

## Divergence and Relevance in Advertising Creativity: Theory Testing in the Nigerian Context

Olarotimi, Busayo Anthony

Department of Mass Communication, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba, Nigeria

### Abstract

There has been a long-existing argument among advertising scholars about what is advertising creativity and the factors that determine creativity in advertising. While certain scholars have argued that there cannot be a definite definition for the concept because of its dependent on many factors, others have stood upon certain theoretical bases to prove that there are determining factors for developing creative advertisements. This paper examines the most discussed theory of creativity, that is, theory of divergence and relevance. The theory proposes that creative advertisements are those that are both divergent and relevant. Advertisements that are divergent have the following: originality, flexibility, synthesis, elaboration, artistic value and humour. Advertisement's relevance to the consumers, brand's relevance to the consumer and the advert/brand's relevant to the culture of the consumer are other propositions of the theory. This research employs content analysis to examine selected Nigerian advertisements which had won awards of creativity. The nine variables of divergence (6) and relevance (3) listed above were used as the content categories while the selected TVs were the unit of analysis. The contents of each TVC were quantitatively analyzed based on the perception of selected Nigerian consumers. The result revealed that no single advertisement contained all the creativity factors. Only four out of the nine factors of creativity had frequent occurrences in the commercials. Out of the four, humour is the most applied technique that made the advertisements creative to the audience. It was proposed that practitioners could exploit the use of humour in creating award-winning commercials.

**Keywords:** Advertising creativity, measuring scale, Divergence, Relevance, theory testing

### Background

Advertising is an art and profession that appeals to the mind and sensation of a targeted audience with the intension of persuading such to buy into a product, service or idea. Due to its persuasive nature, it employs creativity in order to catch the attention of the audience. The relationship between advertising and creativity has become a major tool which considerably determines advertising success and acceptability among practitioners, clients and the audience (Smith, Chen, Yang, 2009). A lot of authors and researchers have been defining, operationalising and conceptualizing advertising creativity, considering its root in psychology and its application in communication, especially advertising. Various models and theoretical proposition have been developed in defense of the importance of creativity in advertising.

The crux of the discourse among the involved scholars is how to determine the measuring standards and determining factors for assessing advertising creativity by stating the factors that determine it as well as what should be present in creative advertisements. Various models and scales have been developed for describing advertising creativity (Smith and Yang, 2004; Earle, 2007). On the other hand, there has been a significant extension in the engagements on advertising creativity. Critics, practitioners, researchers, scholars and other stakeholders have argued that beyond defining the meaning and formative factors/qualities of creativity in advertising, it is more important to measure the effectiveness on product performance, clients' satisfaction, consumers' perception and persuasion (McStay 2010, Haberland and Dacin, 1992; El-Murad and West, 2004; Adisa, 2014; Daechun, 2013). This paper takes a stand with the former believing that without coming up with a popular framework and foundations for determining advertising creativity, it would be unrealistic to have a scale for measuring causalities, effects and other measurable. This hence calls for a review of various models, scales and theories that have been around the entire discourse.

This research work was conducted to utilize the existing measuring tools of creativity in the context of Nigerian advertising industry. This is to determine the extent to which Nigerian advertising practitioners and scholars pay attention to theoretical concepts of advertising creativity in concept development. The significance of this study to theory testing and actual practice cannot be overemphasized. The methodology employed here may turn out to be a template for subsequent measurements useful for both future scholars and advertising practitioners, especially in pre-testing the creativity and relevance of their ideas before expending huge funds on campaigns that usually failed because of novel ideas that do not resonate with the target consumers. Two major research questions were raised in approaching the study and they were as follows: what creative strategies were employed in the selected award-winning advertisements? To what extent were the creativity factors found in the selected Nigerian advertisements?

## Theory of Divergence and Relevance

### *Origin of the Theory*

It all began with the American Psychologist, J. P. Guilford's landmark address to the American Psychological Association (AMA) in 1950 when he, as president of the association, exhorted "...researchers to seriously dig into creativity as a cognitive and social process as well as a personality trait..." (Amabile and Pillemer, 2011, p.3). Guilford made a case for the pivotal role Psychology would play in personal and general creativity. He argued that room should be given to divergence of thinking from the conventional one. He was the first to do justice to the call he made. He proved that a relationship exists between creativity and intelligence: he condemned the omission of divergence thinking in standard IQ test. Divergent thinking was the approach in which problems are solved through unconventional approaches and that was usual with the everyday problem solving. He however lamented about how the educational system limited students to conventional thinking and finding answers to problems in the same way. He recommended divergent thinking for resolving issues (Guilford, 1968, p.8).

