s (2001) CBBE model would also be suitable to the researcher’s study; however, the model’s mechanisms and components are very intricate and complicated to operationalise.

The theoretical framework of this research study is thus based on the four dimensions of Aaker’s (1996) brand equity ten model – brand awareness, brand associations, brand, perceived quality and brand loyalty. The researcher has also selected brand image which is identified by Keller (1993) as one other proprietary asset that contributes to brand perceptions, and ultimately brand equity.

The study’s theoretical framework is defined and operationalised below:

i. Brand Awareness:

Aaker (1991) identifies brand awareness as the principle determinant of brand equity, due to the fact that it is the foundation for other secondary associations to be developed. The researcher will initially determine the influence of the satirical “You People” commercial on Nando’s brand awareness amongst South African millennials.

ii. Brand Associations:

According to Aaker (1991) positive brand associations contribute to generating a strong brand equity; and thus, the researcher’s study investigates South African millennials associations with the Nando’s brand – stemming from the satirical “You People” television commercial.

iii. Brand Image:

Brand Image is a proprietary brand equity asset regarded by Aaker (1991) as a dimension of brand equity. Keller (1993) posits that creating a positive brand image can be achieved through the use of a marketing campaign by connecting the strong associations and memories that consumers possess about a brand.

iv. Perceived Quality:
Aaker (1996) identifies the existence of a linear relationship between the perceived quality of a brand and the strength of the brand’s equity. The study investigates the quality perceived by South African millennials of the satirical “You People” commercial; as well as the Nando’s brand.

v. Brand Loyalty:

Aaker (1996) recognises brand loyalty as a consumer’s commitment to a specific brand. The researcher’s study utilises brand loyalty as a conclusive measure of Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials.

2.4. HUMOUR IN ADVERTISING

As previously identified by the researcher in chapter 1 – there is a dearth of existing literature pertaining directly to satire and satirical advertising. As a result, and for the purpose of this literature review; the concept has been expanded to humour in advertising.

The studies of Chang and Chang (2014) identify that multiple definitions of humour and humorous advertising exist, with the majority of definitions based on two perspectives. According to Chang and Chang (2014) humour can firstly be defined in terms of advertising content, and essentially a humorous advertisement contains any form of puns, satire, jokes, irony, slapstick and incongruities. Sen (2012) notes that humour can secondly be defined in terms of the audience’s response to specific messages in advertisements, and in principle; if an advertisement elicits a positive response and causes the audiences to smile, laugh or feel happy – it may thus be considered a humorous advertisement.

With reference to the above definitions of humour and humorous advertising by Chang and Chang (2014) and Sen (2012), the researcher has logically deduced that the related influence of humorous advertising is predominantly subjective and dependent on the specific content of the advertisement; as well as the audience’s response to the humorous advertisement. Sen (2012) further identifies that humour analysis has
inherent attributes that make it similar to typical qualitative research methods, and researchers are able to apply humour analysis as an analytical tool to investigate various cultural and social phenomena. This provides primary motivation and rationalisation for the utilisation of a qualitative research orientation during the researcher’s study.

According to McDougal (2017) humour is an extensively utilised technique in global advertising, with humorous advertising messages observed to be superior and more effective than non-humorous messages. The studies of Khan and Khan (2013) provide further evidence supporting the superiority of humorous advertising messages as opposed to non-humorous advertising messages. However; the identified brand-related effects of humorous advertising differ between these two studies; as well as other studies by Motwani and Agarwal (2014), Djambaska, Petrovska and Bundaleska (2016), and Hoang (2013).

McDougal (2017) conducted a mixed method research investigation which sought to discover and quantify the effect of humorous television advertisements on consumer brand perception. Contrary to his hypothesis; the research project’s key findings indicated that the humour used in television advertisements has no effect on consumer brand perception. Given that consumer brand perception is related to brand equity; this may initially suggest that satirical television advertisements will not have an effect on brand equity. However; this finding is inconclusive and will be challenged by the researcher’s study.

The findings of McDougal (2017) do however contradict the findings made by Hoang (2013), who argues that humour influences consumers’ attitudes towards a brand; as well as their impressions of the brand, and thus; it proves to have an influence on consumer brand perception. Hoang’s (2013) investigation into the impact of humorous advertising on consumers’ purchase decisions also discovered that humour positively influences brand image – a concept that is directly related to brand equity. This finding is of particular importance to the researcher’s study as it may indicate the prevalence an existing link between humorous advertising and brand equity; a link which the researcher’s study seeks to determine and analyse.
Motwani and Agarwal (2014) are in agreement with Hoang (2013) and they also state that humour does influence brand image; however, this influence is only positive when the humour used in the advertisement is in line with the specific brand’s values and brand identity. This claim by Motwani and Agarwal (2014) bears particular relevance to the researcher’s study and will be further investigated when testing how the satirical Nando’s “You People” television commercial resonates with millennials.

The research investigation conducted by Khan and Khan (2013) is perhaps the most similar to the proposed research study that the researcher intends to conduct. Their research study was conducted on 125 millennial students aged 19-25; thus, focusing on the same population group as the researcher’s proposed study. Their particular study was carried out in India – a developing BRICS nation which shares numerous similarities to South Africa. The purpose of their study was to discover the effect of humorous advertising on brand recognition and awareness; which is thus also similar to the purpose of the researcher’s proposed study, as the concepts of brand recognition and awareness are sub-components of brand equity. Khan and Khan’s (2013) findings indicated that humour is generally associated with increasing product awareness, thereby increasing brand recognition and awareness; as well as brand associations, which all form part of brand equity.

Deductive logic allows the researcher to predict that satirical humour will have an effect on brand equity; given that Khan and Khan (2013) established that humour effects multiple components of brand equity namely: brand recognition, brand awareness, and brand associations. However; some researchers including McDougal (2017) criticise and question the validity of Khan and Khan’s (2013) research study, due to the fact that all of the participants were advertising students and thus possessed knowledge of the concepts under investigation, which may have influenced their responses and produced somewhat biased findings.

Du Plessis (2016), Botha, (2013) and Roberts (2017) all conducted research related to Nando’s advertising. Du Plessis (2016) identifies that consumers tend to respond positively to Nando’s use of political and racial satire because it is effective in alleviating certain tensions that exist in South Africa. Botha (2013) further notes that the use of satire in Nando’s television commercials increases the likelihood of intense
emotional reactions and connections between the consumer and the brand. According to Roberts (2017) Nando’s satirical television commercials resonate with consumers because they amplify the discrepancies between ideal and reality in South African society. The findings of these three researchers will be investigated during the researcher’s study.

2.5. TELEVISION ADVERTISING

Advertising in South Africa is defined by Muridzo (2014) as the promotion of a particular brand’s products or services involving the use of multiple media platforms such as television, radio, print, mobile phones and the internet. According to Muridzo (2014) the advertising industry is a critical component of South Africa’s economy, with brands collectively spending in excess of R50 billion annually. A significant portion of this expenditure has historically been directed towards television advertising; an advertising method which first originated in 1978, two years after the introduction of television into South Africa (Asmall, 2010). Asmall (2010) posits that the popularity of television advertising primarily centres around its ability to reach mass audiences rapidly and frequently; and television is also identified as a collectively more expressive medium for advertisers, providing greater creative capabilities by allowing the use of visuals, audio, colours and actions – which ultimately produces a greater impact on the consumer than other advertising mediums.

Mototo, Chuchu and Nkomo (2017) conducted a research study which sought to investigate the effect of television advertising on brand attitudes and perceived brand value amongst millennials residing in South Africa’s townships. Their findings provide support for the greater creative capabilities provided by television advertising and they emphasise importance of advertising content. Mototo et al., (2017) postulate that there is a positive relationship evident between humorous television advertising content and brand attitudes; as well as a positive relationship evident between the perceived quality of the advertised product and brand attitudes. With reference to the researcher’s study; these findings by Mototo et al., (2017) suggest that they may be a
connection prevalent between satirical television advertising and brand equity; and that there is quality perceived by consumers which is reflected in their brand attitudes.

2.6. BRAND EQUITY

Brand equity is identified by Boo et al., (2009) as a fundamental concept concerning brand management, and its emergence has increased the importance of branding and marketing strategies. Gordon (2010) reports that there has been a general lack of consensus in regard to defining brand equity within existing marketing literature. Expanding on the previous definition of brand equity provided in chapter 1; Kotler and Keller (2012) state that this concept is most commonly defined as a multidimensional market-oriented intangible asset for brands which can be understood from three perspectives – an organisational perspective, a financial perspective, and a consumer perspective.

From an organisation’s perspective, a strong brand equity translates to a competitive advantage over rival brands; whereas the financial perspective observes brand equity as monetary profits or economic brand value, and from the consumer’s perspective; brand equity is reflected in brand loyalty stemming from brand resonance (Bastian, 2015). The researcher’s study will focus on brand equity from a consumer’s perspective as Nel et al., (2009) identify that this perspective allows one to determine how marketing activities have contributed to the value or equity created by a specific brand in the mind of the consumer.

The studies of Nel et al., (2009) and Bastian (2015) provide some of the most comprehensive research conducted on the concept of brand equity in South Africa. Both studies focused on investigating brand equity from a consumer’s perspective, and sought to discover the underlying dimensions and determinants of brand equity; as well as determine the influence of brand equity on consumers’ brand preferences and purchase decisions. The findings of Nel et al., (2009) identify determinants of brand equity as: perceived quality, brand awareness, brand image and brand loyalty. Bastian (2015) also acknowledges these four concepts as determinants of brand
equity; however, she substantiates that brand image is the most influential determinant of brand equity, and she also identifies brand attitudes and brand associations as other determinants of brand equity. In Bastian's (2015) other research findings, brand equity was concluded to be a main contributor to brand preference; and there proved to be a causal link between brand preference and the consumer’s willingness to buy a brand. However; the majority of the aforementioned brand equity research studies largely tend to exclude the influence of advertising and thus the researcher study intends to explore this influence.

2.7. CONCLUSION

The researcher’s study seeks to explore the influence of satirical advertising on brand equity amongst South African millennials; in order to develop a greater understanding of the two concepts and their relation to one another. As the contained concepts are predominantly subjective in nature; a qualitative research approach is thus valid. These concepts also fall within the scope of social sciences and thus the interpretivism paradigm is most appropriate to the qualitative topic.

The literature reviewed suggests that there should be a connection between satirical advertising and brand equity amongst millennials, however; this connection is inconclusive and worthy of further investigation. The literature also implies that the perceived value of satirical advertisements will be reflected in consumer’s attitudes, perceptions; as well as preferences, and this will be examined during the researcher’s study. Other researchers’ studies further attribute the resonance of Nando’s satirical commercials to a number of different factors, and there is essentially no significant proof attributing this resonance to one specific factor.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Research methodology essentially refers to the theoretical and systematic procedure that outlines the specific techniques utilised to collect and analyse data during a research study (Wilkinson; 2015). In principle; research methodology is utilised to determine the relevant results or answers to the research questions, and based on its’ methodological orientation; a research methodology is either quantitative or qualitative in nature (Creswell et al., 2016).

