UCLouvain

LOUVAIN
School of Management

Louvain School of Management

Bad Buzz by association: understanding and managing the impact of influencer scandals on the brand equity, brand image and consumer trust of associated brands

Author(s): Marie Ann Devos
Supervisor(s): Thierry Jupsin
Academic year 2025-2026.
Dissertation for the master of management sciences
Master subject and focus strategy for connected brands
Daytime schedule

Contents

1 Appendix **1**

1.1 Qualitative Survey 2
1.2 Interview Transcript 1 23
1.3 Interview Transcript 2 31
1.4 Interview Transcript 3 35
1.5 Variables 44
1.6 SPSS Output 48

1 Appendix

1.1 *Qualitative Survey*

Qualitative Survey

Bad Buzz by association: understanding and managing the impact of influencer scandals on the brand equity, brand image and consumer trust of associated brands

Hello, my name is Marie Ann Devos, and I am currently completing my Master's thesis at Louvain School of Business. First of all, thank you very much for taking the time to answer my questions and participate in this interview.

As part of my research, I am studying the effects of influencer scandals on brands that are, or have been, associated with those influencers. More specifically, this interview aims to gather professional insights into how brands can understand, manage, and respond to these situations.
The interview should take approximately 45 minutes. With your permission, it will be recorded to ensure that I can accurately analyse your responses afterwards. The information collected will be used for the discussion and analysis section of my thesis.

Your participation is voluntary, and no information will be shared or quoted without your prior agreement. Since your professional perspective is important to this research, your contribution may not be fully anonymous; however, any use of your name, position, or company will only be done with your consent.

Your information

Name and surname	
job title	
E-mail	

Start of the survey

introduction questions

To begin, I would like to learn more about your professional background and your experience in influencer marketing. These first questions will help me better understand your role, your responsibilities, and the context in which you work with influencers, brands, or influencer campaigns.

- **Could you briefly introduce yourself and describe your current professional role?**
- **What are your main responsibilities in your current position?**
- **What types of influencer marketing activities or campaigns do you usually work on?**

Influencer - brand Fit

I would now like to focus on the relationship between brands and influencers, especially the idea of brand–influencer fit. This section aims to understand what makes an influencer appropriate for a brand, what elements are considered important in a collaboration, and whether potential risks, such as scandals or controversies, are taken into account when evaluating this fit.

- **In your opinion, what makes an influencer a good fit for a brand?**

- When thinking about brand–influencer fit, do you consider the possibility that the influencer could one day be involved in a scandal or controversy? Why or why not?
- How important is the alignment between the influencer's personal image and the brand's image when trying to avoid potential reputational risks?
- Do you think an influencer needs to genuinely like, use, or believe in the brand for the collaboration to feel credible and less risky?
- In your opinion, what warning signs could indicate that an influencer may not be a safe or appropriate fit for a brand?
- Have you ever seen or experienced a collaboration where the fit between the brand and the influencer was strong or weak? Could you explain what made it successful or problematic?

Influencer scandals and brand impact

The next section focuses more specifically on influencer scandals and controversies. The goal is to understand how you define this type of situation, what kinds of scandals may be most damaging for brands, and how such events can affect a brand's image, reputation, and consumer trust.

- What types of influencer scandals or controversies do you think are most common today?
- In your opinion, what types of influencer scandals are the most damaging for brands associated with them?
- Do you think consumers tend to hold brands responsible when an influencer they collaborate with is involved in a scandal? Why or why not?
- How can an influencer scandal affect a brand's image, reputation, or consumer trust?
- Do you think the impact of a scandal depends on the strength of the relationship between the brand and the influencer, such as a one-time collaboration versus a long-term partnership?
- In your opinion, are brands more at risk when the influencer has been strongly associated with them over time?
- Have you ever observed or experienced a situation where an influencer scandal affected a brand? Could you explain what happened and how the brand was impacted?

Risk mitigations

I would now like to discuss how brands can prevent and manage risks linked to influencer scandals. This section focuses on what can be done before a collaboration to reduce potential risks, what actions should be taken when a scandal occurs, and how brands can rebuild trust and protect their image afterwards.

- What actions can brands take before collaborating with an influencer to reduce the risk of being associated with a future scandal?
- Do you think brands should analyse an influencer's past content, public behaviour, and online reputation before starting a collaboration? Why or why not?
- What warning signs or red flags should brands look for before deciding to work with an influencer?
- Should brands prepare a crisis management plan before launching an influencer campaign? What should this plan include?
- When an influencer scandal happens, what should be the first steps taken by the brand to limit reputational damage?
- How should a brand decide whether to remain silent, communicate publicly, distance itself from the

influencer, or end the collaboration?

Simulation Case: Morphe and James Charles

To make the discussion more concrete, I would like to present a real case involving the beauty brand Morphe and the influencer James Charles. This case will be used as a practical example to understand how you would analyse the situation and what actions you would recommend to manage the backlash and protect the brand.

"James Charles is a beauty influencer who had a strong commercial relationship with the makeup brand Morphe. Their collaboration included a very popular eyeshadow palette and a close association between the influencer's personal brand and Morphe's image.

In 2021, James Charles faced serious allegations involving inappropriate interactions with minors. The controversy created strong backlash online. Consumers and other influencers criticized Morphe for remaining silent and questioned whether the brand should continue to sell products linked to him.

After the backlash increased, Morphe and James Charles announced that they would end their commercial relationship. The case raised important questions about how quickly a brand should react, whether silence can damage trust, and how brands should manage partnerships when an influencer becomes controversial.

For this simulation, imagine that you are responsible for Morphe's influencer marketing and brand communication at the time of the scandal."

- If you were responsible for Morphe's influencer marketing at the time, what would your first reaction have been when the allegations against James Charles became public?
- Would you have advised Morphe to remain silent, respond publicly, pause the collaboration, or end the partnership immediately? Why?
- How do you think Morphe's strong association with James Charles influenced the impact of the scandal on the brand's image and consumer trust?
- After the backlash, what actions should Morphe have taken to rebuild trust and prevent similar risks in future influencer collaborations?

Conclusion

To conclude the interview, I would like to ask a few final questions that allow you to reflect more generally on influencer scandals, brand collaborations, and the main lessons brands should learn. This is also an opportunity for you to add anything that may not have been covered during the interview.

- In your opinion, what is the most important lesson brands should learn when working with influencers who may become involved in scandals or controversies?
- Is there anything else you would like to add about influencer scandals, brand–influencer collaborations, or how brands can better prevent and manage these situations?

Autorisation

☐	I agree for my information to be used in this thesis
☐	I agree to be sited in citation

Date : 10/06/2026

3 - Bad buzz by association survey

Bad buzz by association survey

Hi, and thank you for taking part in my survey !

I am a master's student at the Louvain School of Management, and this survey is part of my thesis about how people react when a brand is linked to an influencer scandal.

It will take around **15 minutes** to complete. There are no right or wrong answers, I am only interested in your honest opinion as a consumer. All answers are **fully anonymous** and will only be used for academic purposes.

Throughout this survey, when the terms "serious influencer scandal" or "influencer scandal" are used, please interpret it according to what **you personally** would consider serious enough to trigger a reaction or affect your opinion as a consumer. There is no right or wrong interpretation , please rely on your own judgment.

* Indicates required question

1. How do you identify ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female
- ◯ Prefer not to say
- ◯ Other: _____

2. Which age group do you belong to ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55 or more

3. How often do you use social media platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, or Facebook ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very often

4. How often do you see content from influencers on social media ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

5. Have you ever discovered a brand or product through an influencer ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- I Am not sure

6. Have you ever purchased, or considered purchasing, a product because it was recommended by an influencer ? *

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No
- I Am not sure

7. In general, how much attention do you pay to collaborations between influencers and brands ? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	A great deal of attention

8. Before continuing, how familiar are you with situations where influencers are involved in scandals or controversies ? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Not familiar at all
- ◯ Slightly familiar
- ◯ Moderately familiar
- ◯ Very familiar
- ◯ Extremely familiar

9. Have you ever personally witnessed a brand being criticized because of its association with an influencer involved in a scandal? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ I Am not sure

Influencer Scandals and Brand Trust

In this section, please read a short scenario and answer based on how you would personally react. There are no right or wrong answers, we are only interested in your honest reaction as a consumer.

Scenario A

Imagine an influencer named Alex, who has worked for two years as a brand ambassador for a clothing brand called Lumio. Alex's public image, values and lifestyle closely match Lumio's brand image. Alex is recently involved in a public scandal after making offensive comments online, which received wide media coverage and strong public backlash.

10. Because of this scandal, I would trust Lumio less. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

11. I feel confident that Lumio acts responsibly as a brand, despite this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

12. After learning about this scandal, I would feel uncomfortable recommending Lumio to others. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

13. My overall opinion of Lumio as a brand has worsened because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

14. This scandal makes me doubt Lumio's values as a brand. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

15. I would actively look for information about Lumio before making a purchase after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

16. In general, brands should be careful when choosing the influencers they collaborate with. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

Scenario B

Now imagine the same scandal, but Alex's public image, values and lifestyle are very different from Lumio's image. For example, Alex is known for an aggressive, controversial online persona, while Lumio positions itself as a calm, family-friendly brand.