Guilford arrived at the point that creative thinking occurs when divergent thoughts are produced (Guilford, 1956). In other words, divergent thinking is to think outside the usual manner and finding solutions to tasks outside the convention: this is the same as what is now referred to as thinking out of the box (Robinson, 2009). This was followed by an exploration of the human cognitive process and how it leads to creativity; a look at creativity along the individual lifespan; characteristics of creativity and the most conducive environment for creativity to flourish (Simonton, 1999). Several scholars joined this school of thought even though they might be saying the same thing using different terms. Other Psychologists and Sociologists began to expand on these thoughts about human thinking and creativity. Arens (2002, p.380) says German sociologist, Max Weber did postulate that human beings think in two ways i.e. "Objective and Qualitative" ways: the former is the "rational, fact-based manner" of thinking while the later is the "intuitive value-based manner". Arens (2002) also says that "by the 1970s Roger von O'ech had come up to describe the dichotomy of thinking as "hard thinking ... and soft thinking" where the former refers to "logic, reason, precision, consistency, work, reality, analysis and specificity" and the latter refers to less tangible concepts like metaphor, dream, , ambiguity, play fantasy, hunch" (pp. 380). Discourse has been along these two major lines though various terms have been used to describe them.

The pattern of thinking which Guildford (1950; 1956; 1957) described as "*divergence*" is the same thing Max Weber described as "*intuitive*" and "*value-based*"; and it is what Roger von Oech also described as "*soft thinking*" (Arens, 2002, p.380). This kind of thinking is not guided by rules of meaning; it does not have to be logical, precise or consistent; it is neither rational nor fact-based: rather it allows flexibility and softness of thought; it contains metaphors, inductiveness, humour ambiguity and fantasy. This way of thinking is directly opposite the conventional thinking – which is objective, rational, factual and guided.

Abraham Maslow was a Psychologist who discussed human creativity. He identified two stages of creativity namely *primary* and *secondary* creativeness (Smith and Yang, 2004). Maslow's classifications are equivalent to Guilford's *divergent* thinking and *relevance*. *Primary creativeness* comes out of the unconscious and is the source of new discovery. This is what Maslow called real novelty, and is equivalent to the divergence component of creativity. *Secondary creativeness* is based on logic, common sense and reasoning and is built upon previous knowledge (Smith and Yang, 2004).

### *Proposition of the Theory*

Hailing from the above background, the theory of divergence and relevance is summed up to have the following propositions: creativity is the solution that comes from a thinking source that is *divergent* from the usual. *Divergence* is a solution that is different, unique, unusual and novel. *Relevance* means that the same unusual thinking should be meaningful, useful and acceptable: of course it must be offering solution to the problem. This *relevance* clause to the conceptualization also includes the acceptability of the *novel/divergent* idea by the culture of the people concerned. This is the theory that basically defines creativity, as the production of an idea that is novel and appropriate to an open-ended task. That is why it has formed the basis of this discourse on creativity. Although the response must be new, it cannot be merely different. Thus, the response must also be appropriate to the task to be completed or the problem to be solved; that is, it must be valuable, correct, feasible, or somehow fitting to a particular goal.

Therefore the major proposition of this theory says creativity is when a solution comes to a problem through a combination of *divergent thinking* and *relevance* (i.e. *divergence* being a solution that is different, strange, unique, unusual and novel while *relevance* means that the same unusual thinking should be meaningful, useful and acceptable). Applied to communication by advertising scholars, creative advertising is unusual and novel (divergent) yet it is reasonable and acceptable to the audience and others concerned (relevant).

It has dominated the discussion on advertising creativity. It has been the uniting theory driving scholars to define advertising creativity. Creativity is the production of a novel and appropriate response, product, or solution to an open-ended task. Although the response must be new and different, it should not just be merely

that. Thus, the response must also be appropriate to the task to be completed or the problem to be solved; that is, it must be valuable, correct, feasible, or somehow fitting to a particular goal.

#### *How the Theory of Divergence and Relevance Drives Creativity*

This theory is relevant to this research in the sense that it has been the generally proven theory for defining advertising creativity (Daechun, 2013). The theory has been used by several scholars to develop scales (Smith and Yang, 2004; Smith et al, 2007) which they have used to examine the creativity of commercials. Likewise for this work, the theory of *divergence* and *relevance* was applied to explain the typologies and categories which will be used to measure the selected advertisements. Since this work is basically defining and describing creative commercials, the models and typologies drawn from the theory will be used to test the selected commercials. Smith (2007) typology is adapted for the analysis. It is divided into divergence and relevance with each one having sub-factors for determining what makes advertisements creative.