The researcher has selected to utilise a qualitative research methodological orientation which is defined by Astalin (2013) as non-numerical research that seeks to develop knowledge and understanding of specific social phenomena. A qualitative approach is thus appropriate as the researcher intends to develop knowledge regarding the phenomena of satirical television advertising and brand equity.

The subsequent sections contain and define the research study’s research paradigm, research approach and research design; as well as the proposed population, sampling, data collection and data analysis methods.

3.2. RESEARCH PARADIGM

Rehman and Alharthi (2016) formally define the term research paradigm as the fundamental theoretical framework that governs how knowledge is generated and interpreted during a specific research study. Research paradigms are classified according to their epistemological, ontological methodological, metatheoretical and axiological dispositions.

According to Kivunja and Kuyini (2017) epistemology is concerned with the generation and comprehension of knowledge during a research study; ontology refers to the researcher’s philosophical assumptions about the social phenomenon under
investigation; and methodology refers to the research design, methods, approaches and procedures used during a specific research study. Metatheory is concerned with theoretical assumptions; as well as the development and application of overarching combinations of theories used during data analysis and interpretation; and lastly axiology focusses on the purpose or aims of the research and what is of particular value to the researcher (Creswell et al., 2016). Based on these dispositions; three dominant research paradigms exist namely: positivism, critical realism and interpretivism.

The positivism research paradigm assumes that reality exists independently of humans and is governed by immutable laws (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). The epistemological and ontological positions of positivists is that of objectivism and realism respectively; with its’ methodology relying heavily on experimentations (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Metatheory of positivism states that theories are used to predict effects and causal relationships; and axiology of positivism is concerned with objective quantifiable research (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Due to the objective and experimental nature of the positivism paradigm; it is appropriate for quantitative research studies involving natural phenomena, and it is thus not applicable to the researcher’s qualitative research study.

Creswell et al., (2016) identify critical realism as the paradigm associated with case study research which seeks to expose myths and empower individuals to radically transform society. Epistemologically; critical realism is subjective in that it is assumed that no object can be researched without being affected by the researcher (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Ontology of critical realism assumes that reality is subject to change which is governed by underlying structures, its’ methodology provides for a mixed method approach combining both qualitative and quantitative methods, metatheory states that critical realism is concerned with revealing true social conditions; and its axiology focusses on freedom and equality (Creswell et al., 2016). The critical realism paradigm which is associated with mixed method research is thus not applicable to the researcher’s study due to the fact that the researcher will adopt a strictly qualitative orientation.
The interpretivist paradigm proves to be the most appropriate research paradigm for the researcher’s study as Sakyi (2017) identifies that this paradigm is associated with qualitative research studies involving social sciences and the investigation of human behaviour. The dimensions of the interpretivism paradigm and motivation for its selection are provided below:

3.2.1. Interpretivism Paradigm

Ontology of interpretivism states that reality is generated by individuals, its’ epistemology notes that this reality is influenced by the interpretation of events, and its’ methodology informs that analysis tools will be utilised to generate primary findings (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). Metatheory of interpretivism indicates that the theory contained in a research study must form a narrative and generate an in-depth understanding; and its’ axiological disposition states that uniqueness is valid (Edirisingha, 2012).

Edirisingha (2012) identifies that the primary objective of interpretivist research is to merely understand and interpret the meanings within human behaviour; as opposed to identifying and predicting causal relationships. This is in agreement with the purpose of the researcher’s study and thus validates the researcher’s selection of the interpretivism paradigm.

3.3. RESEARCH APPROACH

The research approach essentially expands on the methodological orientation and it refers to the overarching strategy that dictates the collection, measurement and analysis of data during a research study (Astalin, 2013). Based on the specific research purpose; qualitative research can be further subdivided into three research approaches namely: exploratory, explanatory or descriptive (De Vaus, 2001).

The researcher’s qualitative study adopts an exploratory approach. Exploratory research is defined by De Vaus (2001) as research conducted about a specific research problem where there are minimal prior research studies to refer to, and the
The primary focus of the researcher is on generating insights and knowledge for further investigation. This definition essentially directly relates to the topic and purpose of the researcher's study, and therefore an exploratory approach is the most appropriate research approach.

3.4. RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design refers to the overarching process utilised to integrate the components of the research study to ensure that the research questions are adequately addressed (De Vaus, 2001). Astalin (2013) identifies four dominant types of qualitative research designs namely: phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study research.

A phenomenologist research design has been utilised in this research study. Phenomenology involves the investigation and analysis of certain concepts or phenomena (Astalin, 2013). A phenomenologist design is thus applicable to the researcher's study which involves an investigation into the phenomena of satirical television advertising and brand equity.

3.5. POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The research population comprises of the elements that are of particular interest to the researcher and it is expressed using a unit of analysis (Kazerooni, 2001). The research population is subdivided into the target and accessible population based on specific population criteria (Kazerooni, 2001). Hassan (2009) defines sampling as the process of selecting a research sample of objects or individuals from the research population that possess the desired characteristics which are of particular interest to the researcher.

The population and sampling information pertaining to this research study is explained below:
3.5.1. Population

The unit of analysis for the population in this research study is people, or more specifically millennials in Johannesburg. The research study’s target population is millennials in Randburg; which is further subdivided to form the accessible population based on the following population criteria:
- Aware of the Nando’s brand.
- Familiar with Nando’s advertising.
- Active on a social-media platform.
- Subscribed to DSTV or SABC.

3.5.2. Sampling

The process of selecting a research sample is conducted by utilising a specific sampling method, with two overarching sampling techniques existing namely: probability sampling and non-probability sampling (Creswell et al., 2016).

Probability sampling is alternatively known as random sampling due to the fact that it utilises randomisation to ensure that every element of the population has an equal chance of being selected to form part of a specific research study’s sample group (Singh, 2018). Singh (2018) identifies five probability sampling methods namely: simple random sampling, stratified sampling, systematic sampling, cluster sampling and multi-stage sampling. Singh (2018) further notes that all of the aforementioned probability sampling methods are strictly associated with quantitative research studies and are thus not applicable to the researcher’s qualitative investigation.

In contrast to probability sampling; non-probability sampling does not rely on randomization, and instead this technique is more reliant on the researcher’s ability to select elements from the accessible population that possess specific characteristics which are of particular interest to the researcher (Singh, 2018). Etikan and Bala (2017) identify six non-probability sampling methods namely: quota sampling, accidental sampling, purposive sampling, convenience sampling, snowball sampling and modal instant sampling.
Non-probability sampling methods are associated with qualitative studies and the researcher has utilised a purposive sampling method which involves the selection of a sample based on predetermined characteristics (Hassan 2009). Singh (2018) states that purposive sampling is alternatively referred to as judgemental sampling, and this method of sampling is based on the purpose of the specific research study and is reliant on the researcher’s judgements.

Etikan and Bala (2017) identify that non-probability sampling methods are generally more costly in application and less accurate compared to probability sampling methods. Sharma (2017) notes that the purposive sampling method in particular is highly prone to researcher bias as a purposive sample is selected subjectively based solely on the researcher’s judgement, and thus it may prove difficult to validate the representativeness of the sample. The researcher has thus remained highly cognisant of preventing biased sample selections; in order to ensure the accurate representativeness of the final research sample.

Sharma (2017) identifies that the benefits of utilising a purposive sampling method includes the fact that it can provide the researcher with justification to make generalisations from the sample that is under investigation, whether such generalisations are theoretical, analytical or logical in nature. This benefit of the purposive sampling method identified by Sharma (2017) provides primary theoretical justification of the researcher’s selection of this sampling.

Secondary rational justification of the researcher’s selection of the purposive sampling method is provided by the fact that it is the most appropriate non-probability sampling method for the purpose of this qualitative research study, which sought to develop an understanding of how satirical advertising influences brand equity amongst South African millennials. This is essentially due to the fact that the selection of the research sample has been based on the researcher’s judgement.
3.5.3. Sample Parameters

The sample consisted of six individuals whose identity’s have been kept anonymous. The sample is described in the figure below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Focus Group Sample

3.6. DATA COLLECTION METHOD

Kabir (2016) defines data collection as the systematic process of gathering information on the variables of interest in a particular research investigation. The data collection component of a research investigation enables the researcher to determine answers for the stated research questions, and thus there is emphasis on ensuring accurate and unbiased collection of information (Kabir, 2016).

Quantitative data collection methods are generally more structured and rigorous compared to qualitative data collection methods; and examples of quantitative methods include experiments, clinical trials, observations; as well as surveys with closed-ended questions (Kabir, 2016). Due to the fact that the researcher’s topic is qualitative in nature; none of the above-mentioned quantitative data collection methods are applicable. Possible qualitative data collection methods for the researcher’s study include interviews, focus groups and surveys or questionnaires with open-ended questions (Kabir, 2016). Although qualitative data collection methods are generally less structured, less rigorous and simpler to conduct compared to quantitative methods; they can however be more costly and time consuming;
additionally the findings produced are unable to be generalised to elements outside of
the program and are only indicative of the group involved (Kabir, 2016).

The researcher opted to conduct a focus group as the method for collecting data
during this research study. Gil, Stewart, Treasure and Chadwick (2008) describe a
focus group as a guided, monitored and recorded group discussion regarding the
research topic. A focus group has been selected by the researcher due to the fact that
Gil et al., (2008) identifies that this data collection method can be utilised as a
standalone method that produces quality research findings relating to human
behaviour and phenomena. This reason provides initial justification of the researcher’s
selection of a focus group as the chosen data collection method for this research
study.

Further justification of the researcher’s decision to conduct a focus group as the
method for collecting data during the research study is provided by Morgan and
Spanish (1984) who identify that a focus group can be conducted in a relatively brief
period of time by individuals with minimal expertise such as the researcher. Morgan
and Spanish (1984) also state that the major advantage of conducting a focus group
is that it provides the researcher the opportunity to observe participants engaging in
interaction that is concentrated on attitudes and experiences which are of particular
interest to the researcher.

The general format of the focus group conducted during the proposed research study
is provided in Appendix C. The questions have been formulated in-line with the brand
equity dimensions provided by Aaker (1996). The focus group was conducted at the
Joe Public United building in Bryanston, Johannesburg, and was 55:30 minutes in
duration.

3.7. DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

Creswell et al., (2017) define data analysis as the process of formatting, evaluating
and interpreting the data collected during a research study using a combination of
analytical and logical reasoning to establish conclusions and observe specific
outcomes. Quantitative data analysis methods are predominantly statistical and mathematical approaches that are utilised to analyse numerical data; whereas qualitative data analysis methods are utilised to identify common characteristics and determine relationships that exist within non-numerical data (Creswell et al., 2017). Due to the qualitative nature of the researcher’s study; only qualitative data analysis methods were considered for selection. Qualitative data analysis methods include: content analysis, narrative analysis, thematic analysis, discourse analysis, ethnography and grounded theory (Creswell et al., 2017).