17. Because of this scandal, I would trust Lumio less. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

18. This scandal would make me question Lumio's honesty or credibility. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

19. I feel confident that Lumio acts responsibly as a brand, despite this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

20. After learning about this scandal, I would feel uncomfortable recommending Lumio to others. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

21. I would think twice before engaging with Lumio after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

22. My overall opinion of Lumio as a brand has worsened because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

23. I would be more cautious about buying from Lumio after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

24. I would actively look for information about Lumio before making a purchase after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

Brand Response After an Influencer Scandal

This section looks at how a brand's response after a scandal can affect your trust. Please read each scenario and answer based on how you would personally react.

Scenario C

Remember the scandal involving Alex and Lumio. Now imagine that within 24 hours, Lumio issued a clear, honest public statement addressing the situation directly and ended its collaboration with Alex.

25. Because of this response, I would trust Lumio less. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

26. This response would make me question Lumio's honesty or credibility. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

27. Lumio's response makes me feel confident that the brand acts responsibly. . *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

28. Lumio's response to this scandal makes me feel more or less confident about the brand's integrity. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

29. Lumio's products would feel less valuable to me even after their response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

30. My overall opinion of Lumio as a brand has worsened despite their response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

31. I would be more cautious about buying from Lumio after this response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

32. After this response, I would still consider Lumio a reliable brand compared to its competitors. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

33. Even after Lumio's response, I would consider Lumio to be a weaker brand because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

Scenario D

Now imagine the same scandal, but Lumio did not respond publicly, or only issued a brief, vague statement several days later.

34. Because of this response, I would trust Lumio less. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

35. This response would make me question Lumio's honesty or credibility. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

36. Lumio's response to this scandal makes me feel more or less confident about the brand's integrity. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

37. Iwould think twice before engaging with Lumio given their lack of response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

38. Lumio's products would feel less valuable to me even after their response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

39. My overall opinion of Lumio as a brand has worsened despite their response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

40. I would be more cautious about buying from Lumio after this response. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

41. After this response, I would still consider Lumio a reliable brand compared to its competitors. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

42. When an influencer scandal occurs, how important is it for the associated brand to respond quickly? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Very important

43. When a brand responds to an influencer scandal, which elements are most important to you? *

Tick all that apply.

- [ ] Quick response
- [ ] Clear/transparent explanation
- [ ] Honest/authentic tone
- [ ] Apology if necessary
- [ ] Concrete actions
- [ ] Ending the collaboration
- [ ] No response needed

44. Overall, how important is the brand's response in helping you decide whether to keep trusting the brand after an influencer scandal? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Very important

Brand Image and Brand Equity

This last section asks about your overall perception of Lumio as a brand, beyond just trust. Please answer based on the same scenarios described earlier.

Think back to Scenario A: Alex's image closely matched Lumio's, and Alex was involved in the scandal.

45. Knowing about this scandal, Lumio's products would feel less valuable to me. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

46. I would consider Lumio to be a weaker brand overall because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

47. I would choose a competitor brand over Lumio after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

Now think back to Scenario B: Alex's image was very different from Lumio's, and Alex was involved in the same scandal.

48. Knowing about this scandal, Lumio's products would feel less valuable to me. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

49. I would consider Lumio to be a weaker brand overall because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

50. I would choose a competitor brand over Lumio after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

Let's go back to Scenario C: Lumio issued a clear, honest public statement within 24 hours and ended its collaboration with Alex.

51. Knowing about this scandal, Lumio's products would feel less valuable to me. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

52. I would consider Lumio to be a weaker brand overall because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

53. I would choose a competitor brand over Lumio after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

Let's go back to Scenario D: Lumio did not respond, or only gave a brief, vague statement days later.

54. Knowing about this scandal, Lumio's products would feel less valuable to me. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

55. Even after Lumio's response, I would consider Lumio to be a weaker brand because of this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

56. I would choose a competitor brand over Lumio after this scandal. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
I str	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	I strongly agree

57. Thinking about everything described so far, how would this scandal change your impression of Lumio? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Mak	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Make it much more positive

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

1.2 Interview Transcript 1

So my thesis is actually about bad buzz by association - when influencers are involved in a scandal and how that affects the brand linked to them . Examples of that might be James Charles and Morphe, and so on. That s why I d like to ask you: could you briefly describe your current professional role? Within the sector. Within the sector, yes. My current professional role - I m actually a co-founder of influencer agency Master. We ve been doing this for almost six years; October 1st will mark six years. And I kind of fell into it by being very active myself back when social media didn t really exist yet. We had a blog and were already experimenting a little with that, experimenting with YouTube, and so on. I joined a day-one marketing agency for four and a half years. And then I noticed that the whole sector was changing so significantly. Influencer marketing was becoming a very large part of it. Influencers themselves didn t really know how to earn money legally , and so on. So I felt that we had to step in ourselves to simply make the market more professional. And to be able to do everything more according to the rules, for them too. So I proposed to my bosses at the time that I wanted to start a separate agency - Master - focused exclusively on influencer marketing. And they came on board with that. So that s roughly how it grew. But now I m a co-owner. And I think that involves two roles. We do both strategy, which we develop for clients like Disney and Basland Shopping, Kinepolis as well. But we also do creator management. So those are the two sides we have within our team.

Yes, you ve already answered the next two questions at once. What are your responsibilities? What kind of influencer marketing activities do you do? You answered that very well. So let s move on to the next section. And that s about influencer-brand fit. These are some broader questions related to influencer marketing. Such as: what makes an influencer a good match for a brand, in your view?

That depends for me a bit on a case-by-case basis. And we always start with a blank slate. Where first and foremost - and I think this applies to all communication - you look at which target audience you re addressing. And what goal you want to achieve with it. Is it creating awareness? Does everyone need to know your product exists? Or is it more about conversion? And from there we start - do you need very large creators, or do we need to look more at niche audiences? Which target audience do the creators themselves also reach? Which countries do they reach? So it actually goes very deep. So it s always a very personalized approach with us.

And do you take into account, for example, in the fit between a brand and

an influencer, the possibility that an influencer could one day become involved in a scandal or controversy? Why or why not?

Of course that s always in the back of your mind. But for that we also have contracts, of course. Not that we always put a contract in place, because we often already have good contact with creators after working with them for years. Also outside of our own team, of course. Like with you. I think I ve known you since day one of getting into it. So that makes a difference. Then we re less inclined to quickly draw up a contract. We want to move forward with our work. But we do notice that more and more agencies simply draw up a standard contract to protect themselves in that regard and to place the responsibility on the creator. So that person also has to behave online and may not make hate speech and such - that s actually all covered in there. And we have those kinds of contracts too.

And do you think it s important that there s a good alignment between the personal image of the influencer and the image of the brand in order to avoid potential reputational risks?

Yes, we have clients who are very strict about that. Just think of Pokemon. They actually screen the last three months. If you ve used even one swear word, maybe accidentally in a video, you re out of the campaign. We also very often hear: you have to be Disney-proof. That s a term that came about because Disney is very strict about profiles that aren t family-friendly, that consume too much alcohol. There s often a lot of scrutiny, because they re very strict about that. About snacking for example - that you don t overdo it. That everything is very restrained. Creators are watched more closely for what they do than some creators might think.

And what warning signs can indicate, in your view, that an influencer is not a safe or suitable match for a brand?

Warning signs? Sometimes that s hard to know, because you have creators who may have already experienced something in their past. It wasn t through us, but for example there was once a rapper present at a premiere who had at some point been in prison. For Disney, if that comes out afterward, that was a very big issue. That simply wasn t acceptable. Even though it had already happened in the past. So sometimes it s hard to see in the present moment whether a creator is going to do something wrong or not. We do of course have very good feel for the whole sector. So I can steer things better and say, yes, that person makes more edgy content. Maybe this isn t the right moment to use that person for this film. But it s hard to assess. We also had someone on our team who we had to let go who suddenly crossed a line on a personal level. There s not much we can do about that, really. Just

give a few warnings. But do be careful about what you show, because you are a role model to people. And then sometimes you have to react more harshly than you d like. But it s necessary sometimes.

And have you ever seen or experienced a collaboration where the fit between the brand and the influencer was very strong? Or very weak? Can you explain a bit? Whether the collaboration was successful or whether it became problematic?

A very good match is sometimes simply when the client understands what the creator makes and why they re good at it. And gives them free rein - okay, we re placing the trust in the creator. They know best what needs to happen with this product. So you can really see that work well in that way. Maybe an example that stands out is ACID, who is quite controversial. But one of his few sponsors is AirUp. And they use that so effectively that even during court case moments, an AirUp bottle appears on screen and features in all press photos. And he mentioned that just recently on Thriven. Because the audience, especially young people, see him as someone representing the people at that moment. And AirUp goes along with it. They re the heroes who support him in that regard. Whereas if it had been a Disney product he was holding? Yes, that would have been a disaster. You know? So it s such a contradictory way of... Yes, indeed make sure you have the right connection. And see for yourself how far you can and want to go with that. And a very bad match... That s hard to say. I can have personal opinions about whether a creator is a good match or not. But for me, it very often comes down to profiles that have, say, 60,000 followers. Who then get paid a lot of money, but actually only get 2,000 views. Because they ve become less relevant. Even though they may have had their moment of fame before. And they may have had that organic reach at some point. But when you look at what audience they re reaching now - if they re no longer reaching Belgium, for example. That s already a big misstep in your communication plan for me. If those kinds of people end up in the mix.