The theory is being tested by asking if what is divergent to a section of the country is also divergent to people from the other parts of the country. Also, this theory is to find out how the Nigerian creative commercials contain the features of *divergent* thinking and *relevance*? Answer to this question is to analyze the content of selected commercials looking for the creativity variables.

#### *Creativity in Advertising – Use of Divergence and Relevance Advertising*

The simplest and foremost definition of advertising is by Albert D. Lasker who described advertising as “salesmanship in print, driven by a reason why” (Richards and Curran, 2002,p.63). That definition was when advertising was limited only to printing long before electronic media and internet came into play. In order to understand the relationship between creativity and advertising, there is need to take a look at the definition of advertising and its role in marketing. Advertising is only one out of many marketing communication tools. Advertising is derived from the Latin word “advertere” which means to draw attention. Bel-Molokwu (2005, p.1). However the following by Arens (2002) is very encompassing and functional:

Advertising is the structured and composed no-personal communication of information, usually paid for and usually persuasive in nature, about products (goods, services, and ideas) by identified sponsors through various media (pp. 7-8).

Even though advertising and other marketing communication tools comply with the oral process, the major difference is that advertising is structured as against the oral type which is a spontaneous word of mouth. Advertising is a composed commercial text. It is well structures and planned for. The messages are well intended. A lot of special effects or values are added to the messages to achieve specific goals.

Since creativity came into interaction with advertising/marketing, creativity has been approached from a variety of perspectives (Smith and Yang 2004). “Similar to definitions in Psychology, creativity in marketing is usually defined as having two characteristics: divergence and relevance (sometimes called effectiveness)”. And “because an ad has a specific goal, the level of creativity is to some extent based on its ability to achieve that goal [Smith and Yang 2004 citing (Duke and Sutherland, 2001; Finke, 1995; Kover, 1995; Kover et al., 1995; Reid et al., 1998; Tellis, 1998; Wells et al., 1995)] ...Therefore the “line of reasoning leads to the conclusion that creative ads are those that are perceived to be divergent *and* relevant ...” (p. 34).

As more advertising scholars began looking into how creativity is applicable in advertising and marketing, the discourse has been taken beyond just having a personal novel idea: it goes on into how the new idea is acceptable by other stakeholders especially those who are targeted with the commercial messages, as well as the advertisers who must have set productive goals the idea is capable of achieving (Smith and Yang, 2004). The goal-getting nature of advertising changed the nature of the hitherto-going discussion on creativity. How? It moved the definition of creativity from the initial idea of “newness” or “unusual” as authors began to argue that what is new must also be useful, applicable and acceptable being “... the production of ideas or outcomes that are both novel and appropriate to some goal” (Amabile, 2013,p.1) since advertising is a business that must be measurable. In addition, knowing whether or not an idea is both new and useful will not just be determined on a personal perception thus defining a new chart such that creativity is seen as a multi-sided subject. Newness or novelty itself needs to be re-defined because what is new to the creator may not be new to target audience.

#### *Factors and Contents that Determine Advertising Creativity*

As scholars have continued to write about advertising creativity, one major area that requires agreement is what and what should be contained in an advertisement to determine its level of creativity. Almost all scholars are saying the same thing in different ways. What is that same thing? They all agree that a creative ad must contain elements that are both divergent and relevant. Smith and Yang (2004) carried out a review of all earlier literatures that defined and listed the criteria for creativity. They came up with a tabular presentation of the result which shows that divergence and relevance are the two determinants of creativity. He says “reasoning leads to

the conclusion that creative ads are those that are perceived to be divergent *and* relevant” (p. 34).

Divergence and relevance factors have been a theoretical foundation while discussing creativity. Smith and Yang’s (2004) view is apparently the meeting point between theory and literature. The two broad factors that determine creativity (divergence and relevance) are further split into more specific factors. First of all, Smith and Yang (2004) presented a scale of divergence containing fourteen characteristics that define divergence with examples. The fourteen factors are: *fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, resistance to premature closure, perspective, synthesis, humor, fantasy, emotion, richness and colourfulness, empathic perspective, provocative questions, future orientation*. However Smith et al (2007) reviewed the divergence factor and scaled them into another one having just six divergence factors and three relevance factors which are: originality, flexibility, synthesis, elaboration, artistic value and humorous value. Others in the relevance scale are: ad-to-consumer relevance, brand-to-consumer relevance, ad/Brand-to-consumer socio-cultural relevance