The researcher has selected the thematic content analysis method as it is the most appropriate data analysis method for any qualitative research study that seeks to discover using interpretations, and will allow the researcher to accurately determine the relationships that exist between concepts (Alhojailan (2012). Thematic content analysis is defined by Anderson (2007) as an analysis process that is used to interpret verbal, written or behavioural data by coding and classifying the data according to common themes; in order to make logical sense of the data collected and develop a comprehensive understanding of the research findings. Anderson (2007) also identifies that thematic content analysis is the most appropriate qualitative data analysis method for analysing data collected during a focus group as it generates accurate findings that exclude the researcher’s personal opinions and feelings about the prevalent themes.

Myles and Huberman (1994) provide a three-stage process of thematic data analysis which consists of data reduction, data display and data conclusion-drawing. This process will be followed by the researcher and a based on the aforementioned brand equity theory has been utilised to analyse the data. A sample of the data analysis tool; as well as a depiction and explanation of the process is provided in Appendix D.

3.8. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Research limitations and delimitations are defined by Enslin (2014) as specific factors that may enhance or diminish the complexity and accuracy of the findings and insights generated during a specific research investigation. Enslin (2014) further distinguishes
that limitations are factors that occur outside of the researcher’s control; whereas delimitations are specific factors or challenges that occur according to the researcher’s decisions and may be overcome.

3.8.1. Limitations

- Unrepresentative Sample: Due to the fact that the sample size for the researcher’s study is relatively diminutive, and that selection is limited to millennials in the Randburg area only; there is a possibility that the final selected sample group may not be an accurate representation of all millennials in South Africa.

- South African Participants: The majority of existing research studies conducted on humorous or satirical advertising and brand equity amongst millennials have primarily involved American or other foreign native millennials who have been subjected to their own specialised advertising messages and influences.

- Interpretivist Research Paradigm: According to Pham (2018) a criticism of the interpretivism research paradigm is that its’ ontological disposition tends to be subject rather than objective and thus the research outcomes produced will be affected by the researcher’s own interpretations, belief systems and cultural preferences which may result in researcher bias.

- Researcher Background: The researcher is employed in the advertising field and one of Nando’s competitors is a client of the researcher, which may distort the researcher’s interpretation of the data generated during the research study.

3.8.2. Delimitations

- The primary focus of the study is limited to only one brand; as well as only one of satirical advertisement.

- The concept of satirical advertising within South Africa is relatively underexplored, which results in a lack of available literature relating to the concept.

- The researcher intends to investigate the influence of satirical advertising on brand equity amongst millennials, and thus concentrates on brand equity from the consumer’s perspective only.
- The study's population is limited to Randburg millennials aged 23-28 and specific characteristics will be used to restrict the scope of the proposed research study.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains the researcher’s analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data collected during the focus group. The researcher has utilised a thematic content analysis process whereby relevant outcomes have been established from the transcript of the qualitative focus group by means of coding the data. Coding is essentially a facilitating component of thematic content analysis and it is defined by Miles and Huberman (1994) as an analytical process whereby qualitative data is examined and subsequently categorised according to relevant categories and themes within the data. As mentioned in the data analysis section of the study’s research methodology in chapter 3, the researcher utilised the Miles and Huberman (1994) data analysis process, which essentially comprised of: data reduction, data display, and lastly data interpretation.

The audio recording of the entire primary research focus group was firstly transcribed by the researcher. This audio recording is provided on the memory flash drive submitted with the printed version of the researcher’s study, and the focus group transcription is attached in Appendix E. The qualitative data contained in the transcription was subsequently coded into specific categories, and then further divided into relevant themes based on the responses and sentiments of the focus group participants.

The findings provided in the following sections will discuss the identified categories that have been developed based on the study’s theoretical framework provided by Aaker (1996). This essentially refers to the process of data reduction and the qualitative data generated during the contained research study has been reduced into the following five categories:

i. Brand Awareness
ii. Brand Associations
iii. Brand Image
The five categories identified above each include two related themes that have been established through coding. Coding these themes allowed the researcher to develop findings and insights related to each theoretical category. The findings and insights developed were subsequently analysed and interpreted based on the contained study’s research problem, research questions and objectives; as well as existing literature and related research studies. The relevant data findings and interpretations are provided in the subsequent sections below:

4.2. CATEGORY 1: BRAND AWARENESS

Aaker (1991) recognises brand awareness as a dimension of brand equity, and his theory states that achieving a positive brand awareness directly contributes to generating a strong brand equity. The coding and analysis process revealed two themes which suggest that the satirical “You People” commercial contributed positively to Nando’s brand awareness.

The two themes relating to the brand awareness category that were uncovered during the researcher’s data analysis process are advertisement awareness and positive memories. The brand awareness category; as well as the two related themes are displayed in the figure below and discussed in the subsequent sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Brand Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Memories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. Perceived Quality
v. Brand Loyalty
seeing a billboard that said “a meal for all you people” or something like that and I remembered where I saw the commercial. So, it linked it to that and after seeing it I thought to myself: hmm actually maybe I’ll have Nando’s tonight and it was like a trigger.”

4.2.1. Theme 1: Advertisement Awareness

Firstly; the data revealed that all of the participants were aware of the “You People” television advertisement, and some could also recall being exposed to the “You People” messaging through other platforms; namely billboards and product packaging.

4.2.2. Theme 2: Positive Memories

In addition to being aware of the “You People” advertisement, some participants further expressed positive memories of it and the overall sentiment towards the advertisement was largely positive. The data thus indicated a generally positive level of brand awareness stemming from the participants’ awareness and positive memories of the “You People” advertisement.

4.2.3. Interpretation of Category 1

The researcher has identified a generally favourable measure of brand awareness with regards to the millennials’ overall awareness of the satirical “You People” commercial; as well as the Nando’s brand. Furthermore; the findings also indicated that the satirical “You People” commercial proved to have an influence on Nando’s overall level of brand awareness. This identified influence on Nando’s brand awareness stemming from the satirical “You People” commercial is in agreement with the findings of a similar research study conducted by Khan and Khan (2013). Their
research study established that humour in advertising has an apparent influence on brand awareness.

Given that Aaker’s (1996) brand equity theory identifies brand awareness as a component of brand equity and further states that achieving a positive brand awareness directly contributes to generating a strong brand equity; deductive logic thus allows the researcher to assume that the positive brand awareness identified from the data obtained, should in principle also indicate a positive influence caused by the satirical “You People” commercial on Nando’s brand equity amongst millennials. In addition to this theoretical finding; the studies of Nel et al., (2009) identify brand awareness as a key determinant of brand equity, and thus as the satirical “You People” commercial positively influenced Nando’s brand awareness; this should further imply that it had a positive influence on Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials.

4.3. CATEGORY 2: BRAND ASSOCIATIONS

The second category provided by the study’s theoretical Aaker (1996) framework comprises of brand associations; which are identified by Bastian (2015) as a crucial component of brand equity. Brand associations essentially reflect an individual’s perceptions of a specific brand; and they are thus of particular importance to the researcher’s study which sought to determine how satire influences millennials’ perceptions of the Nando’s brand.

The researcher’s thematic content analysis process revealed that in general; the millennial participants possess varied and contrasting associations with regards to the Nando’s brand. The data related to the millennials brand associations essentially produced two contradictory themes. In essence; the millennial participants positively associated Nando’s with satire. In contrast; they negatively associated the Nando’s brand with high prices and expensive products. The two themes related to the brand awareness category are displayed in the figure below and interpreted in the subsequent sections.
4.3.1. Theme 1: Satire

Aaker’s (1991) brand equity theory states that positive brand associations are necessary in generating a strong brand equity. The researcher’s analysis of data generated revealed that participants positively associated the Nando’s brand with humour, and satire in particular. Furthermore; this positive association with satire also positively contributed to their overall perception of the Nando’s brand, as the brand’s use of satirical and controversial advertising was perceived as bravery and admired by the millennial participants.

The data also indicated that Nando’s strong association with satirical humour stems from their consistent use of satirical commercials, which the millennial participants have become accustom to. In addition to the Nando’s brand having been observed by the millennial participants’ as being synonymous with satirical advertising; the researcher further identified an evident entertainment value provided by the brand’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Brand Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Quote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Definitely… yes definitely, because they’re all about political satire and satire in general. So, I think that its great and on brand. And yah, it’s also light and you feel quite tense but then you laugh about it. Also no one was on twitter complaining, everyone was saying that it’s funny because its true so yeah I think that it does fit with the brand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“For number one I chose expensive because we all know Nando’s is really expensive.” (When participants were asked what they most associate with Nando’s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use of humour and satire. This entertainment value provided by the satirical humour manifested in the majority of millennial participants agreeing that they prefer humorous advertisements as opposed to serious or non-humorous advertisements. This supports McDougal’s (2017) finding that states that humorous messages are superior to non-humorous messages.

4.3.2. Theme 2: Expensive

In contrast to the millennial participants’ positively associating the Nando’s brand with satire; the data further revealed that the they also negatively associated the Nando’s brand with being expensive. In fact, the data indicated that the millennial participants possessed an equal amount of positive satire associations and negative expensive associations with regards to the Nando’s brand. However; due to the fact that the millennial participants all had average income levels and limited budgets, the brand’s product pricing was thus a significantly important and influential purchase decision factor. Thus; the millennial participants’ financial positions and heightened importance of pricing culminated in their strong negative association of Nando’s with expensive products and frequently increasing prices.

4.3.3. Interpretation of Category 2

The researcher has interpreted the equal amounts of positive and negative associations as indicating that millennials possess an overall neutral association with regards to the Nando’s brand. The researcher has also interpreted that although millennials’ positively associate the Nando’s brand with satire, this association is not strong enough to outweigh their negative association of the Nando’s brand and its’ products as being expensive.

Unfortunately, the researcher’s qualitative study is unable to quantify the exact nature of the influence of the satirical “You People” commercial on Nando’s brand associations amongst millennials; however, the prevalence of both positive and negative associations indicates that satirical humour has an evident influence on consumers’ brand associations. As brand associations are closely related to brand
perceptions; this identified influence of satirical humour on Nando’s brand associations also indicates an influence on brand perceptions. This finding is in contradiction with the study conducted by McDougal (2017), which postulates that humour used in television advertisements has no influence on consumers’ brand perceptions. Furthermore; this finding proves to be in agreement with Khan and Khan (2013) whose literature states that humorous advertising influences multiple components of brand equity including: brand recognition, brand awareness, and brand associations.

