

PRODUCT RISK RELIEVING

THE EFFECT OF ENDORSER TYPE AND GENDER ON
MALE AND FEMALE CONSUMER RESPONSES

Master thesis Communication Studies

LOTTE WOLBERS

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

PRODUCT RISK RELIEVING

THE EFFECT OF ENDORSER TYPE AND GENDER ON MALE AND
FEMALE CONSUMER RESPONSES

Master thesis Communication Studies

Utrecht, 25-8-2014

Master thesis

Lotte Elisabeth Wolbers

s0170992

Communication Studies (Marketing Communication)

Faculty of Behavioural Sciences

University of Twente

Enschede, the Netherlands

Supervisors University of Twente

Dr. J. Karreman

Dr. J.J. van Hoof

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

Supervisor Inventum B.V.

E. van de Griendt-Boot



Preface

After a tough year of writing my thesis for the master's program, Business Administration, I spent a couple months relaxing. Then, I started writing my thesis for my second master's program, Communication studies, convinced that I should finish this thesis within eight months. Unfortunately, this thesis's timeline was not exactly as I was expecting at the start. Although it did take a couple of months more than expected, I now have some experience within a dynamic working environment, which is exactly the type of job experience I needed. Furthermore, I have now, almost, completed two master's studies, and I think that is something to be proud of.

I want to thank everyone who supported me while writing this thesis and during my studies. In particular, I want to thank my supervisors, Joyce Karreman and Joris van Hoof, for giving me motivating feedback and insights into their visions of researching and writing a thesis.

Also, I would like to thank Ellen van de Griendt, supervisor of Inventum B.V., who gave me the opportunity to write my thesis at the Marketing department. I also want to thank all my other colleagues at Inventum B.V., who always wanted to help me out. I had an amazing, educational, and above all, pleasant time there.

Furthermore, I want to thank my parents, who gave me the opportunity to study and, especially, to study two master's programs, and always supported me. Moreover, I want to thank my friends, in special Joël and Annemieke, and flat mates as well. Although I was a bit grumpy sometimes, all of you continued to convince me I could do it and gave me all the social support I needed.

Last, I want to thank all the others who helped me performing my research: the endorser models, the participants of the focus group sessions, the pretest subjects, and of course all the respondents who filled out the questionnaire. Without them it would have been impossible to graduate.

Lotte Wolbers

Utrecht, 25-8-2014

Table of contents

Abstract	5
Samenvatting.....	6
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Theory	10
2.1 Endorser type.....	10
2.2 Endorser's gender	13
2.3 Audience's gender.....	14
2.4 Relationships between endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender.....	15
2.4.1 Relationship between endorser type and endorser's gender.....	15
2.4.2 Relationship between endorser's gender and audience's gender.....	16
2.4.3 Other relationships	17
3. Method.....	18
3.1 Experimental design.....	18
3.2 Stimulus materials.....	18
3.3 Instrument and measures	19
3.3.1 Control variable: risk aversion.....	19
3.3.2 Attitude toward the advertisement.....	21
3.3.3 Product attitude	21
3.3.4 Purchase intention.....	21
3.3.5 Perceived physical product risk.....	21
3.4 Procedure	21
3.5 Participants	22
3.6 Randomisation check	22
3.7 Validity check of measures	23
4. Results.....	25
4.1 Perceived physical product risk.....	25
4.2 Attitude toward the advertisement.....	26
4.3 Product attitude	27
4.4 Purchase intention.....	28
5. Conclusions and discussion	30
5.1 Conclusions and theoretical implications.....	30
5.1.1 Endorser type	30
5.1.2 Endorser's gender	31
5.1.3 Audience's gender	32
5.1.4 Relationships between endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender.....	33
5.2 Practical implications.....	34
5.3 Limitations of the study and directions for further research	34

References	37
Appendix A	41
Appendix B	46
Appendix C	49
Appendix D	53
Appendix E	57

Abstract

Consumers want to maximise their leisure time, especially regarding meal preparations. Therefore manufacturers invent more and more products that meet consumers' convenience needs, However some of these products are associated with high levels of perceived physical product risk (e.g.: boiling water burns in case of boiling water taps).