**Methodology, Results and Findings**

The specific study population (sample size) used had to be determined and categorised using various sampling techniques. *Purposive sampling* technique was used to select the commercials. Only commercials that had been credited to be creative were purposively selected. Stratified sampling technique was employed to draw the TV commercials from different award categories Lagos Advertising and Ideas Festival (LAIF). The choice of LAIF as the creativity umpire was also through *purposive sampling* because LAIF is the leading and only surviving creativity award in Nigeria. Of the pool of award-winning advertisements within each stratum, a *simple random sampling* without replacement was used to pick seven commercials.

**Table 1.1. Medal Table of 2013 LAIF Award**

S/N	Client	Title of TVC	Category	Agency	Medal
1	MTN	True Service	Corporate Image	DDB	Bronze
2	LASAA	House Numbering	Corporate Image	Insight	Silver
3	LG	Anti-malaria AC	General hardware	LPP/JWT	Bronze
4	MTN	MTN Pulse “slash”	Promotions	DDB	Bronze
5	Etisalat	Free Credit Promo	Telecom	X3M Ideas	Bronze
6	Maltina	Call to Watch	Tourism & Entertainment	Lintas	Bronze
7	Techno Oil	Oil Lubricant	Automobile	DDB	Bronze

Each factor on the divergence scale was used to measure the seven (7) award-winning television commercials. A two-layer coding sheet was used for the content analysis.

**Categories and Unit of Analysis (for content analysis)**

*Set A – Layer of divergence*

The following were the categories lined up to test the novelty/divergence contents of the selected ads.

**Table 1.2. Categories and Unit of Analysis (Divergence)**

SN	Category	Operationalisation
1	Originality	That the ideas in the ads are rare, surprising, or move away from the obvious and commonplace.
2	Flexibility	The ad had different ideas and shifted from one type of subject matter to another.
3	Synthesis	The ad combined or connected normally unrelated objects or ideas.
4	Elaboration	The ad provided numerous details. The ad finished, extended, and detailed basic ideas so they become more intricate or sophisticated.
5	Artistic Value	The ad had striking visual and/or verbal elements.
6	Humorous Value	The contents that are funny and entertaining

*Set B – Layer of Relevance*

The following three categories are used to analyse the same ads looking for the contents of *relevance* in them.

**Table 1.3. Categories and Unit of Analysis**

SN	Categories	Operationalisation
1	Ad-to-consumer relevance	Relevance of the Ad to the audience
2	Brand-to-consumer relevance	Relevance of the Brand to the audience
3	Ad/Brand-to-consumer socio-cultural relevance	Relevance of the ad and the brand to audience’s socio-cultural worldview

After getting the medal list from the organizers of LAIF, videos of commercials in the television categories were searched for from the Youtube video websites and websites of the advertising agencies. Quantitative

method of data analysis was employed through frequency count, percentage value, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi-square.

Both research questions one and two were answered using the same data. While identifying the creative factors used in the selected advertisements, the same data were used to measure the extent of application of each of them in order to determine which ones were used than the others. How much does each of the identified factors that determine creativity play out in the selected commercials altogether? Which of the factors really contribute more and which ones do not? Which ones of these creativity factors are most responsible for creativity? This can only be measured scientifically. The researcher gathered the responses of real consumers who had been chosen to watch the selected commercials. Their responses were scientifically analysed to determine which of these factors contributed more to creativity and to what extent. It should be noted that the focus of this study is not to test the perception of the respondents or the influence of their cultural variations on perception. The concern here is to check for the utilization of the creative theories.

The responses to the questionnaire filled by the participants presented the needed scientific results. The participants were asked to rate the selected adverts against the six factors of divergence and three factors of relevance. This result must, firstly, show us whether or not these factors actually determine advertising creativity. Secondly, it must show how much each of these factors contribute to the creativity of selected ads as rated by the audience participants.

Sixty participants were involved in the experiment Each of the sixty participants had seven copies of the questionnaire which were completed one after the other after they watched each of the seven advertisements. At the end of each session, the participants had completed four hundred and twenty (420) copies of the instrument. The questionnaire contained nine main items. The items were firstly structured into divergence and relevance before further splitting divergence into originality, flexibility, synthesis, elaboration, artistic value and humorous value while relevance was split into advert-consumer relevance, brand-consumer relevance and ad/brand-cultural relevance.