4.4. CATEGORY 3: BRAND IMAGE

Brand image is a component of brand equity identified by Bastian (2015) and Nel et al., (2009) who state that a positive brand image directly contributes to a strong brand equity. The data obtained during the focus group conducted by the researcher indicates that the millennial participants observe a generally positive image of the Nando’s brand. Furthermore; the data also suggests that the satirical humour used in the Nando’s “You People” commercial positively contributes to their brand image. The data reflects two dominant themes related to the brand image category. These themes are South African humour and Nando’s as a funny friend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Brand Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Quote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think what made it funny and made it kind of easy on the palate for me was the fact that they took a stab at every possible kind of faction of South Africa and it wasn’t just one side of the coin. I think that’s what made it more palatable compared to if they had just focussed on one area or one race.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funny Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Like yah, it’s kind of like they’ve moved past it now and now they’re just kind of like the friend that you always want to have around because you know that they will bring the kiki-kees (laughs). It’s that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1. Theme 1: South African Humour

This positive brand image stems from the participants’ impression of the Nando’s brand as being synonymous with accurate South African humour. This accurate representation observed by the millennial respondents further implied cultural understanding on behalf of the Nando’s brand. This understanding and entertainment provided by the satirical South African humour used by Nando’s contributed positively to the millennial respondents’ image of the brand.

4.4.2. Theme 2: Funny Friend

In addition; the data also revealed that the millennial participants positively perceived the Nando’s brand as being a personal friend. Moreover; the millennial participants considered Nando’s as a special friend with an hilarious and witty sense of humour. The researcher has interpreted that the connotations of a friend are thus applicable to the millennial respondents and their relationship with the Nando’s brand. These connotations include: trust, connection and loyalty. This finding is particularly pertinent to the researcher’s study as it indicates an influence of satire on brand imagery.

4.4.3. Interpretation of Category 3

The researcher has interpreted that the predominantly positive image of the Nando’s possessed by the millennial participants; therefore, also indicates a positive influence on Nando’s overall brand equity. The researcher has interpreted the overall findings for category three as being in agreement with the studies of Motwani and Agarwal (2014) who also state that humour does influence brand image; however, this influence is only positive when the humour used in the advertisement is in line with the specific brand’s values and brand identity. This was particularly applicable to the
researcher’s investigation into the influence of the satirical humour used by the Nando’s brand.

4.5. CATEGORY 4: PERCEIVED QUALITY

The data obtained during the primary research indicates that the millennial participants possess varied and contrasting quality perceptions with regards to the Nando’s brand and their products. In essence; the millennial respondents observed the Nando’s products as high quality; however, this perception was outweighed by the expensive prices and cost perceptions. These two dominant trends in perceptions observed in the data can be understood as the value verse price trade-off, and essentially form the themes of the perceived quality category analysed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
<th>Verbatim Quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Perceptions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Umm so I’ve got <strong>quality</strong> number 1 mainly because the last Nando’s that I had like two weeks ago literally tasted as good as the first Nando’s that I had in my life in Rosettenville at their head office store. I think I’ve probably only had one Nando’s experience ever that didn’t live up to my expectations and that’s why quality is number 1.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price Perceptions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>“Well for starters I hate that I feel like I have to go into Nando’s with my three months bank statements and that time it’s a local brand. I have actually had Nando’s in the United Kingdom before and I was shocked that I actually paid less there than I do in South Africa, even with the exchange rate. So, my answer would be no.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Perceived Quality
5.5.1. Theme 1: Quality Perceptions

The data revealed that the majority of the millennial participants possess positive value perceptions related to the high quality of Nando’s products. The millennial participants’ high-quality perceptions stemmed from their personal experiences with the Nando’s brand. Conversely; if the individual participant recalled a negative experience at Nando’s, this then resulted in a negative quality judgement and negative perception of the Nando’s brand. The data also indicated an overall acknowledgement by the millennial participants of the decreases in portion sizes at Nando’s; however, this didn’t result in a negative perception of the quality of Nando’s products. Furthermore, these portion decreases did not discourage consumption of Nando’s, whereas a negative experience resulted in discontinued purchase.

5.5.2. Theme 2: High-Price Perceptions

Contrary to positive value perceptions of the Nando’s brand’s high-quality products; the data further revealed that the millennial participants also possess negative perceptions of the brand’s quality, which can be attributed to their association with exorbitant product prices. The data revealed that all of the millennial participants perceive Nando’s as expensive; however, this only proved to be a deterrent for some. The data further indicated that the satirical “You People” television commercial had no influence on the millennial participants’ perceptions of Nando’s expensive products.

5.5.3. Interpretation of Category 4

The researcher has interpreted the contradictory findings relating to the perceived quality category as indicating inconclusive evidence of the influence of satirical advertising. In essence; the millennial participants enjoyed and appreciated the satirical “You People” commercial; however, it did not influence their quality perceptions and purchase decisions. This contradicts the findings of Mototo et al., (2017) who proved that humorous advertising influences the quality of a brand perceived by consumers.
This finding is also in disagreement with Hoang (2013); who also discovered that humour positively influences brand image; however, Hoang (2013) argues that humour has an influence on consumer’s purchase decisions. In contrast; the researcher’s findings indicate that the millennial participants’ purchase decisions are mainly influenced by financial factors, and thus; the satirical humour had limited influence.

4.6. CATEGORY 5: BRAND LOYALTY

Aaker (1996) identifies brand loyalty as a significantly influential component and indicator of a brand’s equity. The millennial participants’ loyalty to the Nando’s brand is reflected in their frequent consumption; as well as their continued purchase of the brand’s products. These two concepts essentially form the themes for the brand loyalty category and are analysed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Brand Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Purchase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Brand Loyalty
4.6.1. Theme 1: Frequent Consumption

The data obtained during the focus group indicates that a portion of the millennial participants proved to be frequent consumers of Nando’s products. This frequency of consumption varied between participants; with some consuming their food at least once a week, and others at least once a month.

4.6.2. Theme 2: Continued Purchase

Perhaps the most conclusive indication of the millennial participants’ loyalty to the Nando’s brand may be reflected in their continued purchase of the brand’s products; despite their exorbitant and frequently increasing prices. In essence; the data revealed that the millennial participants were cognisant of the fact that the brand’s products are significantly costly; however, this did not prove to be a deterrent to consumption, and ultimately, they continued to support the brand subsequent to an increase in their product prices.

4.6.3. Interpretation of Category 5

This continued purchase and consumption of the brand’s products regardless of increases in their prices has been interpreted by the researcher as active loyalty to the Nando’s brand by millennials. Bastian (2015) reports that brand loyalty implies that equity has been created and thus the millennial respondents’ loyalty to the Nando’s has been interpreted as a contribution made by the satirical “You People” commercial to overall brand equity.

4.7. VALIDITY RELIABILITY AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

Validity, reliability and trustworthiness are metrics which can be utilised to determine the soundness of a particular research study, in relation to the application and appropriateness of the methods undertaken; as well as the integrity of the final conclusions (Noble & Smith, 2015). Anney (2014) states that validity and reliability are predominantly measures applicable to quantitative research studies, however; these
measures can also be applied to qualitative research studies, where trustworthiness is the dominant measure.

Validity in qualitative research refers to the integrity and application of the research methods undertaken, as well as the precision in which the research findings accurately represent the data collected; whereas reliability relates to the internal consistency of the employed data analytical procedures (Long & Johnson, 2000). To ensure that the researcher’s study is reliable and valid, the research methodology has been composed with integrity and is devoid of researcher bias. It also adheres to the necessary human privacy rights and data collection requirements, and it is consistent in its’ theoretical foundation; as well as its’ research and analysis methods.

Guba (1981) identifies that qualitative researchers consider dependability, credibility, transferability and confirmability as trustworthiness criteria that ensure the rigour of qualitative research findings. These criteria; as well as the measures that the researcher followed to ensure that they are adhered to are provided and explained below:

i. Dependability:
Dependability refers to the stability and accuracy of the research findings produced (Anney, 2014). To ensure that the research study’s findings are dependable, the researcher has recorded the entire focus group using an audio recording device. The written transcriptions from the focus group will also be kept.

ii. Credibility:
Credibility is closely related to dependability and is defined as the confidence that can be placed in the truth of the research findings produced (Anney, 2014). The aforementioned measures that will be utilised to ensure dependability should also guarantee the credibility of the researcher’s study.

iii. Transferability:
Transferability refers to the ability of the research study to be interpreted in various different settings and understood by multiple individuals (Creswell et al., 2017). The
research results generated during the study have initially been examined by the research moderator, in order to ensure transferability.

iv. Confirmability:
Confirmability is concerned with the degree to which the research results produced can be corroborated by other researchers and academics (Anney, 2014). The researcher has thus compared the research findings generated during the research study with the findings of similar previous studies, to determine their confirmability.

4.8. CONCLUSION

With reference to the total contents of the data produced in its’ entirety – the researcher has deduced that there is a significant degree of variation prevalent within the findings; as well as their related influence on Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials. This identified variation in the findings produced is reflected in the contrasting influence of the Nando’s “You People” advertisement on the five components of brand equity according to Aaker (1991, 1996). This has resulted in it being significantly difficult for the researcher to accurately determine the overall influence of the “You People” commercial on Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials. The final data interpretations and conclusions are provided with recommendations in the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a holistic conclusion to the entire research study and each research question stated in Chapter 1 is answered with reference to the findings provided in Chapter 4. Furthermore; subsequent to the answering of the research questions, the researcher proposes numerous future recommendations based on the study. The ethical considerations of the research study are also provided.

5.2. CONCLUDING ANSWERS TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

How do South African millennials respond to the satirical “You People” television commercial by Nando’s?

In general; the millennials responses to the satirical “You People” television commercial by Nando’s were predominantly positive. The millennials were entertained by the satirical humour utilised in the commercial and this further translated to their positive response towards the Nando’s brand. The accuracy of the commercial further elicited a positive emotional response by South African millennials.

How does the satirical “You People” commercial influence South African millennials’ perceptions of the Nando’s brand?

Primarily; the satirical “You People” commercial generated a positive perception of the Nando’s brand by the South African millennials. The satirical humour established a South African brand image for the Nando’s, furthermore, the millennials perceived the brand as a friend which indicates trust. However; these positive perceptions stemming from the satirical “You People” commercial were outweighed by the negative functional perceptions possessed by millennials. Essentially; the millennials’ negative functional perception of Nando’s being expensive proved to be stronger than their positive perceptions of the brand as a friend,
How does the satirical “You People” commercial contribute to Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials? (According to the brand equity dimensions provided by Aaker’s (1996) Brand Equity Theory).

Firstly; the data indicated that the “You People” commercial positively contributed to Nando’s brand awareness, due to the fact that the millennial participants were aware of the advertisement and possessed positive memories of it. The researcher has thus deduced that this positive brand awareness identified is likely to positively influence Nando’s brand equity amongst millennials.