These high levels may influence consumers' attitudinal and behavioural intentions: attitude toward the advertisement, product attitudes, and purchase intentions. Furthermore, these consumer responses can influence each other as well. Therefore, risk-reduction mechanisms need to be used in order to relieve risk among consumers. The easiest mechanism to manipulate and implement is an endorsement, which can influence attitudes and purchase intentions. However, endorsements exist in three types (celebrity, expert, and consumer), in which the expert and consumer endorser have the potential to relieve risk without many negative effects. In addition, the endorser's gender and audience's gender can influence consumer responses. Therefore, this study has examined the impact of the independent variables endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender on the dependent variables perceived physical product risk, attitude toward the advertisement, product attitude, and purchase intention.

The models (male and female) were chosen based on a preliminary investigation and were photographed as experts and as consumers. By selecting the male and female endorser in a preliminary investigation, the study tried to eliminate influences by non-similarity, such as age and attractiveness. The settings of the final photos were adjusted based on the discussions about this topic during preliminary investigation focus group sessions, as well as by a content analysis of advertisements within several magazines. The chosen innovative high physical risk product used for this study was a 3-in-1 boiling water tap (chance of boiling water burns). The main study consisted of a two by two by two design and the data was collected by online questionnaire.

In the end, the data of 345 respondents was analysed. The results showed only a significant influence of endorser type on attitude toward the advertisement, where the consumer endorser elicited a more positive attitude toward the advertisement than the expert endorser. Other investigated relationships did not result in any significant differences. Moreover, no significant interaction effects were found. Therefore, this study did not support any of the assumptions based on established theory.

Samenvatting

Consumenten willen meer vrije tijd, zeker als het gaat om het bereiden van eten. Fabrikanten hier op in gaan spelen door steeds meer producten te ontwikkelen die tegemoet komen in deze gemakbehoefte. Sommige van deze producten zijn echter verbonden met een hoog niveau van waargenomen fysiek product risico (bijvoorbeeld brandwonden bij een kokend water kaan).

Hoge niveaus van waargenomen product risico kunnen een invloed hebben op de attitudes and gedragsintenties, zoals de attitude ten opzichte van de advertentie, product attitudes en aankoopintenties, van consumenten. Ook kunnen deze verschillende consumentenreacties invloed hebben op elkaar. Risicoreductie mechanismes kunnen helpen om het waargenomen product risico onder consumenten te verlagen. Een endorsement is het gemakkelijkst te implementeren mechanisme. Endorsements kunnen opgedeeld worden in drie types (beroemdheid, expert en consument), waarbij met name de expert en de consument endorser de mogelijkheid hebben om zonder veel negatieve neveneffecten het waargenomen risico te verlagen. Naast het endorser type kan ook het geslacht van de endorser en het geslacht van het publiek een invloed hebben op de reacties van consumenten. Om deze reden heeft dit onderzoek de invloed van de onafhankelijke variabelen endorser type, geslacht van de endorser en het geslacht van het publiek op de afhankelijke variabelen waargenomen fysiek product risico, attitude ten opzichte van de advertentie, product attitude en aankoopintentie onderzocht.

De gebruikte endorser modellen (man en vrouw) zijn gekozen op basis van een vooronderzoek. Door de modellen te kiezen op basis van een vooronderzoek is er geprobeerd om invloeden van ongelijkheid, zoals leeftijd en aantrekkelijkheid, te beperken. Deze uiteindelijke modellen zijn gefotografeerd als een expert en als een consument. De setting van de foto's zijn gebaseerd op discussies tijdens het vooronderzoek en op een inhoudsanalyse van advertenties in verschillende tijdschriften. Het gekozen innovatieve product met een hoog fysiek product risico is een 3-in-1 kookkraan (kans op brandwonden). Het hoofdonderzoek bestond uit een twee bij twee bij twee design en de data zijn verzameld door middel van een online vragenlijst.

Uiteindelijk is de data van 345 respondenten geanalyseerd. De resultaten lieten alleen een significant invloed van endorser type op de attitude ten opzichte van de advertentie zien. Hierbij zorgden de consument endorseers voor een significant betere attitude ten opzichte van de advertentie dan de expert endorseers. Alle andere onderzochte relaties lieten geen significant verschil zien. Ook zijn er geen interactie-effecten gevonden. Op basis van de resultaten kan geen van de op de theorie gebaseerde hypothesen bevestigd worden.