The terms had been simplified to the audience with examples before the lab session started. Under originality for instance, participants were asked if the advert they had watched was: “out of the ordinary”, “away from habit-bound and stereotypical thinking” or “unique”. Based on their own perception, they were asked to tick “yes” or “no” in the provided box. Each sub-item was 1 point if rated “yes” and 0 point if rated “no”. The three sub-items must be attempted and rated “yes” or “no”. Hence, this gave the main item the potential to score three points if rated “yes” in the three places or less as the case may be. Under flexibility, the following sub-items: “the ad contained ideas that moved from one subject to another”, “the ad contained different ideas”, “the ad shifted from one idea to another” were rated while humorous value had “the ad is humorous”, “the ad is entertaining”, “the ad is interesting” as variables.

Therefore, whatever number of “yes” the participants ticked was valued based on the expected number of “yes” and the numbers of “no” were not reckoned with. Under relevance, the first to the third items had 4, 5 and 6 sub-items respectively. The total number of potential “yes” as expected from the items versus the actual number of “yes” ticked and the number of the participants were all used to arrive at the percentage contribution of the each item to creativity of the selected advertisements. See table 4.1.1 for distribution table of ‘yes’ for each advertisement against the nine factors of creativity.

**Table 1.4 Distribution Table for Rating the Commercials**

The frequency table showing the number of 'yes' each ad has against the creativity factors				MTN True Service	LASAA-House Num.	LG-Anti-Malaria AC	MDA-Call to Watch	Etisalat-Free Credit	Techno Oil Product	MTN-Pulse Slash
	ENY	NP	ETNY	FY 1	FY 2	FY 3	FY 4	FY 5	FY 6	FY 7
Originality	3	60	180	121	76	100	116	114	105	85
Flexibility	3	60	180	148	89	83	108	85	138	84
Synthesis	3	60	180	112	63	91	118	59	111	94
Elaboration	3	60	180	139	61	86	113	75	109	80
Artistic Value	3	60	180	156	89	117	121	130	138	106
Humorous Value	3	60	180	158	106	105	95	146	126	69
Ad-Consumer Relevance	4	60	240	182	124	153	153	138	148	111
Brand-Consumer Relevance	5	60	300	226	181	215	215	182	206	207
Ad/Consumer-Cultural Relevance	6	60	360	266	207	200	200	206	226	143

Key: ENY=expected number of 'yes'; NP=number of participants; ETNY=expected total number of 'yes'; FY1-FY7= frequency of 'yes' for the seven ads.

The table 1.5. shows in percentage, the responses of all the participants as they rated the ads against the items that determine creativity.

**Table 1.5.**

		MTN True Service	LASAA-House Num.	LG-Anti-Malaria AC	MDA-Call to Watch	Etisalat-Free Credit	Techno Oil Product	MTN-Pulse Slash
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Divergence	Originality	67.2	42.2	55.6	64.4	63.3	58.3	47.2
	Flexibility	82.2	49.4	46.1	60.0	47.2	76.7	46.7
	Synthesis	62.2	35.0	50.6	65.6	32.8	61.7	52.2
	Elaboration	77.2	33.9	47.8	62.8	41.7	60.6	44.4
	Artistic Value	86.7	49.4	65.0	67.2	72.2	76.7	58.9
	Humorous Value	87.8	58.9	58.3	52.8	81.1	70.0	38.3
Relevance	Ad-Consumer Relevance	75.8	51.7	63.8	63.8	57.5	61.7	46.3
	Brand-Consumer Relevance	75.3	60.3	71.7	71.7	60.7	68.7	69.0
	Ad/Consumer-Cultural Relevance	73.9	57.5	55.6	55.6	57.2	62.8	39.7

While table 4.1 shows the frequency of 'yes', table 4.2 shows the frequency percentage for the 'yes'. For instance, each of the ads is expected to have 180 'yes' under **originality**. MTN True Service has 121 'yes' (67.2%); LASAA has 76 'yes' (42.2%); LG Anti-malaria ad has 100 'yes' (55.6%); Call to Watch has 116 'yes' (64.4%); Etisalat Free Credit Promo has 114 'yes' (63.3%); Techno Oil has 105 'yes' (58.3%) and MTN Pulse slash has only 85 'yes' (47.2%). This result shows that LASAA House numbering is the least original advert followed by MTN Pulse Slash. According to the participants, MTN True Service has an idea that is more extraordinary and divergent, followed by Call to Watch and then by Etisalat Free Credit Promo. Other ones are on the average.