With reference to the millennial participants’ associations with the Nando’s brand; there proved to be a significant amount of variation and the researcher is thus unable to determine their influence on the brand’s equity. The next finding revealed that the Nando’s brand conveyed a predominantly positive brand image to the millennial participants, and thus the researcher is able to deduce that this should imply a positive influence on brand equity. In contrast; the value of the Nando’s brand perceived by the millennial participants was predominantly negative in nature, as the high price perceptions outweighed the high-quality perceptions. This thus implies a negative influence on Nando’s brand equity amongst South African millennials.

The final finding relating to brand loyalty indicated that the majority of the millennial participants proved to be loyal to the Nando’s brand. This loyalty was demonstrated in their frequent and continued consumption of Nando’s products – despite increases in prices. This positive brand loyalty should conversely result in a positive influence on brand equity. Given these influences on the five identified components of Nando’s brand equity amongst millennials, it is conclusive that the “You People” commercial influenced the brand’s overall equity. Unfortunately; the overall nature of this influence is unable to be established by the researcher’s qualitative study; however, the researcher is able to reliably conclude that this influence was predominantly positive.
5.3. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Sanjari, Bahramnezhad, Fomani, Shoghi and Cheraghi (2014) identify that due to the nature of qualitative research studies; the interaction between the researcher and participants can be ethically challenging for the researcher, as he or she is directly involved in multiple stages of the study, and therefore, the formulation of specific ethical considerations is imperative to ensuring the trustworthiness of the qualitative research findings produced. Quadri (n.d.) defines ethical considerations in research as the standards for conduct that essentially distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behaviours of the researcher; as well as the participants.

The research study only commenced once the researcher obtained ethical clearance which has been provided in Appendix F. The ethical considerations that were taken into account include:

i) **Of the Researcher:**
- Avoid falsifying of information and distorting of results.
- Utilisation of appropriate data collection and data analysis tools.
- Eliminate all forms of researcher bias.
- Ensure responsible and safe use of participants’ private information.
- Safeguard all findings and data generated during the proposed research study.

ii) **Of the Participants:**
- Provide informed consent and ensure confidentiality through the signing of the research consent form provided in Appendix G.
- Fully understand the research topic and purpose of the research.
- Avoid deception by answering all questions truthfully and provide accurate information.

5.4. FUTURE IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

The findings generated by the research study will expand the existing body of knowledge by providing evidence regarding the influence that satire has on brand
equity amongst millennials. This evidence will provide brand managers and advertising strategists with a better understanding of the complexities of satirical television advertising and how this influences brand equity amongst South African millennials. With reference to the generally positive brand-related researcher predicts that satire should positively influence brand equity amongst South African millennials.

5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the researcher’s study was to generate knowledge regarding satirical humour in television advertising; in order to ultimately develop a conclusive understanding of its’ influence on brand equity specifically amongst the South African millennial consumer segment. The researcher has thus fulfilled the purpose of the study and can reliably conclude that satirical television advertising has a positive influence on brand equity amongst South African millennials. Furthermore; it may be stated that, if used correctly, satire can be used as an effective tactic to build brand equity.

It is recommended that future quantitative research should be conducted to further measure the exact influence that satirical television advertising has on brand equity amongst South African millennials.
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APPENDIX A: AAKER’S BRAND EQUITY MODEL

APPENDIX B: KELLER’S CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY MODEL
APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP FORMAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMEWORK:</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP QUESTION:</th>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaker: Brand Loyalty</td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION:</strong> “Welcome everyone and thank you for agreeing to take part in this focus group. Today’s discussion is about Nando’s – the fast-food, fried peri-peri chicken brand, and we will be focussing specifically on one of their recent television commercials – The ‘You People’ commercial. To start; please can everyone introduce themselves to the group by telling us your name, age, occupation; as well as how often you purchase Nando’s and when was the last time that you did?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaker: Brand Awareness</td>
<td><strong>QUESTION 1:</strong> Before I show you the “You People” commercial; does anyone know this commercial or remember it just by hearing its title? i.e. do you know of the Nando’s “You People” commercial?</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLAY COMMERCIAL FOR PARTICIPANTS**

**NOTE:** Observe and record participants’ initial reactions to the commercial

**GENERAL COMMERCIAL & BRAND QUESTIONS**

| Aaker: Brand Associations | **QUESTION 2:** Describe your initial reaction or how this commercial made you feel using one word or emotion? | #1 |
| Aaker: Brand Associations & Perceived Value | **QUESTION 3:** What do you think of this commercial? Do you like it or not and why? | #1 & #3 |
| Aaker: Brand Associations & Perceived Value | **QUESTION 4:** What about the commercial appeals to you? | #1 #2 & #3 |
| Aaker: Brand Associations & Perceived Value | **QUESTION 5:** Do you find the commercial funny? Please explain your answer by describing how and why the humour used in it appeals to you or not. | #1 & #3 |
Aaker: Brand Image & Brand Associations

QUESTION 6:
Do you think that the commercial and the humour in it matches what you know about the Nando’s brand and why? #2

Aaker: Brand Associations & Perceived Value

QUESTION 7:
Do you think that the commercial is an accurate representation of reality in South Africa? #1 & #3

Aaker: Brand Associations & Brand Attitudes

QUESTION 8:
Do you share the same sentiments, feelings or views as those expressed in the commercial and can you relate to the it? #1, #2 & #3

Aaker: Brand Image, Brand Associations, Brand Attitudes & Perceived Value

QUESTION 9:
In your opinion; what does this commercial say or convey about the Nando’s brand? #2

Aaker: Perceived Value & Brand Loyalty

QUESTION 10:
Do you prefer funny commercials as opposed to serious commercials? In essence; are you more likely to purchase products displayed in funny commercials or serious commercials? #3

WORD GAME:
We are now going to play a word game. In front of you, you will find five packs of words labelled 1-5. Each different question will require you to pick a word or words that you find most appropriate to the question asked

WORD PACK 1:
1) Witty-Wordplay
2) Sarcasm
3) Satire
4) Slapstick
5) Dark-Offensive

Aaker: Brand Associations

QUESTION 11:
From the 5 types of humour in word pack 1 – please select the 1 that you feel best describes the humour used in the “You People” Nando’s commercial. #1 & #2

WORD PACK 2:
1) Trustworthy
2) Expensive
3) Clever
4) Funny
5) Quality
6) Offensive
7) Boring
8) Cheap
9) Influential
10) Sincere
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aaker:</strong> Brand Image, Brand Associations &amp; Brand Attitudes</th>
<th><strong>QUESTION 12.1:</strong> From the 10 words in word pack 2 – please select the 3 words that you feel best describes the Nando’s brand. (Which 3 words or descriptors do you most associate with the Nando’s?) #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aaker:</strong> Brand Image, Brand Associations &amp; Brand Attitudes</td>
<td><strong>QUESTION 12.2:</strong> Using the leftover words from word pack 2, select the 3 words or descriptors that you least associate with the Nando’s brand? #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORD PACK 3:</strong> 1) Sophisticated 2) Charismatic 3) Adventurous 4) Obnoxious 5) Humorous</td>
<td><strong>QUESTION 13:</strong> From the 5 types of personalities in word pack 3 – select the 1 that you feel would best describe the Nando’s brand’s personality if it was a human? #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORD PACK 4:</strong> 1) Parent 2) Lover 3) Friend 4) Grandparent 5) Child</td>
<td><strong>QUESTION 14:</strong> From the 5 types of people in word pack 4 – which 1 do you feel best describes the Nando’s brand and your relationship with the brand? #2 &amp; #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORD PACK 5:</strong> 1) Chicken Licken 2) Mc Donalds 3) Kentucky Fried Chicken 4) Nando’s 5) Steers</td>
<td><strong>QUESTION 15:</strong> Arrange the 5 fast-food brands in word pack 5 according to your personal preference and based on everything that you know about the brands – with number 1 as your favourite brand and number 5 as your least favourite brand. #2 &amp; #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX D: DATA ANALYSIS TOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
<th>Verbatim Quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Equity Themes (e.g. Brand associations, Brand resonance)</td>
<td>X% (amount that the theme appears)</td>
<td>Respondents exact quotes that reflect the particular brand equity theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E: FOCUS GROUP TRANSCRIPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>THEORY CATEGORY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Okay let’s start! Welcome everyone and thank you for agreeing to be a part of today’s focus group. I’ve already explained all the ethical information to you all, but just to reinforcer – you are not obliged to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable and you can leave the focus group at any time and all the information you provide will be kept private. I must also inform you that I am recording this focus group for the purpose of writing the research transcripts. To start; please can we go around and introduce yourselves to the group by giving us your name, age, occupation; and also tell us how often you purchase Nando’s and when was last the last time – if you can remember.</td>
<td>Frequent Consumption</td>
<td>00:00 – 00:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Hi my name is (name removed), I am 28 years old and I am a strategist. The last time I purchased Nando’s was probably three to five weeks ago.</td>
<td>Frequent Consumption</td>
<td>00:45 – 00:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>I’m (name removed), I’m 26 turning 27 and I’m a poultry farmer. Last time I ate Nando’s was about a week to a week and a half ago</td>
<td>Frequent Consumption</td>
<td>00:57 – 01:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DATA ANALYSIS KEY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Brand Awareness</td>
<td>1.1) Advertisement Awareness 1.2) Positive Memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Brand Associations</td>
<td>2.1) Satire 2.2) Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Brand Image</td>
<td>3.1) South African Humour 3.2) Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Perceived Quality</td>
<td>4.1) Quality Perceptions 4.2) Price Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>5.1) Frequent Consumption 5.2) Continued Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td><em>(Name removed), I'm a professional snowboarder. I'm 23 years old and the last time I bought Nando's was about 2 months ago or so, through the drive-thru.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>I'm <em>(name removed)</em>, I'm 23, I'm a writer and I have Nando's quite often. Probably once every two weeks or even sometimes once a week, but on average — at least twice a month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Hi I'm <em>(name removed)</em>, I'm 25. I am a full-time professional dancer. I eat Nando's probably every second day. The last time I ate Nando's was last night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>I also had it yesterday, haha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>I'm <em>(name removed)</em>, I'm 26. I'm a lawyer and the last time I had Nando's was probably a month or two ago. I don’t really have it that often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Cool, thanks guys. So as I’ve explained already; today we will be speaking about Nando’s, but specifically about their “You People” commercial. Before I play this commercial for you, is anyone aware of this commercial and remember seeing it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td><em>Nods head yes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td><em>Nods head yes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td><em>Nods head yes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Yip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Cool so it seems everyone has seen it and is aware of it. I am now going to play the commercial for you before we get into the questions. <em>Plays “You People” Commercial</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>I was laughing my <em>explicit</em> off!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Okay so you found it funny then I’m guessing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Yeah!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Cool cool…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Yah same here. I thought it was funny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Umm, yah – it’s quite hilarious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>My first reaction was probably like a little bit tense, but after seeing it again I found it quite funny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Same here. I found it funny as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Me too. I also found it quite funny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Okay cool. So everyone likes this commercial, but now tell me – why do you like it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>I like it mainly because it taps into South African stereotypes and I remember when it played it was at the zeitgeist of what was happening in South Africa and there was a lot of turmoil between blacks, whites, coloureds and whatever. So it was a cool way of us just laughing at ourselves in terms of what we all think about each other and it was relatable. <strong>South African Humour &amp; Positive Memories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>I think what made it funny and made it kind of easy on the palate for me was the fact that they took a stab at every possible kind of faction of South Africa and it wasn’t just one side of the coin. <strong>South African Humour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:09</td>
<td>Participant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:10</td>
<td>Participant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:11</td>
<td>Participant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:23</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:46</td>
<td>Participant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:18</td>
<td>Participant 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:35</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:38</td>
<td>Participant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:50</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:52</td>
<td>Participant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Uhm… I’d say that when it came to the scene where the white lady thought that the black lady worked at the store. Yeah, that’s something that I’ve experienced way too many times before and I find it really annoying but I think that’s more of a dig at myself and my dress sense than the actually advert. So yeah, I was initially a bit touched but then when I saw it again I laughed at myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>It’s funny because all of us experience something along the lines of people assuming something about us and the different people in South Africa based on their race. For example when the other people order extra hot for the Indian guy; that’s a common assumption that Indians like hot and spicy food, but I know many Indian people who can’t stomach hot food at all. So yeah its funny because you remember when the same thing happened to you in your life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Yeah I agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Cool uhm… Do you think that this commercial and specifically the humour used in it matches the Nando’s brand based on what you know about the brand, and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td><em>Nods head yes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Definitely… yes definitely, because they’re all about political satire and satire in general. So I think that its great and on brand. And yah, it’s also light and you feel quite tense but then you laugh about it. Also no one was on twitter complaining, everyone was saying that it’s funny because its true so yeah I think that it does fit with the brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Yeah also because its mainly that Nando’s has always been super consistent with these type of adverts and they always have controversial adverts or social-media posts which of course will always upset someone or a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Yah I think just to add onto that; what Nando’s has done is that they’ve built up this platform for themselves where they can do these certain things and it goes down okay with South Africans because we just think to ourselves “oh it’s Nando’s.” I think if any other brand tried to do something like this, because they haven’t earned the right to do it, it wouldn’t be received well by South Africans. So like because we know that this is a Nando’s ad, we find it okay because they’ve essentially earned the right to do something like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Like even though they are kind of being super offensive in this advert, they’re doing it tastefully so it’s not something that people can really get very angry or offended by as opposed to if it was done in an ugly or insulting way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td><em>Nods head yes and agrees with everyone</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Anyone else want to add anything… all good? Cool moving on. We’ve sort of touched on it already, but would you say that this ad accurately represents the current reality in South Africa and the way that people stereotype each other? Or would you say that it’s not that accurate and that’s not how people stereotype each other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Aah… I’m going to say that it does. It definitely does. Like Participant 2 said earlier about white people asking him if he works at a shop when he’s shopping – that’s also happened to me and also to a certain degree this doesn’t really bother me anymore. It also makes you understand stereotypes and that it’s easy to assume things – like for example a lot of black people work in retail stores so it’s understandable that we get asked if we work in the stores. It’s just how it is and that’s something we need to remind ourselves. Yes this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