1. Introduction

Many people see cooking at home as a chore, and meal preparation as time consuming (International Markets Bureau, 2010). Therefore, it is not surprising that many consumers wish to save time cooking weeknight meals (Consumer Reports, 2014). Both of these statements indicate the following: today's consumers want convenient solutions to maximise their leisure time (International Markets Bureau, 2010).

According to the International Markets Bureau (2010), convenience in terms of cooking is not only about quick-to-prepare meals but also about assistance. In this case, assistance refers to products that remove steps in the preparation process for meals that are not necessarily quick-to-prepare. Responding to these time-saving and simplification demands, manufactures invented more appliances to meet these types of needs in the last decades (e.g., microwave ovens, freezers, dishwashers, and more recently, robotic vacuums, single-serve coffee containers, and boiling water taps). Although all these innovative products are ideal time savers and (cooking) simplifiers, some of them are associated with high risks as well: for instance boiling water taps, and dishwasher was well, are associated with high risks in the physical sphere (boiling water burns).

The most common two-pronged conceptual approach of risk within consumer behaviour is as follows: "The consumer's perception of uncertainty and the adverse consequences associated with the purchase of a product or a service" (Currás-Pérez & Sánchez-García, 2012, p. 188). With regard to physical product risk, or risks related to safety or health (Cases, 2002), the focus is especially on the latter phrase: the adverse consequences. However, the first point is also important, since it is quite likely that risk aversion, or "the extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguous situations, and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid these" (Hofstede & Bond, 1984, p. 419, as cited in Bao, Zheng, Zhou, & Su, 2003), has an influence on the perceived physical product risk as well.

Several studies have indicated that a high level of general perceived risk among consumers negatively affects a consumer's attitudinal and behavioural intentions (e.g., Jarvenpaa, Tractinsky, & Vitale, 2000). Therefore, manufacturers of these kinds of products, and especially their marketers, must reduce consumers' levels of perceived product risk. So-called risk-reduction mechanisms and improving concepts related to risk-reduction can help reduce this perceived product risk among consumers.

Literature shows many mechanisms for, and important concepts in, risk relieving (Roselius, 1971; Tan, 1999), for example endorsements, retailer's reputation, brand loyalty, brand image, private testing, store image, free samples, money-back guarantees, free trial periods, government testing, shopping, expensive models, and word-of-mouth. Regarding advertising, endorsements are the most obvious mechanism to use and the easiest to implement. In addition, several previous studies have indicated the power of endorsements in relieving risk. Low levels of risk perception will, in turn, have positive influences on consumers' attitudinal orientations and behaviours (Jarvenpaa et al., 2000). However, a

challenge with this specific risk-reduction mechanism is that each type (celebrity endorsers, expert endorsers, and consumer endorsers) persuade (potential) consumers in their own way. Therefore, it should be investigated which endorser type is the most effective in cases of innovative products with high physical risks.

In addition, an endorser can be male or female. Earlier studies have shown that females are mostly shown in advertisements related to food products, cleaning products, beauty products, medicines, clothes, and home appliances, while males are mostly shown in advertisements for cars, travel, alcohol and cigarettes, industrial products, entertainment media, and industrial companies (Kang, 1997). Since innovative kitchen appliances can be seen as a mix between industrial products (male) and home appliances (female), investigation can discover whether a male endorser or a female endorser has the greatest positive effect on consumers.

Furthermore, the audience's gender can play a role in this effectiveness of endorsers or can be an important factor on its own. Namely, men and women judge advertisements in different ways. The selectivity hypothesis, for example, mentioned that men and women process information in different ways: men have a tendency to focus on the most prominent cue and women try to process every cue (Meyers-Levy, 1989, as cited in Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran, 1991). Therefore, the general impact of an endorser, or the specific impact of endorser type and/or gender, can be stronger (if it is the prominent cue) or weaker (if it is not the prominent cue) for a male audience than for a female audience. In addition, researchers agree that the way in which men and women process advertisements varies with information cues, such as product risk level (Wolin, 2005). Furthermore, men and women experience risk in different ways (Croson and Gneezy, 2009): men are willing to take risks more often than women. All previous information indicates that men and women can have different reactions to advertisements for high physical risk products.