Under **flexibility**, MTN True Service is still the most rated ad and this time, flexibility (82.2%) has done more than originality. Techno Oil is next to True Service on the flexibility table with 138 'yes' (76.7%) and followed by Call to Watch with 108 'yes' (60.0%). These three commercials were agreeably very flexible flowing from one story to another while passing the message across. MTN True Service for instance contains almost everything about the lifestyles of the North and Creeks of Nigeria. Techno Oil ad flows from the outlook

of a marketplace and a busy street to the family life and the pressure of child birth and so on. LG anti-malaria AC is one commercial that this researcher had rated to be flexible but falling short of that with the respondents. It was scored 83 'yes' (46.1%) by the respondents while the researcher had believed it moved from one subject to another.

For **Synthesis**, the respondents believed that Call to Watch's many stories are more excellently well blended together with 118 'yes' (65.6%) than MTN True Service that has 112 'yes' (62.2%) followed by Techno Oil's 111 'yes' (61.7%). Other ads were very low in synthesis especially Etisalat Free Credit (32.8%) and LASAA (35.0%). On and on, all the variables of creativity have different degrees of contribution to the creativity of the commercials. A closer look at **humorous value** shows that MTN True Service also has the highest rating of 158 'yes' (87.8%) followed by Etisalat Free Credit Promo with 146 'yes' (81.1%) and Techno Oil (126 'yes', 70.0%). LASAA House numbering that appeared most humorous according to the researcher's analysis was rated having only 106 'yes' (58.9%) alongside LG anti-malaria's 105 'yes' (58.3%).

Beyond divergence however, a look at the relevance of the commercials to the consumers and cultures shows that MTN True Service had the highest 75.8% **ad to consumer relevance** with 182 out of 240 'yes'. It was followed by LG anti-malaria AC being at par with Call to Watch that both had 153 'yes' (63.8%). Brand to consumer relevance also showed the same result ordering thus: MTN True Service (226 'yes', 75.3%); LG anti-malaria AC and Maltina Call to watch (215 'yes', 71.7%). Relevance of the ad to culture revealed that MTN True Service has the highest relevance with 73.9% followed by Techno Oil (62.8%). MTN Pulse Slash is least in relevance to culture with 39.7%. Others are over 55%. Truly nothing appears Nigerian in MTN Pulse Slash not even the Kung Fu itself is local to Nigeria. Such ad would have relevant to the Chinese or Korean culture.

The researcher looked across the creativity variables: which one of them proved to be more contributive to creativity? A look at MTN True Service across all creativity factors shows that humorous value contributed 87.8%, artistic value (86.7%), flexibility (82.2%), elaboration (77.2%), ad to consumer relevance (75.8%), brand to consumer relevance (75.3%), relevance to culture (73.9), originality (67.2%) and synthesis (62.2%). Brand to consumer relevance contributed more to LASAA House Numbering with 60.3%. Humorous value is next with 58.3%. Others follow as cultural relevance (57.5), ad to consumer relevance (51.7). Other remaining factors of divergence from originality to artistic value are all very low (below 50%).

Because of the varying level of contribution made by the variables, there was the need to compare the variables scientifically. ANOVA was used to measure the significant differences in the contribution of the creativity factors under divergence and relevance in order to further answer the research question seeking to know which factors contributed more to advertising creativity. Table 4.4. is the ANOVA comparing adverts against the creativity factors. In table 4.4, any factor that is above  $> 0.05$  has no significant contribution to creativity in the selected commercials and so could not be followed up. In other words, only those that are below or equal to 0.05 ( $< 0.05$ ) have significant contribution to creativity.

**Table 1.6. ANOVA for comparing variables against adverts**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Divergence(Originality)	Between Groups	1217.401	6	202.900	1.289	0.288
	Within Groups	5511.182	35	157.462		
	Total	6728.583	41			
Divergence(Flexibility)	Between Groups	5591.484	6	931.914	7.929	0.000
	Within Groups	4113.684	35	117.534		
	Total	9705.168	41			
Divergence(Synthesis)	Between Groups	2763.508	6	460.585	3.457	0.009
	Within Groups	4663.034	35	133.230		
	Total	7426.542	41			
Divergence(Elaboration)	Between Groups	3617.935	6	602.989	3.075	0.016
	Within Groups	6863.284	35	196.094		
	Total	10481.219	41			
Divergence(Artistic values)	Between Groups	2774.859	6	462.477	1.904	0.108
	Within Groups	8500.243	35	242.864		
	Total	11275.102	41			
Divergence(Humorous values)	Between Groups	5727.401	6	954.567	3.266	0.012
	Within Groups	10230.485	35	292.300		
	Total	15957.886	41			
Relevance(ATCR)	Between Groups	1873.718	6	312.286	.847	0.543
	Within Groups	12902.323	35	368.638		
	Total	14776.041	41			
Relevance(BTCR)	Between Groups	413.661	6	68.944	.310	0.927
	Within Groups	7773.852	35	222.110		
	Total	8187.513	41			
Relevance(ABVCR)	Between Groups	1859.724	6	309.954	1.103	0.380
	Within Groups	9831.144	35	280.890		
	Total	11690.868	41			