- **Participant 1**: The ad uses stereotypes but these stereotypes aren't wrong when one looks at them deeper. It's not a lie and that's why it's also funny.

- **Participant 3**: Yeah.

- **Participant 4**: I can definitely relate to the ad and a few times I've actually found myself at a shop and I was scared to ask any black person if they work there. So I've been on the opposite side of that as well... So like from the white side it's the truth as well and it's a bit of both – in some ways maybe it's overdramatising it to make light of the situation, but still, those things are really happening. You know?

- **Participant 2**: Funny enough I've actually also experienced the same thing and as a black person I've also been scared to ask another black person at the shop if they work there. So I've actually been on both sides.

- **Participant 4**: Like yes they are overdramatising the situations in the advert but these things do still happen quite often and that's why it's accurate.

- **Moderator**: Okay so everyone has sort of alluded to this already, but can everyone relate to this advert and quite easily?

- **Participant 2**: Yah 100%.

- **Participant 6**: Yes.

- **Participant 3**: *Nods head yes*

- **Participant 5**: *Nods head yes*

- **Participant 1**: Yes but I would've preferred it if they rather had a Cape Town coloured guy instead of a Joburg one because
Moderator: Now on a bit of a more deeper level – what does this commercial convey about the Nando’s brand? Or what does it say about them as a brand by using this commercial?

Participant 5: It says that us as South Africans are very unique and you won’t find other people like us anywhere else in the world. Like looking at the ad, there is so many types of people here and that makes us who we are. This is kind of just like Nando’s and what makes them who they are and different from everybody else.

Participant 3: For me it comes across as like Nando’s is brave enough and has the balls to put something like this out.

Participant 2: And besides them having the balls; it also shows that Nando’s has a proper understanding of who their market actually is.

Participant 6: Yes definitely.

Participant 1: Yah, they don’t try to fake it or just throw in a vernacular word to be more appealing like the current Samsung billboard with the word “nje” but with a picture of a white guy skateboarding in Dobsonville. Nando’s own these type of adverts, they live up to it, they breathe it and it’s who they are. We don’t expect anything different from them and like you just know that they’re that person. They’re kind of like that friend that you have who you know is very messed up, but you still love them for it regardless.

Moderator: Anyone else? Okay, moving on… Would you say that you prefer a funny commercial opposed to a serious commercial? In essence; it obviously depends on the product, but would you say that you are more likely to purchase that you see in a funny commercial or a serious commercial?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Funny. Mainly because it takes a lot to make me laugh and I don’t just find anything funny. So if a brand goes through the effort and makes me laugh, then I feel like they’re deserving of my attention and as a result they will probably get a sale.</td>
<td>15:44 – 16:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>For me it depends a lot on the product. Like with food for instance; that takes away from my hard earned “fun” money. But if it’s something else that is more expensive, then I would rather prefer more of an emotional ad that makes me feel something. But I don’t know, that might be because I am an emotional person, so yah – I’d say that it definitely depends on the type of product.</td>
<td>16:11 – 16:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>I think that even for me it would depend on the product. I don’t like when brands try to be serious just for the sake of it. Sometimes it’s never that deep like you’re selling shampoo or something and you’re trying to be deep, but come on – it’s just shampoo, relax it’s unnecessary to be that deep. Maybe when they’re talking about something serious like cancer then maybe be serious but even then it doesn’t have to be too serious. So yeah I think it just depends.</td>
<td>16:33 – 17:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>I think for me also it depends on the individual watching the ad because everybody has their own emotions that triggers something. When I think of emotional ads that triggered something for me, I think of Allan Gray – yes it’s just investments and insurance, but just the way they deliver it and drop a bomb at the end that makes you go “wow.” I think also going back to everyone’s points, I feel that every brand has their own place and emotion that they play on, but I think that it also depends on who they’re trying to get to buy the product. Laughter might get them to buy the product because you might be a serious brand but your audience might be attracted to laughter and that might be the route that you have to go.</td>
<td>17:10 – 17:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:58</td>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>But if you had to see like a funny Allan Gray ad then you wouldn’t be that hooked on it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:03</td>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>I don’t know because I've never seen one but it depends on the execution and it might just catch me. Like King Price does it well in insurance but they’re aimed at a younger market who are attracted to humour so they can play in that space, whereas old brands over 100 years plus like Prudential and Allan Gray could never change their serious approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:28</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Anyone else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:32</td>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Like for example if you had to see like a car crash advert but with a funny twist, then would that make you go and buy their life insurance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:44</td>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>I’m not sure, but with that there’s definitely different levels of humour. Like the “You People” ad is simply a laugh out loud, extra funny ad; whereas the ad you described is still a bit serious with a light-hearted chuckle at the end. So yah I think it’s definitely about the delivery and the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:10</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Okay so I’m getting very positive vibes so far from everyone about Nando’s... So this positive feeling that you guys have about the Nando’s brand and their communications, but specifically this “You People” ad – does it validate them charging a higher price and would you be okay with paying a higher price for their products? What are your thoughts on that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:40</td>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Well for starters I hate that I feel like I have to go into Nando’s with my three months bank statements and that time it’s a local brand. I have actually had Nando’s in the United Kingdom before and I was shocked that I actually paid less there than I do in South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moderator: Okay but with that being said – do you still purchase Nando's?

Participant 2: Yeah because it tastes so good man!

Moderator: So would you say that their advertising contributes to you still purchasing them or is it only their food that you keep going back for?

Participant 2: Umm, I’d say mainly the food… their peri-peri wedges as a starter is great and of course their half chicken is amazing and their rolls that have the white flour on top, even though they make a huge mess.

Participant 4: I think that like it’s also something that we’re aware of. I’ve had many a conversation with friends and family about how Nando’s has gotten expensive and their prices have gone up or whatever; but we still go there because its good food and we like the food, even though we know its expensive. So yeah we are aware that they’re expensive but it doesn’t stop us.

Participant 5: I mean their advertising is for the people – it’s about us. So they could also be about the people’s economic status too in terms of their pricing because South Africa is in a very tough space at the moment and not everybody can afford the luxury of going to Nando’s. Yes we love their ads, great. But can we afford it? I mean

Participant 6: Yeah you’re right but I also don’t want to not count their advertising because I think it all works together. Like if the advertising is good but when you go to the store and it’s a bad product then you’re not going to buy it, so it all works together to make it better. Like participant 4 was saying – we can always go somewhere else. I mean cool; we can say that it’s expensive but no one is forcing us to buy it and we can always go somewhere else.
I might love the ad but I might not be able to afford to eat there.