Thus, endorsers have the potential to reduce the level of perceived risk among consumers. Perceived risk reduction, in turn, can positively influence other consumer responses. Moreover, consumer responses may influence each other. Therefore, research can discover which endorser characteristics (type and gender) provoke the most positive responses from the two audiences (male and female). This leads to the following research question:

RQ: To what extent are endorsers effective in positively affecting consumer responses to advertisements of products with physical risks?

In order to formulate an answer to this question, first the literature will be explored. Chapter 2 will elaborate on the most important theoretical concepts: consumer responses, endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender, as well the relationships among them. Also, several hypotheses and a sub-research question related to these concepts will be introduced in this chapter. Chapter 3 will introduce this study's method, including the design, instrument and measures, and procedure. Even so, this chapter presents the first analyses regarding the participants and the reliability and validity of

the measures. Afterward, chapter 4 will present the study's results and will determine if the hypotheses can be supported. Finally, chapter 5 will formulate conclusions according to the current study. Furthermore, this chapter presents some limitations of the study and provides some directions for further research.

2. Theory

As stated, endorsers have the potential to reduce perceived risk among consumers. Endorsers also seem to have an impact on attitude toward the advertisement and product perceptions, such as the product's image (Atkin & Block, 1983, as cited in Tripp, Jensen, & Carlson, 1994). Furthermore, the level of risk perception provokes many other consumer responses. According to Jarvenpaa et al. (2000), risk perception levels have its influences on consumers' attitudinal orientations and consumers' behaviours. Therefore, attitudes and behavioural intentions are important for this study as well.

An attitude is "a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor" (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 598). Thus, attitude expresses the tendency to an evaluative judgment (neutral, negative, or positive) about a particular object. Such a particular object may be a product or an advertisement. During this study, the former will be referred to as "product attitude(s)" and the latter as "attitude(s) toward the advertisement".

In addition to the direct influence of the perceived risk on behavioural intentions, according to several researchers, attitudes are strongly related to purchase intentions as well (Berens, van Riel, & van Bruggen, 2005; Jarvenpaa et al., 2000; Lee, Lee, & Garrett, 2012). In other words, a positive increase in an attitude leads in the end to a greater purchase intention (Lee et al., 2012). Several theories showed that intention is an accurate measure for actual behaviour (e.g., Theory of Planned Behaviour (TpB) of Ajzen, 1991). Furthermore, the predictive belief of behavioural intention to actual behaviour is widely used within social science studies, or more specifically, in studies pertaining to purchase intention (e.g., Chen, Chen, & Huang, 2012). Since behaviour can be predicted by the intention to behave, purchase intention will be used as a measure for actual purchase behaviour in this study.

This again emphasises the importance of risk-reduction mechanisms. As said, an endorser is, for marketers, the easiest risk-reduction mechanism to manipulate. This study, therefore, will examine the effect of several endorser characteristics on the dependent variables: perceived physical product risk, attitude toward the advertisement, product attitude, and purchase intention. The first section of this chapter will explore the endorser types and their specific qualities. Next, section 2.2 will elaborate on the role of endorser's gender in influencing consumer responses. Afterward, the importance of the audience's gender in relation to advertising will be explained (section 2.3). Section 2.4 will then provide information about possible relationships between the independent variables: endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender.

2.1 Endorser type

As mentioned, there are three types of endorsers, all of whom persuade consumers in different ways. This section will first explain all three endorser types. Afterward, several relevant studies will be introduced and the first hypothesis and sub-hypotheses, related to endorser type, will be stated.