Now we re going to move a bit from the theoretical concepts to a more open perspective. So I m going to ask you to also use a bit of your user perspective for these questions. In your view, what kinds of influencer scandals or controversies are most common today?

What I come across more often, for example, is those finance influencers. The moment I see something like that, I already think: scam. That reaction has become automatic. Speaking as a user. And especially for young people, that s quite dangerous. They very quickly get drawn into stories about investing and crypto. And just go for it. I myself also come a bit from an insurance background. Where you know that you can t

just have someone sign something. They have to pass tests first, and so on. But all of that has become so accessible. That they sometimes don t understand the risks involved. And they very quickly pull those young people into their communication plan. And I find that very dangerous. For me, that s also one of the points that s often overlooked. It always goes about alcohol and things like that. But for me, that s actually a very big pitfall. So that s something I can share from my side.

And what kinds of influencer scandals are damaging to brands, in your view, if they re associated with them?

I think all influencer scandals are damaging. They actually harm the entire sector. And we ve seen that with agencies too. Especially in the Netherlands, there were already cases in the past, especially just when I was starting out - coming from the Netherlands. Boos, if you know that program, is a YouTube program that analyzes everything. If there s one manager - it only takes one - who s actually deceiving people and charging too much. And that comes out and gets exposed. That damages the whole sector. Nobody trusts it anymore. Agencies in general. It s the same with creators. If a creator - if those kinds of scams surface, or if things go wrong, lawsuits follow. Those influencers are put in a bad light again. It ends up in the media. So it actually damages trust in the influencer themselves. If a brand wants to work with that creator, that brand might no longer come across as trustworthy. So it s actually a huge circle that s all interconnected. Which makes it not so straightforward.

And do you think consumers hold brands responsible when an influencer they collaborate with becomes involved in a scandal? Or do they keep those separate?

I think they automatically do that, unfortunately. That s also why we have those clauses. And why you have to protect yourself - who do you invite to the premiere? Who s coming? We pay a lot of attention to that. Because you get indirectly involved regardless. We ve also had something happen - an incident - where an external party present at an event did something that probably wasn t meant badly. But still came across as mocking - touching the hair of a Black person. And that was caught on camera. They turned it into a whole case. Without showing that person on camera. Without naming the client. Really just that shot - we find this unacceptable. We want this addressed. Other young people are also very vocal about that. You shouldn t let this slide. This is not okay. So no one was really directly implicated. But yes, everyone knows. That was probably for that campaign, or something like that. So you understand - you do get indirectly involved. And you do

feel a bit of the client s anxiety - hopefully this doesn t grow bigger than it is. And maybe this is actually a nice example for them to show that this is not okay. And that s perfectly fine, of course. So it is tricky.

Do you think the impact of a scandal depends on the strength of the relationship between the brand and the influencer - for example, a one-off collaboration versus a long-term partnership?

I do think you have more of a handle on influencers when you work with them for a long time. I think you can also much better sense how that person is doing. And what kind of content they typically make. Because you re simply in contact with them much more often. But then it s also up to your agency to already be aware of what a creator is like. So that actually doesn t make all that much of a difference. We work with one creator and for our clients it s sometimes a one-off. But for us it s already been a six-year trajectory. So it s a bit of a double situation. If you have clients who only collaborate once and don t know the creator very well, it can indeed come up more often. And you ll have that less with long-term collaborations. But if you work with an agency, you assume the agency already knows that, so to speak.

And have you personally experienced a brand that really felt an impact from such an influencer situation?

We ourselves haven t - not yet. Even with that incident we experienced. And we didn t feel any impact from it. Because from both sides it was handled with respect. They had respect - if they wanted to get that message out. And I also knew there was respect in the sense of: we don t need to drag your name into this. That wasn t the intention. So it can go that way too. And then it s completely fine. So in our own practice. And I think - I hope - though I don t know that from your research - that Belgium has remained fairly spared from that. There are always bad apples. You get that in every sector. Absolutely. But I find that we re still fairly well-behaved in Belgium in that regard. Toward the edges. On the Dutch-speaking side, at least. Yes, yes, yes.

Now we re moving on to risk mitigation strategies. Actually what I m writing my thesis for - to write down ways that might help brands, in case we ever - living in Belgium - happen to be faced with such a situation. And the first question in this section is: what actions can brands take before collaborating with an influencer to reduce the risk of impact following a scandal? Or in case the influencer were to cause a scandal?

For me there are actually two things. You have the influencer certificate that was launched. That s not from the government. It s really from within the sector. Where we want creators to already get a foundation

of all the existing rules. That they actually understand a piece of ethics and a piece of legislation. And can demonstrate to other companies - look, I operate professionally. I know what the rules are. And I can conduct myself accordingly. So for us, that s a big step. If many creators were to complete and follow this. That they ve already gone through those workshops. And actually have that foundation. I think that s already a strong point. Also for a creator to show: I conduct myself properly. That matters. On the other hand, we also see more emerging - that as a creator or agency you have to be able to indicate: the people we work with - these are people who follow a certain ethical standard. These are people who aren t reckless. Or who engage in such practices. And sometimes there are also separate contracts that formally establish that with the creator. Okay, the creator agrees that they won t do such a thing. That s also part of it. In the past that was just a small clause. Now it can actually be a full page. Covering just the basic conduct expected of a creator.

Now for a slightly controversial question - or at least I was told it might be a bit controversial. Do you think brands and agencies should analyze the past content and online public behavior of an influencer before starting a collaboration?

Controversial in the sense of actually going through a creator s past to look at what they ve already posted. Yes. Again, that really varies a lot per client. Sony Pictures tends to think - we just look at what fits. They have a lot of titles, like a scary movie where you just have to go all out. The worse it is, the better, in a way. Matching how that film is. If that person has used too much alcohol in the past - they re not immediately going to penalize them for that. If things are okay now. Of course, they won t take profiles that are currently completely over the top in that regard either. But they do have a bit more flexibility than a Disney brand that internally already has a lot of rules - this can t happen and this can. So there s a difference there. But I m still always convinced that... yes, if you want to project a sense of responsibility. Not just as a creator, but also as a client. Then you don t want to associate yourself with people who don t have good intentions toward other people. So I don t mind at all if a deep dive is done into a profile. To analyze whether it s a smart move to collaborate with that person.

And following this question, do you think brands and agencies should perhaps draw up a crisis management plan before launching an influencer campaign?

I think many - and here I m looking at the larger ones - already have some kind of crisis plan ready. They know very well - okay, there s a

problem. They know that from the PR world too. A press release is sent out. It s not just ignored or turned around. And a lot of negative things get written. They probably already know what the next steps should be. But very often it starts with analyzing the problem. Looking with the agency and the client - okay, what s the logical next step? And then continually checking back - was this a good response or not? So I think there is that kind of experience at a lot of clients through PR and other matters. It s not new just because there are now creators . People in the press are also people. They also dare to push boundaries sometimes. But I think there is a plan. Should everyone have one? Everyone should have thought about the what-if at some point. That certainly. But I think if you just communicate about it openly with the right people, you re actually already much further ahead. Without there needing to be panic.

Yes, of course. And in your view, when an influencer scandal takes place, what should the first steps be to limit reputational damage to the brand and the agency?

We always try to talk to the creator first. To share what s happening - this can t really go on. Sometimes something happens without any bad intentions - not from the creator either. Even if it blows up into a scandal. Because sometimes not everyone is equally thoughtful or takes the time to think things through. But they can still communicate something that might be completely controversial. So I think the problem has to be addressed first. That the post might already be removed as a gesture of goodwill. Or something along those lines. And then you can move forward fairly quickly. I think a lot of people simply don t want it to reach the press. And that it can be resolved internally. I think that s also very important - not to let it fully explode. And then it s about trying to control everything as much as possible. But very often, when it has actually blown up, a statement is posted from the client on social media - look, we don t want to be associated with this. The responsibility lies with the creator and this is what happened. I think there are possibilities to position yourself somewhat outside of the blast.

And that s why I m going to jump to the next question, now that you mention that. How should a brand decide whether to stay silent, communicate publicly, or simply distance itself from the influencer or end the collaboration?

I think it also depends on how big it blows up. If it really starts to take on a life of its own, sometimes you have no choice but to respond as a brand. If you haven t been able to control it and it s spread too far, or it s going really viral online - you can t contain that. One

video goes online and thousands follow about your topic. Then it s out there and you can t let it go anymore. Then you have to do something about it from your side. So I think - look at how big the scandal is, and go from there.

Now we re going to move on to a small simulation case. It s about Morphe and James Charles. I don t know if you remember, in 2021 that was a big deal. James Charles was accused of sexual abuse of minors. He was associated with Morphe. Morphe waited a very long time before ending the collaboration, before responding publicly. That was the first major - after Logan Paul, but that was a bit different of course - the first major scandal where a brand really felt it hard in its sales. How strongly a scandal can actually impact a brand. If you had been responsible for influencer marketing at Morphe, what would your first reaction have been when the accusations against James Charles became public?