In the ANOVA table 4.4, the creativity factors have the following mean of significance: originality (0.288), flexibility (0.000), synthesis (0.009), elaboration (0.016), artistic value (0.108), humorous value (0.012), advert-consumer relevance (0.543), brand-consumer relevance (0.927) and advert/brand-consumer relevance (0.380). The implication of the table of significance is that four out of the six factors of divergence were significant while no factor under relevance was significant. These results show that only flexibility, synthesis, elaboration, and humorous value were significant to advertising creativity in the present study. In other words they are the factors that determine advertising creativity and others were insignificant.

They also show that none of the factors under relevance made any significant contribution. This is contrary to the literature and theoretical principle that say a creative advert must both be divergent and relevant. Importance of relevance (called appeal or usefulness) in advertising has been emphasized by theory, literature and commentaries. It is therefore a contradiction here that this study has seen the very important variable as having no significance.

Furthermore, the four variables that have significant contributions to creativity needed to be compared more deeply. The question now is how creative are the commercials that lack the two out of six features of divergence and all the three factors under relevance? However, the answer to the current research question should tell the extent to which the four creativity factors found in the adverts were significant in comparison with one another. This question was answered by the follow-up to the ANOVA result. The means of the factors (items) that had significant contribution to creativity were closely looked at here to know the extent of their contribution to the creativity of selected ads. As seen earlier, only flexibility, synthesis, elaboration and humorous value have



significant contribution to creativity and they are the ones that could be followed up to this stage. Table 4.5 is the ANOVA mean showing the extent of their contributions.

**Table 1.7 Means for significant contribution of variables to creativity.**

FLEXIBILITY		SYNTHESIS.		ELABORATION.		HUM. VALUE.	
Adverts	Mean	Adverts	Mean	Adverts	Mean	Adverts	Mean
MTN True Serv.	68.19 <sup>a</sup>	MDA-Call to Watch	54.89 <sup>a</sup>	MTN True Serv.	64.45 <sup>a</sup>	MTN True Serv.	72.18 <sup>a</sup>
Techno Oil	66.44 <sup>a</sup>	MTN True Service	52.27 <sup>a</sup>	Techno Oil	53.07 <sup>ab</sup>	Etisalat-Free Credit	69.79 <sup>ab</sup>
MDA call to watch	57.34 <sup>ab</sup>	Techno Oil	52.23 <sup>a</sup>	MDA Call to Watch	52.70 <sup>ab</sup>	Techno Oil	60.08 <sup>abc</sup>
Etisalat-Free Credit	47.90 <sup>bc</sup>	MTN Pulse	46.28 <sup>ab</sup>	LG Anti-mal. AC	43.40 <sup>b</sup>	LASAA	50.34 <sup>bcd</sup>
MTN-Pulse Slash	41.77 <sup>c</sup>	LG Anti-m AC	45.33 <sup>ab</sup>	MTN-Pulse Slash	41.80 <sup>b</sup>	LG Anti-mal. AC	49.81 <sup>bcd</sup>
LG Anti-mal. AC	39.90 <sup>c</sup>	LASAA	35.80 <sup>b</sup>	Etisalat-Free Credit	39.71 <sup>b</sup>	MDA Call to Watch	46.51 <sup>cd</sup>
LASAA	39.10 <sup>c</sup>	Etisalat-Free Credit	31.84 <sup>b</sup>	LASAA	35.32 <sup>b</sup>	MTN-Pulse Slash	37.84 <sup>d</sup>