| Participant 1 | I agree with that. Like for me if they could string all their ads together in a movie; then I would probably go watch that in cinema. But saying that their ads convince me to buy their food is a bit of a stretch. Yes there’s entertainment value to their adverts, but it doesn’t make me consider them. Like if I had the option between two things and I saw a Nando’s ad before I made the purchase, I wouldn’t automatically gravitate to Nando’s. I’d still go for either what I’m used to or what I want. So for me the Nando’s ad doesn’t drive purchase and it doesn’t make me want to buy them. | 21:58 – 22:33 |
| Moderator | But do their ads make you like the brand? | 22:34 – 22:35 |
| Participant 1 | Yes, I like the brand. | 22:35 – 22:36 |
| Moderator | Okay so does everyone agree on that? The ad might not make you want to purchase their products, but it makes you feel more positive about the brand? Is that what their adverts do? | 22:37 – 22:49 |
| Participant 1 | *Nods head yes* | 22:49 |
| Participant 2 | Mmm (in agreement) | 22:50 |
| Participant 3 | *Nods head yes* | 22:50 |
| Participant 6 | Also speaking about that; I’m trying to figure out what they were actually advertising in the ad that you showed us and I can’t remember. | 22:50 – 22:55 |
| Participant 5 | You’re right. | 22:56 – 22:57 |
| Participant 4 | Me too. | 22:57 – 22:58 |
| Participant 6 | See like it’s a cool ad and I could probably tell you word for word what happens in all the scenes, but now I’m wondering if it was for a burger or a chicken… I actually don’t know. What meal was it? | 22:59 – 23:07 |
| Participant 4 | But then if we’re talking about all their advertising and not just TV – I remember seeing a billboard that said “a meal for all you people” or something like that and I remembered where I saw the commercial. So it linked it to that and after seeing it I thought to myself: hmm actually maybe I’ll have Nando’s tonight and it was like a trigger. | Positive Memories | 23:09 – 23:39 |
| Moderator | Alright everyone so that’s the first part of our focus group done. I am now going to hand these pieces of paper out to you. You will see that there are five word packs that should’ve been cut out but I was too lazy, so instead you will just be using a pen to mark the words. I’ll explain to you as we go but as you can see on the papers there is word pack one, two, three, four and five. Okay so may everyone please refer to word pack one. We are now going to play a word game where each question will require you to select a word or words that you find most appropriate to the question asked. Each question is a bit of a follow-on from the previous one and we will stop after each question to discuss your answers. So in word pack one from those five types of humour: witty-wordplay, sarcasm, satire, slapstick and dark-offensive – please will you tick next to the one that you find best describes the type of humour that you saw in the “You People” commercial. *Pause while participants complete* Okay is everyone done? Cool… Let’s start with participant 1. What did you say it was? | 23:41 – 26:00 |
| Participant 1 | I said satire because of the language they used and the scenes. Like when the old coloured lady is shouting out the window for the kids to keep quiet – that’s just a standard and happens all the time. So everything and every | Satire | 26:02 – 26:28 |
scene is played up and it wasn’t just one element for me.

Participant 2  | I also said satire. Mainly also because of the scene in the store that I described earlier when the black person is asked if they work there. Like I’ve been on both sides of that situation. | Satire | 26:29 – 26:45

Participant 3  | I chose witty-wordplay just because how they constructed all the different scenes and used all the slang sayings. That’s what took out the dark-offensive part. | 26:46 – 27:03

Participant 4  | I said satire but I’m not sure if that’s just because of my association with Nando’s or specifically this ad. This ad has a little bit of satire but I don’t know if I would say it’s all satire because it’s not political but there is an underlying element of satire. | Satire | 27:05 – 27:26

Participant 5  | I said witty-wordplay because I find it complete clever wit throughout with the way that they use all the different slangs in it like participant 3 said. | 27:27 – 27:37

Participant 6  | I have satire as well for the same reason that participant 4 said and I don’t know I might also be relating it to the brand. | Satire | 27:38 – 27:49

Moderator  | Cool. Please can we now refer to word pack two. Out of those ten words or descriptors, which three do you most associate with the Nando’s brand. In order; please mark one, two, three next to the words on your pieces of paper. *Pause while participants complete* I'll give you guys a few more seconds… Okay let’s start with participant 6 | 27:50 – 29:44

Participant 6  | Okay umm… I’m going to say first funny mainly because that’s how their advertising always is and how they present themselves as a brand. **Expensive** because it’s not cheap and when I think of fast-food I line them all up like: Nando’s, KFC, Chicken Licken, etc – Nando’s is always number one. If it’s a nice month then I’ll have Nando’s, but like if I’m struggling then I’m definitely not having Nando’s so that’s | Expensive, Price Perceptions & Quality Perceptions | 29:45 – 30:59
### Participant 5
For number one I chose **expensive** because we all know Nando’s is really expensive. **Funny** for number 2 and **quality** for number 3. **Funny** because we’ve all seen their ads and we know they’re about that; and **quality** because we know that even though they are expensive – Nando’s always produces quality food.

1) **Expensive**
2) **Funny**
3) **Quality**

### Participant 4
The first one is **clever** and I think that they’re clever even with little things. Like yesterday I had Nando’s and on the packet it said “let’s take this outside.” I mean that’s like a small thing but I just appreciate that. **Expensive** & Quality Perceptions

For number two I wasn’t sure whether to put **expensive** or **quality** because I kind of think that the two are aligned so I just ended up putting both for number 2. Then for number 3 I put **funny**.

1) **Clever**
2) **Expensive & Quality**
3) **Funny**

### Participant 3
Me as well – **clever** number 1 because I really think that they come up with really clever ideas for their brand. **Influential** I think and **expensive**.

1) **Clever**
2) **Influential**
3) **Expensive**
| Participant 2 | Umm so I've got **quality** number 1 mainly because the last Nando's that I had like two weeks ago literally tasted as good as the first Nando's that I had in my life in Rosettenville at their head office store. I think I've probably only had one Nando's experience ever that didn't live up to my expectations and that's why quality is number 1. Number 2 – **clever**, pretty much because of the same reason that participant 4 mentioned. Yah like those little notes on their packaging are pretty cool and as someone from the south I appreciate the one that she received yesterday with “let's take it outside.” Then **funny** because I genuinely can't think of a Nando's advert that wasn’t funny. 1) Quality 2) Clever 3) Funny | Quality Perceptions | 32:08 – 33:00 |
|Participant 1 | I think for me; number 1 – **expensive** because it’s just always the first thing that comes to mind when I think of Nando's. 2 – definitely **funny** and I think that they manage to keep their finger on the pulse and they play up what's humorous when it happens verses trying to be funny. It's like they're just naturally funny. I think 3 – **influential** like if you look at the billboard on William Nicol with the “my milkshake is better than yours” it's just… just the way they do it like everybody just speaks about Nando's. I mean even if they had a clothing line everyone would have an item of Nando's clothing with some saying on it or some sort. Umm yah. 1) Expensive 2) Funny 3) Influential | Expensive | 33:02 – 33:42 |
|Moderator | Cool… Okay we’re still on word pack two. From the leftover words that you haven’t used in the last question – select the three words that you least associate with Nando’s. So make those 10, 9, 8… So 10 is obviously the least associated. I'm just going to the toilet | | 33:43 – 34:11 |
quickly while you guys do this…
Thanks, take your time.

*Moderator exits room*

Okay so is everyone done? Okay
Participant 6 – what are the least associated words?

| Participant 1 | Using the leftover words in word pack 2 select the three words that you least associated… Okay. | 34:13 |
| Participant 2 | Cheap… ahaha. | Price Perceptions 34:22 |
| Participant 6 | Mmhhmm hmm… hahaha. | 34:24 |
| Participant 2 | Bro, it tastes like water and sugar plus added sugar. (unrelated conversation about the complimentary beverages provided by the Moderator). | 35:00 |
| Participant 6 | That’s it… I always have it as like a starter. | 35:03 |
| Participant 2 | Ooh with an extra splash of sugar! | 35:05 |
| Participant 6 | No! Haha. | 35:06 |
| Participant 1 | There’s like no hint of alcohol to any degree. | 35:09 |
| Participant 6 | Nothing! Nothing at all… | 35:11 |
| Participant 2 | Oh yea this thing – it will like get you buzzing. Like I think the first time my hun made me have them, I maybe had like six in about an hour bra. | 35:13 |
| Moderator | Right, so is everyone done? | 35:29 |
| Participant 6 | I’m not having like six… that’d be like nah. (end of unrelated conversation about the complimentary beverages provided by the Moderator). | 35:31 – 35:34 |
| Moderator | Kay… Participant 6. What are the least associated words? | 35:35 – 35:40 |
| Participant 6 | Why are you starting with me? I’m joking, haha. So, ahaha! Umm 10 – cheap, that’s like yah. 9 – boring and then yes offensive is 8 mainly because I feel like the other ones won’t be right, because I don’t not find them clever or trustworthy or whatever but offensive is just the closest one.  
1) Cheap  
2) Boring  
3) Offensive | Price Perceptions 35:41 – 36:07 |
| Moderator | Cool umm… Just touching on it, would you say that the fact that you least associate cheap with then; would you say that this isn’t a bad thing because cheap has some negative connotations? So would you say that it might not be a good thing, but it’s also not a bad thing? | 36:08 – 36:25 |
| Participant 6 | Yah, it’s not a good or a bad thing, they just aren’t. | Price Perceptions 36:26 – 36:29 |
| Moderator | They’re just not cheap. Cool, participant 5? | 36:29 – 36:30 |
| Participant 5 | Aah 10 – cheap, 9 – sincere and 8 – boring.  
1) Cheap  
2) Sincere  
3) Boring | Expensive 36:31 – 36:36 |
<p>| Moderator | Sincere? Why would you say that? | 36:36 – 36:37 |
| Participant 5 | They’re not sincere… | 36:37 – 36:38 |
| Moderator | So you wouldn’t say that… | 36:39 – 36:40 |
| Participant 5 | Yeah if you look at them they’re not sincere. | 36:41 – 36:42 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant 1</th>
<th>They go for the jugular every time!</th>
<th>36:42 – 36:43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Yah, like they come to fetch you and they come to drag you regardless of who you are.</td>
<td>36:43 – 36:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Whether or not you’re offended – they don’t care.</td>
<td>36:49 – 36:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Yes exactly.</td>
<td>36:50 – 36:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Okay Participant 4?</td>
<td>36:51 – 36:52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participant 4 | I said cheap, boring and sincere as well because I thought that offensive would be in the middle at like 5. Because like we’re not offended but maybe someone would be by one of the things. I don’t know… So yah. Then trustworthy and sincere I was also like which one? But yah, I just went with sincere.  
1) Cheap  
2) Boring  
3) Sincere | 36:53 – 37:19 |
| Moderator    | Cool, Participant 3? | 37:20 – 37:21 |
| Participant 3 | Yeah I did the same: cheap, boring and then I chose trustworthy. Only because I’ve had a bit of bad experiences, like more than once where I’ve ordered a half chicken and it was like half of a half chicken or the roll was like you know, ten days old or whatever.  
1) Cheap  
2) Boring  
3) Trustworthy | Price Perceptions 37:22 – 37:44 |
| Participant 1 | It was like the chicken’s little sister that you got. Haha! | 37:45 – 37:47 |
| Participant 3 | Like if I’m already paying that much then it must be the full portion. | 37:48 – 37:50 |
| Participant 4 | There was a time where the portions were just smaller and I noticed it. I was like hey this wrap is like that big and it used to be like this big. So like… | 37:51 – 38:01 |
| Participant 6 | Haha like what is going on now? | 38:01 – 38:02 |
| Moderator | Aah Participant 2? | 38:02 – 38:03 |
| Participant 2 | Umm so I said **cheap** – 10, offensive – 9 and boring – 8. Umm reason being, cheap well yah... self-explanatory. For offensive... I've seen on social-media that actually a lot of people get offended by Nando's ads, like in my age group. Umm, and I always be like what the *explicit* is wrong with you? Like where is your sense of humour? And that's actually I sometimes say in the comments. Like I'm very famous for being blocked haha! I always say dumb *explicit* on social media. Umm yah, and then boring, ahh yah, I just don't see them as this boring. 
1) Cheap 
2) Offensive 
3) Boring | Price Perceptions | 38:04 – 38:43 |
| Moderator | So they're still entertaining... Alright. Participant 1? | 38:43 – 38:45 |
| Participant 1 | Aah same here... 10 – **cheap**, 9 they're definitely not boring and I think 8 I mean offensive is subjective so I don't think that they intend to be offensive and it's obviously dependant on the recipient. So yah personally; they're not offensive. 
1) Cheap 
2) Boring 
3) Offensive | Price Perceptions | 38:46 – 39:04 |
<p>| Moderator | Cool... Okay, we're almost done guys. Almost done! Umm... Can we refer to word pack three please. Umm so these are five types of like personality traits or personalities. Umm so I want you to select one that you feel if Nando's was a person, how would you describe their personality? From those five. | 39:05 – 39:31 |
| Participant 6 | You need to explain obnoxious to this hun from Soweto. | 39:32 – 39:35 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Obnoxious? Okay let me explain it to you people, haha… So obnoxious is like offensive I guess, but it's like you almost don't care what you say. Like I know it's going to offend someone but I'm going to say it anyway.</th>
<th>39:36 – 39:56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Oh okay.</td>
<td>39:56 – 39:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Do we put a one or a just a tick next to it?</td>
<td>39:58 – 40:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Aah… Just a tick is okay because there is only one that you must choose. <em>Pause while participants complete</em> Okay let’s start with you Participant 1.</td>
<td>40:01 – 40:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Aah I don’t know. I ticked them as charismatic. I think that for me they’ve elevated beyond just humour. I think that they’ve become a person and I can actually picture Nando’s as a person. They take on different personalities and they gel with their surroundings and they are adaptable. So yah, charismatic for me.</td>
<td>40:21 – 40:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>I picked humorous umm as like participant 1 just previously mentioned, it doesn’t look like their intention is to offend people, but they rather just play on everything that is going on around them and find a funny twist to it. They’re like the class clown.</td>
<td>40:42 – 41:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Cool… next?</td>
<td>41:03 – 41:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Aah, I think that Nando’s is quite adventurous in terms of like their ads and the way they the go about things. I mean like they’re even outside of South Africa, so yah…</td>
<td>41:05 – 41:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Participant 4?</td>
<td>41:19 – 41:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>I ticked <em>obnoxious</em> because I actually read through the sample questions last night and I was like: I’m going to pick that. Haha! But I don’t know, I’m also not sure. Maybe <em>charismatic</em> would suit them more and I feel like they would be both. They would be charismatic obnoxious basically.</td>
<td>41:21 – 41:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Haha okay! Participant 5?</td>
<td>41:49 – 41:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>I think <em>humorous</em>. I just think because South Africa is always so serious about everything, every now and then Nando’s comes to shake us up a bit and remind us that listen; we’re all human and we’re all here for a specific reason so laugh about it… Have some fun. Yah.</td>
<td>41:52 – 42:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>I picked <em>charismatic</em> aah… Yah I picked charismatic because it’s kind of like that person that you’re always drawn to somehow and like they have all the right things to say as well. Humorous was going to be very obvious, but I guess to participant 1’s point as well. Like obviously they’re very humorous. Like yah, it’s kind of like they’ve moved past it now and now they’re just kind of like the friend that you always want to have around because you know that they will bring the kiki-kees (laughs). It’s that friend that you bring to the braai and everybody’s hyped now… Yah.</td>
<td>42:10 – 42:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Haha! That explanation was for you people!</td>
<td>42:45 – 42:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Hahaha! Yah you people!</td>
<td>42:50 – 42:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Haha! Okay so can we now go to word pack four, our second last word pack. So from the five types of people, I know some of you have already mentioned a few people like the class clown or a friend, but from those five types of</td>
<td>42:55 – 43:43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
people that I’ve given, which one do you feel best describes the Nando’s brand but in terms of your relationship with the brand. So basically who is Nando’s to you? Or complete the sentence: Nando’s is a ____ to me.