That s extremely sensitive. And it s also hard to assess. I look at the case of Bart De Pauw and VRT. If there s already evidence right away, you can almost immediately say - okay, this is a hard place and we re stopping here. But if there s no evidence, sometimes brands still stand behind a creator until it s been established that there is indeed evidence of a problem. There are certainly online - I think it s gotten to that point. Let me pause for a moment. There are certainly many people online who also want to bring hate toward a creator. So much comes online that you sometimes have to think - half of it might just be hate toward that creator without anything having actually happened. It s very hard then - and I also understand why a brand doesn t immediately say that s a fact. Even though it s very sensitive, especially on a topic like this. Sometimes you have no choice but to distance yourself temporarily and see how things unfold. But if it s something less severe, you can take a moment to assess how substantiated this is and whether you really need to take steps. And if you just drop everyone at the slightest thing that comes in, that s also tricky. Because then you also no longer have trust in a creator, and sometimes it might turn out nothing happened at all. But in this case that was of course something different. But I think you understand what I mean.

Yes. Go ahead... I ll be away for about fifteen minutes and then I ll send you a message. Yes, I ll stay here in the channel. There are still five questions left, so... But I ll come back shortly. Okay, great. Bye . Bye. Bye. Bye.

1.3 Interview Transcript 2

One of the points that many users and followers of James Charles and users of the Morphe brand clashed on was the fact that it took them a very long time to communicate with the public. Would you have advised Morphe to stay silent, to respond publicly, or would you have said to wait, just as Morphe did, to see how things would unfold - even if that created a somewhat negative impact on the brand?

I think I would have distanced myself from the creator more quickly. Even if it s a case of - I usually say where there s smoke, there s fire. If one or more people indicate that something is going on, you can already take a step back and release a statement. We are still neutral because we want to wait and see how things develop. But for now, we are putting things on pause. Not necessarily breaking it off, but perhaps taking a position that supports the victims or potential victims in some way, while also not fully cutting ties with the creator until things have been clarified. But you can already take a step back and not associate yourself so closely or get drawn into the whole story that unfolds. That would have been a wise choice, especially in that case.

What actions should Morphe have taken after the backlash to rebuild trust with their consumers?

Sorry, I m just translating some things. That s allowed. I understand. I get it too.

How can they win back trust? I don t think that s so straightforward. I think it s often underestimated just how hard it is to regain trust. Even now, they may still be receiving messages saying you handled it well, or whatever.

It s really not that simple. I think that sometimes you have to focus on - and this can also be poorly received - but for example, donating a portion of the next year s revenue to a good cause, supporting victims in general terms, not specifically those victims, but doing something more broadly around sexual abuse or whatever that might be. That can be a signal, but yes, we support that. On one hand, we stand with the victims and we show our goodwill. And yes, I don t think you can do much more than that. Except show that you stand on the side of the victims and that you acted with good intentions. I don t know how to put it exactly, but it s not straightforward at all. And do you think that the strong bond between James Charles and Morphe caused people to be even angrier at Morphe for taking so long?

That s actually a bit of a parasocial... Yes, I definitely think so. I think the stronger that bond, the more heavily you as a brand get

dragged into it. It really is - especially when someone is so much the face of your brand, and then something happens. I also had a lecturer from a university college who suddenly said, yes, we ve gotten some bad press because of one lecturer. Yes, one out of thousands did something wrong. So the entire name gets tarnished, at least among those who didn t know about it before. I still don t know exactly what it was about. Apparently something is going on. Yes, the university college is also heavily affected by it. Then it s just a matter of figuring out how to deal with it. And the more deeply involved that person is in your brand, the harder it is for the brand to get out of it.

And what do you think is the most important lesson brands should learn when working with influencers who may become involved in scandals or controversies?

I think that applies across all areas of communication. Even your own communication always carries risks. You can always publish something that contains something you perhaps didn t notice. A wrong word, sentence, or phrasing. And yes, you have to know that this can happen. It can even be a translation into another language where a mistake slips in that lands very badly with the audience. And that s just your own communication. That s then through a public-facing persona you deploy to put a lot out there.

So what can you do to prevent it? I think thoroughly researching creators in advance - really knowing who does what and what they re up to. We know many people where we think, okay, very creative person, fun on TikTok. But if you look at their stories, you can see what s really going on in their life, so to speak. And is that something you want your brand to be associated with or not? And if so, the risk is greater that it will come back to affect your brand. I think that s one of the most important things you can do preventively - and then make sure you have contracts in place so you re in a strong enough position as a brand not to get associated with or dragged into such scandals. But it always comes at the most unexpected moments, I think. And then it s really - yes, panic meetings or who knows what. All hands on deck, figuring out how to come out of it as well as possible.

Is there anything else you d like to add about influencer scandals, brand-influencer collaborations, or anything else you d like to be known in a thesis that broadly covers this topic?

What I d really like to say is that I think brands sometimes make it too easy for themselves and think, okay, we look at views or we look at follower counts. And it doesn t matter who we use. It costs us nothing, for example, and so we ll go with that person because it s free and they ll just do something. Whatever request they get, they send things

out. Be careful, I d say. We know very well who the good collaborators are, who are genuine, who knows the rules, and who doesn t. We don t just invite anyone or send things to people we re not familiar with. So that s always important, and I think too many people just think, views are views - and that s not how it is. That s not how it is. So yes, that s the danger. And it doesn t even have to be a scandal. It can just be a certain image of a creator down the line that you end up being associated with. And that s where I again find the influencer certificate a good point - to actually educate creators a little on what is and isn t acceptable. Nothing to do with the thesis. Did you contribute to that influencer certificate? Yes. And I obtained it, by the way. I have it. Yes, that s right.

Actually, I think we were already starting up the Influencer Marketing Alliance about three years ago because we noticed that far too many regulations were coming through that the sector had no say in at all. Also regarding what the VRM does, concerning advertising. There are many things we disagree with. Whereas before I personally had to go to the VRM as one of the few to look at how - the rules were actually even stricter before they were published. To tone things down a bit. But the Alliance exists precisely to counter such things. There also needs to be better, more logical legislation on child labor, for example. There are many things on the table. There are many things that would have already been passed into law had we not been there. Which are now back at the drawing board. Because we realized, okay, we need a steering committee. We need to build it together with the sector. And the same goes for the certificate. It was either that or the government would do it. Because every country already has it, except Belgium. So we knew the government had it then. And then it becomes about fining you when you do something wrong. And we want the certificate to be able to respond educationally. Instead of saying, you re doing it wrong, you have to pay a thousand euros. No, look, these are perhaps some points for improvement. Pay attention to this, so you don t get a fine. That s a bit the philosophy behind the whole thing. That we do it in a self-regulatory way. And that worked. And it just needs to get a little more traction. It had a very poor launch, I think. Due to miscommunication from ACID, for example. And VTM News said it actually came from the government. And that you supposedly couldn t obtain a certificate. So that wasn t true at all. So it was very poorly launched . So the trust among creators isn t there. Which is difficult, but it will come. Especially because Bol and L Oreal, they re going to require it - and Coca-Cola too - and are even going to provide the certificates themselves. In the sense that if you re doing a campaign

with Coca-Cola, you have to have it. And if you don t have it yet, they ll finance it for you. That s roughly where things stand. That you take it anyway. And that you know the rules. That s also something to think about for yourself.

It s a shame there isn t a Walloon version yet. Because that s where it falls short. When I look at my French TikTok - all those Walloon creators, they don t even add a disclosure when they collaborate with brands. Yes, but when we run campaigns, we do try to include that. When they submit a caption, we add "advertisement" to it. But it s up to them how they build it. We just have to be able to show as an agency that we re doing our best on that front. And it s indeed tricky that it s a different regulatory body. But actually the certificate is for French speakers too. So they can do it as well. It s just that they have fewer oversight bodies, like the VRM in Flanders. There they have the ACC, certainly in Wallonia. If you get a fine from them, it s even worse than in Flanders. Because they go after money here. That s even worse. What are the fees? Did that come up? I got a warning. But for something... Something silly, a giveaway. And I forgot. I had written " giveaway" and not "advertisement." And never followed up on it. And I already had my French account. 2,500 euros. If I didn t rectify it within three days. Yes. Those are pretty much the same amounts. Oh, I thought - because through Lisa I knew it was around 100... 1,000 euros. So I thought. The last one I saw was 1,500. Recently. For small things. But actually it s quite common for it to cost that much. 2,500. I don t feel comfortable with that. I didn t have to pay. But I was already ... And repeatedly, Average Rob got one of 5,000. For his own beer brand no less. So that stings. So yes. The certificate is for Belgium then. But it depends on how strict the oversight bodies are in each region. It s very much, let s say, very intense.

1.4 Interview Transcript 3

So, hello, my name is Marie Ann Devos and I am currently finishing my master s thesis at the Louvain School of Business. First of all, I would like to sincerely thank you for taking the time to answer my questions and participate in this interview. In the context of my research, I am studying the effects of influencer scandals on brands that are or have been associated with influencers. More specifically, this interview aims to gather professional insights on how brands can understand, manage, and respond to these situations. The interview will last approximately 45 minutes. With your permission, it will be recorded so that I can accurately analyze your answers afterward. The information collected will be used for the discussion and analysis section of my master s thesis. Your participation is voluntary and no information will be shared or quoted without your prior consent. Since your professional perspective is important for this research, your contribution may not be able to remain fully anonymous. However, any use of your name, role, or company will only happen with your consent. I have to say this because there have been issues in the past. Okay, yes, I understand. That s completely fine. I m not going to sue you through our school.