A comparative look at the mean of these four most significant variables showed which of them was most significant to creativity. Humorous value has the highest mean among the four. From table 4.4, Humorous value, in the last column, has a mean of 72.18<sup>a</sup> with MTN True Service, 69.79<sup>ab</sup> with Etisalat free Credit Promo, 60.08<sup>abc</sup> with Techno Oil, 50.34<sup>bcd</sup> with LASAA House Numbering, 49.81<sup>bcd</sup> with LG anti-malaria AC, 46.51<sup>cd</sup> with Call to Watch and 37.84<sup>d</sup> with MTN Pulse Slash. If one compares the four variables on table 4.4 along the horizontal line, humorous value has the highest mean. On the other hand, one could also take any of the commercials and compare the mean across the four variables of creativity, humour is also very high. For instance MTN True Service shows the following: humour (72.18<sup>a</sup>), flexibility (68.19<sup>a</sup>), elaboration (64.45<sup>b</sup>) and synthesis (52.27<sup>a</sup>). Etisalat Free Credit Promo has humour (69.79<sup>ab</sup>), elaboration, flexibility (47.90<sup>bc</sup>), (39.71<sup>b</sup>) and synthesis (31.84<sup>b</sup>). LASAA House numbering has humour (50.34<sup>bcd</sup>), flexibility (39.10<sup>c</sup>), synthesis (35.80<sup>b</sup>) and elaboration (35.32<sup>b</sup>). LG anti-malaria AC has humour (49.81<sup>bcd</sup>), synthesis (45.33<sup>ab</sup>), elaboration (43.40<sup>b</sup>) and flexibility (39.90<sup>c</sup>). Out of the seven ads, five of them have higher humorous value than other variables. Humour is very important therefore to advertising creativity. It is the most significant variable of advertising creativity.

## References

- Adisa, Lanre (2014). How Nigerian creative agencies can save West Africa in Cannes list. Noah's Ark Communications Website. Assessed on 26. 02. 14.
- Amabile, T. M. & Pillemer, J. (2011). Perspectives on the social psychology of creativity. *Journal of Creative Behavior*. Harvard: Boston
- Amabile, T.M. (2013) Componential theory of creativity. Working paper to appear In Eric H. Kessler, Ed. *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*. Harvard: Sage
- Arens, W. F. (2002). *Contemporary Advertising*. McGraw Hill/Irwin: New York.
- Bel-Molokwu, J. (2005). *Principles of Advertising*. Advertising Practitioners Council of Nigeria: Lagos
- Daechun, An (2013). Cultural influences on perceptions of advertising creativity: a cross-cultural comparison of U.S. and Korean advertising students. *International Journal of Marketing Studies* Vol. 5, No. 5, September 2013, pp. 75-87
- Earle, Lee. (2007). Considering a general theory of creativity in advertising: the case for a socio-cultural model. *Journal of Business and Public Affairs* Volume 1, Issue 2
- El-Murad, J. & West, D. C. (2004). The definition and measurement of creativity: what do we know? *Journal of Advertising Research* 44(2) pp. 188-201.
- Guilford, J.P. (1950). Creativity. *The American Psychologist* 14: 444-454. <http://www.apa.org/about/governance/president/address.aspx#1950>.
- Guilford, J.P. (1956) The structure of intellect, *Psychological Bulletin* 53: 267-93
- Guilford, J.P. (1968) *Intelligence, creativity, and their educational implications*.
- Haberland, G. S. & Dacin, P. A. (1992). The development of a measure to assess viewers' judgments of the creativity of an advertisement: a preliminary study, in John F. Sherry, Jr. and Brian Sternthal eds. *NA - Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 19, Provo, UT : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 817-

825.

- McStay, A. (2010). A qualitative approach to understanding audience's perceptions of creativity in online advertising. *The Qualitative Report* Volume 15 Number 1 January 2010 pp. 37-58
- Richards, J. I. & Curran, C. M. (2002) Oracles on advertising: searching for a definition. *Journal of Advertising*, Volume XXXI, Number 2 pp. 63-78
- Robinson, K. E. (2009) Thinking outside the box: thinking begets ideas that beget improvements. Speech delivered at the Department of Defense Public Health Conference in Hampton, Va.
- Simonton, D.K. (1999). Creativity as blind variation and selective retention: is the creative process darwinian? *Psychology of Enquiry* Vol. 10, No. 4. : Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.
- Smith, R. E. & Yang, X. (2004). Toward a general theory of creativity in advertising: examining the role of divergence. *Marketing Theory Articles*, Vol. 4(1/2) pp 31-58. Sage Publications: Indiana.
- Smith, R. E; MacKenzie, S. B; Yang, X.; Buchholz, L. M. & Darley, W. K. (2007). Modeling the determinants and effects of creativity in advertising. *Marketing Science*. Vol. 26, No. 6, November-December 2007, pp. 819-833
- Smith, R.E.; Chen, J; & Yang, X (2009). The impact of advertising creativity on the hierarchy of effects. *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 47-61