*Pause while participants complete*

Cool… Aah, Participant 6?

**Participant 6**

Ahh I’m going to say **grandparent**. Haha I know it’s random but like now that I think about it… I’m like okay, I don’t see my grandparents often but every time that I go it’s always such a nice time there and they feed me or make sure that I’m well taken care of and I leave feeling great; but like I’ll probably only see them like once every month or once every two months.

43:44 – 44:08

**Moderator**

Cool… Participant 5?

**Participant 5**

I said **friend** because your friends talk *explicit* every now and then, but you still love them and you’re not going anywhere because you love them for who they are and that’s it.

44:11 – 44:22

**Moderator**

Cool. Participant 4?

**Participant 4**

Umm… I said **friend** because like they’re there for me when I’m hungry or when I feel like chicken and I want to be healthy because don’t want to have fried chicken like KFC vibes you know?

**Friend** & **Quality Perceptions**

44:25 – 44:35

**Moderator**

100%, 100%... Yes.

44:35 – 44:36

**Participant 3**

I chose **child** just because a child misbehaves the most out of all the options. So yah, in terms Nando’s I’d say that they’re like on that misbehaving edge but in a good way.

44:37 – 44:53

**Moderator**

Cool… Participant 2?

**Participant 2**

So I also chose **child** reason being that when I picture Nando’s as a human being, I see them as like a young kid,
like a toddler or like five years old, somewhere around there. Because like naughty little kids are like crackheads, haha... Like I even always call my little niece a crackhead and her father always gets upset but whatever... But like with little kids they always do the dumbest *explicit* ever, but it's also always the funniest *explicit* ever, so yeah... And also like children live rent-free and Nando's legit lives rent-free in my mind... Umm but not in my pocket.

**Moderator**  
Mmm okay... Yah... Participant 1?

**Participant 1**  
Aah... I chose friend, I mean they're like one of those crazy friends that you kind of only open the circle to when need be. They're not like a friend of a friend of a friend. They're like that one friend that when you need that person to come through then they come through. They're like only your friend and not a bigger circle friend type of thing, but that crazy friend that you love regardless... Yah like you first have to check the environment and then invite them. Haha like you check first: is it safe?

**Friend**  

**Moderator**  
Okay so we're on the last word pack, word pack number five and these are the last questions... So of those five fast-food brands in word pack five, please arrange them according to your personal preference; so obviously with number one being your favourite and number five being your least favourite. This is based on your personal preference, considering all factors and taking everything into account. So write number one to five with one being your most favourite and five your least favourite.

*Pause while participants complete*

Okay let's start with you participant 1.
| Participant 1 | Aah number one: McDonald’s – for some reason I’ve just always had consistency with them. Consistency in pricing and when I buy a Big Mac I know what I’m getting. It’s just always consistent and I appreciate consistency in life.  
1) Chicken Licken – because they actually do real chicken.  
2) Steers – flame grilled; not everybody does it like them. If you were doing a blind tasting you would know a Steers burger or their chips from anything.  
3) Nando’s  
4) KFC – I’m not sure what they produce but it’s definitely not real chicken. | Quality Perceptions | 47:25 – 47:40 |
| Participant 2 | It’s not real food. | | 47:40 – 47:41 |
| Participant 1 | That’s also true. It’s just… I just appreciate consistency in life. Umm number 2 Chicken. Umm… Because they actually do real chicken | | 47:41 – 47:48 |
| Participant 2 | 1) Chicken Licken – nothing can compete with their hot wings and sliders.  
2) Nando’s – pretty much based on what I’ve said about them already.  
3) Steers – for me I only put Steers below Nando’s because they’ve gotten extremely expensive. Like a King Steer burger is over R100 now only for the burger, it’s like R120 with the chips.  
4) KFC – KFC was actually going to be number five if they hadn’t released that new hot and crispy skin option, it tastes like Popeyes but better.  
5) McDonald’s – McDonald’s is last which I feel really bad about because I always ate McDonald’s after a party when they were the only place open. So I feel kind of bad because they were always faithful. | Quality Perceptions | 47:48 – 48:18 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant 3</th>
<th>Quality Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Chicken Licken</td>
<td>48:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Nando’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Steers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) KFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) McDonald’s</td>
<td>48:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And that order is based purely on their quality of food, not their logos or their brand or anything else.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant 4</th>
<th>Quality Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Nando’s</td>
<td>48:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Steers – I really love Steers but I have Nando’s more often so that’s why they’re number one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Chicken Licken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) McDonald’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) KFC</td>
<td>48:52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant 5</th>
<th>Quality Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Nando’s</td>
<td>48:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Chicken Licken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) McDonald’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Steers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) KFC</td>
<td>49:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I can’t really explain why I chose this order but I really just hate KFC so that’s why they’re last.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant 6</th>
<th>Quality Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) KFC – mainly because I thought about the last month or two and what I’ve had most often and I feel like KFC saved - 87 -hemselves’s with the box meals which are like R50 and you get a whole lot of stuff in it. I also feel like if I’m going to pay around R100 for food then I’ll rather go to a sit down restaurant.</td>
<td>49:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) McDonald’s – this is because they’re open late night. KFC and McDonald’s are the only two that are open 24 hours and this is important for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Chicken Licken – definitely because of their great wings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Nando’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Steers – this is because I actually can’t remember when last I had Steers. I only go there for their ice-cream and that’s it.</td>
<td>50:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alright just one last question, still on word pack five. Now if you had to only consider their advertising; how would you rank these brands? Just write “A”</td>
<td>50:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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or “Ad” at the top and then number them accordingly below that. Remember to base your order on their advertising only. We’re running out of time so you can just give me your orders only and we won’t discuss your decisions any further afterwards.

| Participant 6 | 1) Nando’s | 2) Chicken Licken | 3) KFC | 4) Steers | 5) McDonald’s | 54:00 |
| | 54:11 |
| Participant 1 | 1) Nando’s | 2) Chicken Licken | 3) KFC | 4) McDonald’s | 5) Steers | 54:11 |
| | 54:22 |
| Participant 2 | 1) Nando’s | 2) Chicken Licken | 3) Steers | 4) KFC | 5) McDonald’s | 54:24 |
| | 54:38 |
| Participant 3 | 1) Chicken Licken | 2) Nando’s | 3) Steers | 4) KFC | 5) McDonald’s | 54:39 |
| | 54:51 |
| Participant 4 | 1) Chicken Licken | 2) Nando’s | 3) KFC | 4) Steers | 5) McDonald’s | 54:51 |
| | 55:00 |
| Participant 5 | 1) Nando’s | 2) Chicken Licken | 3) Steers | 4) McDonald’s | 5) KFC | 55:01 |
| | 55:09 |
| Moderator | Alright everyone, I just want to thank you all, you’ve really been excellent. I must assure you again that everything will remain confidential. Thank you very much for your help and that brings us to the end of the focus group. | 55:10 |
| | 55:30 |
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