So to start and introduce things a little, I m going to ask you a few questions. Most of the answers to the three questions after the first one come naturally, but we ll see - I ve written them down. Could you briefly introduce yourself and describe your current professional role?

Of course. My name is Chloe van Butselen. I m 24 years old and I m currently a freelance social media manager and content creator.

What are your main responsibilities in your current role?

My main responsibilities in my current role are primarily creating social media content and managing social media for various clients. That s actually a brief summary of the two main tasks, so to speak. Really making sure social media performs well and that everything comes across correctly to the audience.

What kinds of influencer marketing activities or campaigns do you usually work with?

Do you mean like how I work with people? Or what exactly do you mean? Are you more into fitness? Oh, the type. What type of campaigns? Oh yes, yes. Large-scale, small-scale? Actually a bit of everything. Indeed, like sports. I collaborate with my fitness gym, where I m allowed to go work out for free. Also food - food-related content. Products for my hair too, for curly hair. So beauty, lifestyle, sports, food. Actually quite varied, but everything that suits me, so to speak.

I would now like to focus on the relationship between brands and influencers, particularly on the idea of brand-influencer fit. This section aims to understand what makes an influencer suitable for a brand and which elements become important when a collaboration even begins to ring.

What makes an influencer a good match for a brand, in your view?

When the interests align, primarily. You wouldn t have a beauty brand collaborate with... wait, how should I put it better? You wouldn t have a sports brand collaborate with someone who doesn t really do sports. You know? Someone who regularly goes to the gym - I find that a nice fit for a sports brand, so to speak.

When you think about the fit between a brand and an influencer, do you take into account the possibility that the influencer might one day become involved in a scandal or controversy? Why or why not? And now I m going to ask you to go back a bit to what you did before, because now you re a freelancer. Yes, yes. When you were more in contact with influencers - you did an internship and you also worked at a company, where I think you did have some... So what s your perspective on that?

So about... Say the beginning of the question again. When you think about the fit between a brand and an influencer, do you take into account the possibility that an influencer might one day become involved in a scandal or controversy? Why or why not?

Actually not. Not even during my internship. I didn t immediately think about that - if something were to happen with the brand that an influencer could become involved in. You don t immediately think about that, so to speak.

And how important is the alignment between the personal image of the influencer - for example yourself - and the image of the brand, in order to avoid potential reputational risks?

That s a difficult question, isn t it? I might put it a little... Yes, of course... Yes. Do you think that... you have the brand fit... Yes, you have the brand fit. Do you think that if the brand fit works better, you have less risk of reputational damage if something were to happen? So if the brand suits the influencer better, there s less risk?

Yes, yes. I definitely think so. Yes. Yes, I think so, definitely.

Do you think an influencer has to genuinely like, use, or believe in the brand to make the collaboration credible and less risky?

Yes, I think that s a must. Because otherwise you can tell that if that person doesn t stand behind it, they ll never be able to sell it as well, so to speak, to their followers or viewers.

And based on your experience, are there warning signs that can indicate that an influencer might not be the right match for a brand?

Yes, I think so. I once received an offer to advertise a dating app, while I had already been in a relationship with my boyfriend for two or three years. So I politely declined that one. Well, I turned it down. So I think that if a brand doesn t do good enough research into the influencer s situation, that can clash. And then maybe not everyone thinks about it - being an influencer - and just says yes because they want the money.

And that actually answers my next question a bit. Oh. Have you ever seen or experienced a collaboration where the fit between the brand and the influencer was strong or weak? Can you explain what made the collaboration successful or problematic?

So I ve had various collaborations. And indeed, the one I just mentioned I turned down because it doesn t suit me. And I find it a bit strange to advertise a dating app when you re in a relationship. And then sometimes more child-oriented products were asked of me to advertise. But that s not quite my target audience - mine is more young adults. So I turned those down too. Because I also don t think it would even have a serious impact if I start posting about things my followers aren t interested in. Which makes sense, because they watch your content because they re interested in what you share. For me, that s primarily diabetes content, sports content, and just my life. So I think especially when things connect to that, it can be successful.

Now we re moving on to the impact on the brand. When there s a scandal - for example, the influencer has done something wrong. And how that can impact the brand. So the goal is to understand how these kinds of situations are defined. Which kinds of scandals can be most damaging to brands. And how such events can affect the brand s image, reputation, and consumer trust.

And the first question is: what kinds of influencer scandals or controversies occur most often today, in your view?

I think primarily, from what I see passing by on social media, is when an influencer has a very outspoken opinion about the world and what s going on in it. For example, a position on Palestine and so on. And sometimes you see that come up when that influencer collaborates with a brand that... How do you put it? That they then work with a brand that ... Pro-Palestine, right? So they say... that it actually doesn t align with what they stand for. And with what they share on their social media. And that they still end up collaborating with a brand that doesn t actually meet that standard or something. That s just one example I ve seen pass by, I think. Just to clarify. So for example an influencer who says on social media: Free Palestine. And then afterward works with a brand that absolutely doesn t respect those values. Yes, exactly

. Or for example someone who says they re body positive. But then has a collaboration with Ozempic. Okay. That s just a clarification. Yes.

And what kinds of influencer scandals are most damaging to brands in your view, if they re associated with them? So an influencer does something. What kind of thing would they have to do for it to be truly damaging to the brand?

If the influencer doesn t respect the norms and values that the brand wants to project. If the brand wants to project, for example, that it s very eco-friendly. But then the influencer portrays it as not eco-friendly. That it then engages in greenwashing, or however you d put it .

It s difficult. I haven t experienced that myself. So it s something... Can you also try to put yourself in the shoes of a consumer? Because the next question is... Do you think, as a consumer, that brands should be held responsible when an influencer they re associated with becomes involved in a scandal? Why or why not? Maybe that makes it a little easier to gain perspective.

Wait. Say it one more time... Sorry. Put yourself in the shoes of a consumer. Do you think consumers hold brands responsible when an influencer does something wrong? When they re involved in a scandal? As in, the brand is partly to blame. Or associated. So the influencer does something they shouldn t. Yes. And they have loads of collaborations with someone else. Do you think consumers also hold the brand partly responsible? So partly blame them for... Yes, I think so. So that brand does that too. Yes, I think so, because it does originate from the brand. They also decide that they want to collaborate with that influencer. So they are partly responsible for that. It could be that the briefing wasn t clear or something. But these days, quite often, I see in briefings that everything is clearly explained. But there can always be misunderstandings.

And how can an influencer scandal affect the image, reputation, and consumer trust of a brand, in your view? So, an influencer does something wrong. They ve just also launched a campaign. They ve said something racist online, for example. Yes. How can that negatively affect the brand?

I think it changes the brand s image a little in the eyes of consumers. Because they do say: oh yes, that brand chose to work with that influencer. And they find it okay that they act like that. So that can automatically have a somewhat negative effect. But I don t think massively, unless it s something really big. It depends a bit on the situation, of course. It changes things a little.

And do you think - now that you re saying this - do you think the impact

of a scandal depends on the strength of the relationship between the brand and the influencer? For example, a one-off collaboration versus a long-term partnership?

Yes, certainly. I m quite sure about that. If you ve worked with a brand for a long time - for example, you work long-term with a sports brand. But you also occasionally collaborate with another sports brand. Then your followers or consumers won t really believe that you re fully committed to that brand. That you re just doing it for the sake of it. But also, if the influencer does something - says something racist or misbehaves. Or even these days you can get into scandals for practically anything. I think that if you ve really worked long-term with a major sports brand as an ambassador, the impact on that brand is greater compared to a brand they may have only worked with once. Yes, definitely. Yes, because with a long-term collaboration you see the brand appear more often with that influencer. So you link them faster to that person. Whereas if it was a one-time thing, you do sort of move past it. But then after a while you forget they even collaborated.

And have you ever observed or experienced a situation where an influencer scandal affected a brand? That can be from English TikTok, from anywhere. Not just Belgium. Have you noticed a scandal that then indirectly affected a brand?

Sorry. Sorry, my brother. Good, meanwhile. Bye. Okay. Well, you ve probably noticed that at some point. But I can t immediately name which one. What was it again? I think - yes - in the Netherlands there was recently a trip with a whole group of female influencers. I don t remember which brand it was. Sorry? The pizza thing. Yes, I think so. And apparently one of the influencers really bullied another one there. And that did circulate on my social media. And it actually had an impact on that brand. So yes. It hasn t happened to me in Belgium specifically. But this is the most recent one I can actually think of.

Now we re going to look a bit at risk mitigation. So what brands can put in place. Or influencer marketing managers like you, who are freelancers. What can you put in place yourself to prevent or remedy such situations?

So in your view, what actions can brands take before collaborating with an influencer to reduce the risk of being dragged into a scandal in the future?

Yes. I think first of all, before selecting the influencer, doing a thorough background check. What do they stand for? What do they mainly post about? Does it really fit the brand and what they want to stand for? Then the second thing they can do when they go into business with the influencer is to clearly draw up a contract, or a briefing with

clear guidelines on what may and may not be said. Clearly state the norms and values upfront. So they definitely know what the brand stands for. And so they can also bring that forward in their videos or photos . Yes, so primarily make good agreements between the influencer and the brand. And definitely make sure everything is properly agreed upon. I ll shorten that.

And now that you say this, you re actually answering my next question. Do you think brands should analyze the past content, public behavior, and online reputation of influencers before starting a collaboration? Why or why not?

I think they should, because if you don t, the chances are greater that you run into problems. And that their followers might also think: why are you working with them? That doesn t suit that person. And that can come across as strange too.

And what warning signs or red flags should brands watch out for before deciding to work with an influencer?

I think primarily looking at how the influencer behaves. I think in the influencer world there are influencers who are very genuine. But that there are also a few who maybe have a bit of a second face in life alongside that. Let me quickly send a message to someone who keeps calling. Wout.

Okay. Yes, that s true.

Okay, next question. Do brands need to prepare a crisis management plan before launching an influencer campaign? Yes? Yes, that s what I was taught in school. That it s important to have a crisis plan. Because it s important to respond. Because if you don t respond, you re essentially agreeing with what happened in that crisis. So you do need to have a plan ready to build on.

And what should this plan contain in your view?

Good question. It s been a while since I learned that. Yes, but now - with your experience. Brief as far as you ve gotten. It should include someone who will communicate about it. If it s a large brand, it s normal that one person should step forward. And apart from that, what s also done is sending out emails to customers and so on. With an explanation if something has gone wrong. For example, I work together - because I have type 1 diabetes - with Omnipod. My insulin pump. That brand. And recently there was a small production fault with the pumps, which caused them to leak. Insulin was seeping through, causing people to have higher blood sugar levels. And they handled this by first sending a message to the ambassadors - us - before they sent out the press release and the emails to the world. So that we could also communicate correctly about it. And if we ourselves were experiencing

those problems, that it was normal and would be resolved.
And when an influencer scandal occurs, what should the first steps of the brand be to limit reputational damage?
You ve already answered it a bit - communicating with customers. But is there anything else you think is really important to do first?
Definitely responding and acknowledging it. I think that s the first... For the rest, I m not sure what they should do. I think also internally looking at... first figuring out how best to respond, so to speak. Yes, I don t know if that s a good answer to your question.
There are no bad or good answers. But really not. No, no, no. Okay.
And how should a brand decide whether to stay silent, communicate publicly, distance itself from an influencer, or end the collaboration entirely?
Oh, wait. It s really noisy. How should a brand decide whether to stay silent, communicate publicly, distance itself from the influencer, or fully end the collaboration? If something goes wrong, that is.
That also depends on the situation, I think. If it s a one-time collaboration and it goes wrong, that s less serious than if they have a long-term collaboration. I think if you have a long-term collaboration and something goes wrong, they should clearly communicate. For example, if a small mistake was made, give a warning to the influencer. And then clearly list the norms and values and everything they need to take into account. And if it s something really big, then yes, stop it. That doesn t necessarily have to be communicated externally, unless it s an ambassador. And then it s about giving a bit of an explanation as to why they ve stopped working with the person representing the brand. So yes, that.
Now we re going to do a small simulation case of Morphe and James Charles.
Ah.
Voil a. To make the discussion more concrete, I d like to briefly present the case around the beauty brand Morphe and the influencer James Charles. This case will be used as a practical example to understand how you would analyze the situation and what actions you would recommend to manage the negative reactions and protect the brand.
So James Charles - a beauty influencer who had a strong commercial relationship with the makeup brand Morphe. Their collaboration included a very popular eyeshadow palette and a close association between the influencer s personal brand and Morphe s image. In 2021, James Charles was confronted with serious allegations regarding inappropriate interactions with minors. The controversy caused strong negative reactions online. Consumers and other influencers criticized Morphe for staying silent and questioned whether the brand should continue

selling products linked to him. As criticism grew, Morphe and James Charles announced they would be ending their commercial relationship.
The case raised important questions about how quickly a brand should respond, whether silence can damage trust, and how brands should manage partnerships when an influencer becomes controversial.
For this simulation, I m asking you to imagine that at the time of the scandal you were responsible for influencer marketing and brand communications at Morphe. Okay.
So if you had been responsible for influencer marketing at Morphe at that time, what would your first reaction have been when the accusations against James Charles became public?
I would perhaps first get in contact with the influencer themselves and hear what the actual situation is. Because they could just be rumors - you never know for sure. It could also be that the influencer denies it , so to speak. But if it is proven to be true, I would take immediate action as the brand to look at what s best for the brand itself. Whether that s ending the collaboration or continuing but having the influencer take the lead and address it themselves. I m struggling to find the words. And I would maybe in such a case - because what happened was very serious - already have stopped the collaboration with James Charles and then shared this via social media. I think that through the actions he took, Morphe no longer wants to collaborate with him, because they don t support that.
And would you have advised Morphe to stay silent or to respond publicly?
Yes, to respond publicly. A bit faster than what they actually did?
Yes, I think so, because otherwise people keep speculating and doing things, and then it can only get worse.
And how do you think the strong association between Morphe and James Charles affected the impact of the scandal on the brand image and consumer trust? Negatively, positively, did it leave a mark?
I think it was negative for a period, but I think that once it s stopped, it might actually become positive again, so to speak. That customers then think: okay, they do recognize the mistake, so we can trust the brand again.
And that s a nice introduction for my next question. Okay. What actions should Morphe have taken after the backlash to restore trust and avoid similar risks in the future?
I don t know. Mainly just showing that they have a good heart, so to speak , as a brand. So yes - did they end the collaboration after all the backlash? Oh yes. I think maybe coming out with something new, because the product was linked to him. So maybe bringing something else - something nice - to the brand, perhaps with another influencer who does

have the right norms and values and who can be trusted, so to speak. Someone with a good image with their target audience. Okay.

And as a conclusion, to close the interview... Oh, I can t find the words anymore. To close the interview I d like to ask a few final questions that allow you to reflect more broadly on influencer scandals, brand collaborations, and important lessons brands should take from them. This is also an opportunity for you to add anything that hasn t come up during the interview.

What do you think is the most important lesson brands should learn when collaborating with influencers who may become involved in scandals or controversies?

Hmm. Above all, really doing very thorough research into who they are and what they stand for, I think. Yes, before going into business with an influencer, making sure it s the right fit for the brand. Especially that.

And is there anything else you d like to add about the influencer world, collaborations between brands and influencers, or how brands can better prevent or manage these situations?

I m not entirely sure how they can prevent that. Yes, as I said - clear agreements, drawing up a contract. No, I find it quite difficult. I still don t know what I d add. No problem. And then I ll finish with the consent. Do you agree that your information - your information in this master s thesis - can be used? Absolutely. And do you agree to be quoted? Absolutely. Okay, great. That was the interview. Okay.

1.5 Variables

Hypothèse_Mémoire_Data.sav

	Name	Type	Width	Decimals	Label	Values	Missing
1	Gender	String	6	0		None	None
2	Age	String	10	0		None	None
3	SM_Use	String	10	0		None	None
4	Infl_Exp	String	10	0		None	None
5	Discovery	String	13	0		None	None
6	Purch_Infl	String	13	0		None	None
7	Collab_Att	Numeric	1	0		None	None
8	Scand_Fam	String	19	0		None	None
9	Witness	String	13	0		None	None
10	Trust_A1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
11	Trust_A2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
12	Caution_A1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
13	Caution_A2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
14	Trust_A3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
15	Caution_A3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
16	Infl_Vet	Numeric	1	0		None	None
17	Trust_B1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
18	Trust_B2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
19	Trust_B3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
20	Caution_B1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
21	Reconsider	Numeric	1	0		None	None
22	Caution_B2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
23	Caution_B3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
24	Info_Seek	Numeric	1	0		None	None
25	Trust_C1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
26	Trust_C2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
27	Trust_C3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
28	Integrity_Conf	Numeric	1	0		None	None
29	Caution_C1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
30	Caution_C2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
31	Caution_C3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
32	Reliab_Vs_...	Numeric	1	0		None	None
33	Weak_Brand	Numeric	1	0		None	None
34	Trust_D1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
35	Trust_D2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
36	Trust_D3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
37	Reconsider...	Numeric	1	0		None	None
38	Caution_D1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
39	Caution_D2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
40	Caution_D3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
41	Reliab_vs_...	Numeric	1	0		None	None
42	Resp_Speed	Numeric	1	0		None	None
43	Resp_Elem...	String	131	0		None	None

Hypothèse_Mémoire_Data.sav

	Columns	Align	Measure	Role
1	6	Left	Nominal	Input
2	10	Left	Nominal	Input
3	10	Left	Nominal	Input
4	10	Left	Nominal	Input
5	13	Left	Nominal	Input
6	13	Left	Nominal	Input
7	8	Right	Nominal	Input
8	19	Left	Nominal	Input
9	13	Left	Nominal	Input
10	8	Right	Nominal	Input
11	8	Right	Nominal	Input
12	8	Right	Nominal	Input
13	8	Right	Nominal	Input
14	8	Right	Nominal	Input
15	8	Right	Nominal	Input
16	8	Right	Nominal	Input
17	8	Right	Nominal	Input
18	8	Right	Nominal	Input
19	8	Right	Nominal	Input
20	8	Right	Nominal	Input
21	8	Right	Nominal	Input
22	8	Right	Nominal	Input
23	8	Right	Nominal	Input
24	8	Right	Nominal	Input
25	8	Right	Nominal	Input
26	8	Right	Nominal	Input
27	8	Right	Nominal	Input
28	8	Right	Nominal	Input
29	8	Right	Nominal	Input
30	8	Right	Nominal	Input
31	8	Right	Nominal	Input
32	8	Right	Nominal	Input
33	8	Right	Nominal	Input
34	8	Right	Nominal	Input
35	8	Right	Nominal	Input
36	8	Right	Nominal	Input
37	8	Right	Nominal	Input
38	8	Right	Nominal	Input
39	8	Right	Nominal	Input
40	8	Right	Nominal	Input
41	8	Right	Nominal	Input
42	8	Right	Nominal	Input
43	34	Left	Nominal	Input

Hypothèse_Mémoire_Data.sav

	Name	Type	Width	Decimals	Label	Values	Missing
44	Resp_Import	Numeric	1	0		None	None
45	Equity_A1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
46	Equity_A2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
47	Equity_A3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
48	Equity_B1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
49	Equity_B2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
50	Equity_B3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
51	Equity_C1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
52	Equity_C2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
53	Equity_C3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
54	Equity_D1	Numeric	1	0		None	None
55	Equity_D2	Numeric	1	0		None	None
56	Equity_D3	Numeric	1	0		None	None
57	Impr_Shift	Numeric	1	0		None	None
58	Trust_A2_R	Numeric	8	2		None	None
59	Trust_B3_R	Numeric	8	2		None	None
60	Trust_C3_R	Numeric	8	2		None	None
61	Trust_D3_R	Numeric	8	2		None	None
62	Trust_A_Me...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
63	Trust_B_Me...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
64	Trust_C_Me...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
65	Trust_D_Me...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
66	Caution_A_...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
67	Caution_B_...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
68	Caution_C_...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
69	Caution_D_...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
70	Equity_A_M...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
71	Equity_B_M...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
72	Equity_C_M...	Numeric	8	2		None	None
73	Equity_D_M...	Numeric	8	2		None	None

Hypothèse_Mémoire_Data.sav

	Columns	Align	Measure	Role
44	8	Right	Nominal	Input
45	8	Right	Nominal	Input
46	8	Right	Nominal	Input
47	8	Right	Nominal	Input
48	8	Right	Nominal	Input
49	8	Right	Nominal	Input
50	8	Right	Nominal	Input
51	8	Right	Nominal	Input
52	8	Right	Nominal	Input
53	8	Right	Nominal	Input
54	8	Right	Nominal	Input
55	8	Right	Nominal	Input
56	8	Right	Nominal	Input
57	8	Right	Nominal	Input
58	12	Right	Nominal	Input
59	12	Right	Nominal	Input
60	12	Right	Nominal	Input
61	12	Right	Nominal	Input
62	14	Right	Scale	Input
63	14	Right	Scale	Input
64	14	Right	Scale	Input
65	14	Right	Scale	Input
66	16	Right	Scale	Input
67	16	Right	Scale	Input
68	16	Right	Scale	Input
69	16	Right	Scale	Input
70	15	Right	Scale	Input
71	15	Right	Scale	Input
72	15	Right	Scale	Input
73	15	Right	Scale	Input

1.6 SPSS Output

Cronbach Caution A

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,794	,795	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Caution_A1	Caution_A2	Caution_A3
Caution_A1	1,000	,514	,586
Caution_A2	,514	1,000	,589
Caution_A3	,586	,589	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,563	,514	,589	,075	1,146	,001	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Caution_A1	6,84	4,396	,617	,387	,741
Caution_A2	7,07	4,526	,619	,390	,739
Caution_A3	6,71	4,278	,675	,456	,679

Cronbach Caution B

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,742	,744	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Caution_B1	Caution_B2	Caution_B3
Caution_B1	1,000	,558	,439
Caution_B2	,558	1,000	,480
Caution_B3	,439	,480	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,492	,439	,558	,119	1,272	,003	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Caution_B1	6,65	5,694	,581	,349	,648
Caution_B2	6,41	4,809	,609	,380	,608
Caution_B3	6,08	5,463	,522	,273	,712

Cronbach Caution C

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,775	,778	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Caution_C1	Caution_C2	Caution_C3
Caution_C1	1,000	,530	,568
Caution_C2	,530	1,000	,518
Caution_C3	,568	,518	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,539	,518	,568	,049	1,095	,001	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Caution_C1	5,25	5,692	,630	,398	,683
Caution_C2	5,21	5,277	,591	,350	,720
Caution_C3	5,26	5,009	,619	,388	,690

Cronbach Caution D

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,757	,756	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Caution_D1	Caution_D2	Caution_D3
Caution_D1	1,000	,518	,563
Caution_D2	,518	1,000	,445
Caution_D3	,563	,445	1,000

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Caution_D1	Caution_D2	Caution_D3
Caution_D1	1,000	,518	,563
Caution_D2	,518	1,000	,445
Caution_D3	,563	,445	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,509	,445	,563	,118	1,265	,003	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Caution_D1	7,70	3,501	,636	,406	,616
Caution_D2	7,64	3,831	,545	,303	,720
Caution_D3	7,63	3,791	,579	,349	,683

Cronbach Equity A

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,791	,792	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Equity_A1	Equity_A2	Equity_A3
Equity_A1	1,000	,534	,549
Equity_A2	,534	1,000	,593
Equity_A3	,549	,593	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,559	,534	,593	,059	1,110	,001	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Equity_A1	6,30	4,758	,606	,368	,744
Equity_A2	6,24	4,132	,641	,414	,708
Equity_A3	6,18	4,327	,653	,427	,694

Cronbach Equity B

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,780	,782	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Equity_B1	Equity_B2	Equity_B3
Equity_B1	1,000	,537	,552
Equity_B2	,537	1,000	,545
Equity_B3	,552	,545	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,545	,537	,552	,015	1,027	,000	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Equity_B1	7,08	3,839	,620	,384	,703
Equity_B2	7,11	4,416	,614	,377	,711
Equity_B3	7,11	3,998	,625	,391	,695

Cronbach Equity C

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,807	,811	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Equity_C1	Equity_C2	Equity_C3
Equity_C1	1,000	,541	,674
Equity_C2	,541	1,000	,552
Equity_C3	,674	,552	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,589	,541	,674	,133	1,246	,004	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Equity_C1	5,48	5,004	,686	,496	,709
Equity_C2	5,49	4,653	,597	,357	,805
Equity_C3	5,43	4,699	,693	,504	,697

Cronbach Equity D

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,740	,745	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Equity_D1	Equity_D2	Equity_D3
Equity_D1	1,000	,557	,415
Equity_D2	,557	1,000	,510
Equity_D3	,415	,510	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,494	,415	,557	,142	1,341	,004	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Equity_D1	7,05	3,673	,555	,333	,672
Equity_D2	7,11	3,183	,630	,404	,578
Equity_D3	7,16	3,097	,526	,285	,713

Cronbach Trust A

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,779	,779	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Trust_A1	Trust_A2_R	Trust_A3
Trust_A1	1,000	,461	,584
Trust_A2_R	,461	1,000	,577
Trust_A3	,584	,577	1,000

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Trust_A1	Trust_A2_R	Trust_A3
Trust_A1	1,000	,461	,584
Trust_A2_R	,461	1,000	,577
Trust_A3	,584	,577	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,541	,461	,584	,123	1,268	,004	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Trust_A1	6,4308	4,793	,587	,364	,732
Trust_A2_R	6,3231	4,622	,584	,357	,737
Trust_A3	6,2615	4,390	,679	,462	,630

Cronbach Trust B

Fiabilité

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,783	,784	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Trust_B1	Trust_B2	Trust_B3_R
Trust_B1	1,000	,561	,538
Trust_B2	,561	1,000	,542
Trust_B3_R	,538	,542	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,547	,538	,561	,024	1,044	,000	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Trust_B1	7,0154	5,479	,626	,392	,702
Trust_B2	6,8564	5,649	,629	,396	,698
Trust_B3_R	6,9897	5,979	,611	,373	,719

Cronbach Trust C

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,788	,789	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Trust_C1	Trust_C2	Trust_C3_R
Trust_C1	1,000	,582	,535
Trust_C2	,582	1,000	,549
Trust_C3_R	,535	,549	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,555	,535	,582	,047	1,088	,000	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Trust_C1	4,8051	4,508	,634	,405	,708
Trust_C2	5,1641	4,715	,645	,418	,697
Trust_C3_R	4,9026	4,532	,609	,372	,735

Cronbach Trust D

Echelle : ALL VARIABLES

Récapitulatif de traitement des observations

		N	%
Observations	Valide	195	100,0
	Exclu[a]	0	,0
	Total	195	100,0

a. Suppression par liste basée sur toutes les variables de la procédure.

Statistiques de fiabilité

Alpha de Cronbach	Alpha de Cronbach basé sur des éléments standardisés	Nombre d'éléments
,778	,780	3

Matrice de corrélation inter-éléments

	Trust_D1	Trust_D2	Trust_D3_R
Trust_D1	1,000	,542	,508
Trust_D2	,542	1,000	,577
Trust_D3_R	,508	,577	1,000

Statistiques récapitulatives d'éléments

	Moyenne	Minimum	Maximum	Plage	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	Nombre d'éléments
Corrélations inter-éléments	,542	,508	,577	,069	1,137	,001	3

Statistiques de total des éléments

	Moyenne de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Variance de l'échelle en cas de suppression d'élément	Corrélation complète des éléments corrigés	Carré de la corrélation multiple	Alpha de Cronbach en cas de suppression d'élément
Trust_D1	7,4667	3,869	,590	,351	,731
Trust_D2	7,2359	4,243	,644	,417	,672
Trust_D3_R	7,2256	4,083	,615	,387	,699

H1

Test T

Statistiques sur échantillon uniques

	N	Moyenne	Ecart type	Moyenne d'erreur standard
Trust_A_Mean	195	3,1692	1,01781	,07289
Caution_A_Mean	195	3,4359	,99872	,07152
Equity_A_Mean	195	3,1214	,99861	,07151

Test sur échantillon unique

Valeur de test = 3

	t	df	Signification p unilatéral	Signification p bilatéral	Différence moyenne	Intervalle de confiance de la différence à 95 % Inférieur	Supérieur
Trust_A_Mean	2,322	194	,011	,021	,16923	,0255	,3130
Caution_A_Mean	6,095	194	<,001	<,001	,43590	,2948	,5770
Equity_A_Mean	1,697	194	,046	,091	,12137	-,0197	,2624

Test sur échantillon unique

Valeur de test = 3

	t	df	Signification p unilatéral	Signification p bilatéral	Différence moyenne	Intervalle de confiance de la différence à 95 % Inférieur	Intervalle de confiance de la différence à 95 % Supérieur
Trust_A_Mean	2,322	194	,011	,021	,16923	,0255	,3130
Caution_A_Mean	6,095	194	<,001	<,001	,43590	,2948	,5770
Equity_A_Mean	1,697	194	,046	,091	,12137	-,0197	,2624

Tailles d'effet pour échantillon unique

		Standardisation[a]	Estimation des points	95% Intervalle de confiance Inférieur	95% Intervalle de confiance Supérieur
Trust_A_Mean	d de Cohen	1,01781	,166	,025	,307
	Correction de Hedges	1,02176	,166	,025	,306
Caution_A_Mean	d de Cohen	,99872	,436	,289	,583
	Correction de Hedges	1,00260	,435	,288	,581
Equity_A_Mean	d de Cohen	,99861	,122	-,019	,262
	Correction de Hedges	1,00249	,121	-,019	,261

a. Dénominateur utilisé pour estimer les tailles d'effet.
Le d de Cohen utilise l'écart type échantillon.
La correction de Hedges utilise l'écart type échantillon, plus un facteur de correction.

H2

Test T

Statistiques des échantillons appariés

		Moyenne	N	Ecart type	Moyenne d'erreur standard
Paire 1	Trust_A_Mean	3,1692	195	1,01781	,07289
	Trust_B_Mean	3,4769	195	1,13414	,08122
Paire 2	Caution_A_Mean	3,4359	195	,99872	,07152
	Caution_B_Mean	3,1880	195	1,08566	,07775
Paire 3	Equity_A_Mean	3,1214	195	,99861	,07151
	Equity_B_Mean	3,5504	195	,95916	,06869

Corrélations des échantillons appariés

		N	Corrélation	Signification p unilatéral	Signification p bilatéral
Paire 1	Trust_A_Mean & Trust_B_Mean	195	,101	,079	,158
Paire 2	Caution_A_Mean & Caution_B_Mean	195	-,065	,184	,367
Paire 3	Equity_A_Mean & Equity_B_Mean	195	-,075	,149	,298

Test des échantillons appariés

		Différences appariées					t	df	Signification	
		Moyenne	Ecart type	Moyenne d'erreur standard	Intervalle de confiance de la différence à 95 % Inférieur	Supérieur			p unilatéral	p bilatéral
Paire 1	Trust_A_Mean - Trust_B_Mean	-,30769	1,44503	,10348	-,51178	-,10360	-2,973	194	,002	,003
Paire 2	Caution_A_Mean - Caution_B_Mean	,24786	1,52211	,10900	,03288	,46284	2,274	194	,012	,024
Paire 3	Equity_A_Mean - Equity_B_Mean	-,42906	1,43550	,10280	-,63181	-,22631	-4,174	194	<,001	<,001

Tailles d'effet pour échantillons appariés

			Standardisation[a]	Estimation des points	95% Intervalle de confiance Inférieur	Supérieur
Paire 1	Trust_A_Mean - Trust_B_Mean	d de Cohen	1,44503	-,213	-,355	-,071
		Correction de Hedges	1,45065	-,212	-,353	-,070
Paire 2	Caution_A_Mean - Caution_B_Mean	d de Cohen	1,52211	,163	,021	,304
		Correction de Hedges	1,52803	,162	,021	,303
Paire 3	Equity_A_Mean - Equity_B_Mean	d de Cohen	1,43550	-,299	-,442	-,155
		Correction de Hedges	1,44108	-,298	-,440	-,154

a. Dénominateur utilisé pour estimer les tailles d'effet.
Le d de Cohen utilise l'écart type échantillon de la différence moyenne.
La correction de Hedges utilise l'écart type échantillon de la différence moyenne, plus un facteur de correction.

H3

Statistiques des échantillons appariés

		Moyenne	N	Ecart type	Moyenne d'erreur standard
Paire 1	Trust_C_Mean	2,4786	195	1,01815	,07291
	Trust_D_Mean	3,6547	195	,95630	,06848
Paire 2	Caution_C_Mean	2,6188	195	1,09408	,07835
	Caution_D_Mean	3,8274	195	,90900	,06509
Paire 3	Equity_C_Mean	2,7333	195	1,04460	,07481
	Equity_D_Mean	3,5538	195	,85677	,06135

Corrélations des échantillons appariés

		N	Corrélation	Signification p unilatéral	Signification p bilatéral
Paire 1	Trust_C_Mean & Trust_D_Mean	195	,137	,028	,056
Paire 2	Caution_C_Mean & Caution_D_Mean	195	-,030	,340	,681
Paire 3	Equity_C_Mean & Equity_D_Mean	195	,016	,411	,823

Test des échantillons appariés

		Différences appariées					t	df	Signification	
		Moyenne	Ecart type	Moyenne d'erreur standard	Intervalle de confiance de la différence à 95 % Inférieur	Supérieur			p unilatéral	p bilatéral
Paire 1	Trust_C_Mean - Trust_D_Mean	-1,17607	1,29776	,09293	-1,35936	-,99278	-12,655	194	<,001	<,001
Paire 2	Caution_C_Mean - Caution_D_Mean	-1,20855	1,44301	,10334	-1,41235	-1,00474	-11,695	194	<,001	<,001
Paire 3	Equity_C_Mean - Equity_D_Mean	-,82051	1,34029	,09598	-1,00981	-,63121	-8,549	194	<,001	<,001

Tailles d'effet pour échantillons appariés

			Standardisation[a]	Estimation des points	95% Intervalle de confiance Inférieur	Supérieur
Paire 1	Trust_C_Mean - Trust_D_Mean	d de Cohen	1,29776	-,906	-1,072	-,739
		Correction de Hedges	1,30281	-,903	-1,068	-,736
Paire 2	Caution_C_Mean - Caution_D_Mean	d de Cohen	1,44301	-,838	-1,000	-,674
		Correction de Hedges	1,44862	-,834	-,996	-,671
Paire 3	Equity_C_Mean - Equity_D_Mean	d de Cohen	1,34029	-,612	-,765	-,459
		Correction de Hedges	1,34550	-,610	-,762	-,457

a. Dénominateur utilisé pour estimer les tailles d'effet.
Le d de Cohen utilise l'écart type échantillon de la différence moyenne.
La correction de Hedges utilise l'écart type échantillon de la différence moyenne, plus un facteur de correction.

Validity

Corrélations

Corrélations

		Trust_A_Mean	Caution_A_Mean	Equity_A_Mean
Trust_A_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	1	-,026	,026
	Sig. (bilatérale)		,722	,719
	N	195	195	195
Caution_A_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	-,026	1	,120
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,722		,096
	N	195	195	195
Equity_A_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	,026	,120	1
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,719	,096	
	N	195	195	195

Corrélations

		Trust_B_Mean	Caution_B_Mean	Equity_B_Mean
Trust_B_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	1	-,038	-,071
	Sig. (bilatérale)		,599	,321
	N	195	195	195
Caution_B_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	-,038	1	,018
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,599		,799
	N	195	195	195
Equity_B_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	-,071	,018	1
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,321	,799	
	N	195	195	195

Corrélations

		Trust_C_Mean	Caution_C_Mean	Equity_C_Mean
Trust_C_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	1	,099	-,009
	Sig. (bilatérale)		,167	,905
	N	195	195	195
Caution_C_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	,099	1	-,024
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,167		,742
	N	195	195	195
Equity_C_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	-,009	-,024	1
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,905	,742	
	N	195	195	195

Corrélations

		Trust_D_Mean	Caution_D_Mean	Equity_D_Mean
Trust_D_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	1	-,114	,049
	Sig. (bilatérale)		,111	,493
	N	195	195	195
Caution_D_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	-,114	1	,001
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,111		,985
	N	195	195	195
Equity_D_Mean	Corrélation de Pearson	,049	,001	1
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,493	,985	
	N	195	195	195