The most commonly used endorser type is the celebrity endorser. In America, such celebrity endorsers are used in approximately 25% of all commercials (Shimp, 2000, as cited in Edwards & La Ferle, 2005). According to McCracken (1989), a celebrity endorser is defined as “any individual who enjoys public recognition and who uses this recognition on behalf of a consumer good by appearing with it in an advertisement” (p. 310). Celebrity persuasion takes place by identification (Kelman, 1961). The second endorser type is the expert endorser. An expert endorser can be anyone who has more knowledge about a specific skill or product/service than the average person. This means that anyone can be seen as an expert endorser and, therefore, used in advertising as such. To be more precise, a celebrity can be an expert in his or her own field, but an expert endorser is not necessarily a celebrity (Thwaites, Lowe, Monkhouse, & Barnes, 2012). According to Friedman and Friedman (1979), as cited in Wang (2005), expert endorsers persuade through their credibility: consumers see the expert endorser as a credible source to solve their specific problems. Since expert endorsers express authority and, therefore, knowledge and expertise, they provoke credibility (Cialdini, 2001). The third type of endorser is the consumer endorser or “common man” endorser. This endorser type persuades by similarity to the audience (Dean and Biswas, 2001; Tan, 1999) and is, therefore, perceived as similar to the consumer (e.g., girl next door).

Some scientists mentioned the celebrity endorsers as the most successful, while others found expert endorsers the most effective, and still others found consumer endorsers had the greatest positive effects on consumers. Celebrity endorsers, however, will be excluded from this study because many scientists have already investigated the effect of this type and celebrity endorsers can have extremely detrimental effects (Amos, Holmes, & Strutton, 2008). Namely, negative information related to the celebrity can be transferred to the product and/or brand. As a study by Thwaites et al. (2012) showed, the public’s perception of a product can be reduced by the celebrity’s negative publicity, regardless of the strength or indirectness of the relation of that celebrity to the publicity. Therefore, the current study will focus on the other two types of endorsements: the expert, who generally persuades by credibility, and the consumer, who generally persuades by similarity.

On the one hand, Wilson and Sherrell’s (1993, as cited in van Mulken, & Hornikx, 2011) meta-analysis and Pornpitakpan’s (2006) literature review indicated expert endorsers as the most effective, since this type generally persuades by credibility. Both studies concluded that, in general, high-credibility sources are more persuasive than low-credibility sources. As an example, Pornpitakpan (2006) mentioned that, according to Braunsberger (1996), a source high in expertise leads to more positive attitudes toward the endorser and the advertisement than a source low in expertise. On the other hand, some research indicated consumer endorsers were more persuasive because they are perceived as similar and, therefore, are more influential than non-similar endorsers in changing attitudes and opinions (Feick & Higie, 1992). However, the difference between an expert endorser and a consumer endorser can be slight, since an expert endorser can be perceived as similar to the audience and a consumer endorser can be perceived as credible as well.

More specifically, Petty, Cacioppo, and Goldman (1981) tried to assess how personal involvement affected the relative importance of argument quality and source expertise in influencing participants' attitudes toward the topic. The source expertise results showed, in this case, that a high-expert source's message (commission chaired by a professor of Princeton University) was more persuasive than that of a low-expert source (a local high school). Tests for interactions showed that the expertise manipulation had a stronger effect in cases of low personal involvement than in cases of high personal involvement. Additionally, according to Feick and Higie (1992), several studies showed that similarity between the endorser and the audience was more effective in low involvement products (e.g., cookies) than in cases of high involvement products (e.g., televisions). Based on these two studies a high innovative high risk product seems to be a high involvement product. If so, an expert endorser seems to be more effective than a consumer endorser. In addition, Wang (2005) found that when consumers were already interested in the endorsed product (in this case a movie) the intention to behave and the perceived credibility is more enhanced by consumer endorsers than by expert endorsers. Based on the previous, it seems that not every endorser type has the same effects in every situational context. Friedman and Friedman (1979, as cited in Lin, Wang, & Chen, 2008) concluded the same: the effectiveness of endorsers varies according to the nature of the product. Therefore, the question is which of the two endorser types is most likely to positively affect consumer responses in cases of an innovative product with a high physical risk.

Until now, literature has been inconclusive regarding this question. Firstly, Tan (1999) showed that expert endorsers are greater risk relievers than consumers when online shopping for high risk products. Although an inkjet printer was used as a high risk product, a different situational context than the current study, Tan (1999) did take into account the risk level of the product. Moreover, the measured general perceived product risk included all forms of product risk, including physical risk. Secondly, Biswas, Biswas, and Das (2006) investigated the effect of endorser types on consumer risk perceptions. The measured perceived risk dimensions, however, differed from the central dimensions within the current study (performance risk and financial risk versus physical risk). They found that the perceived performance risk and the perceived financial risk of a high technology-oriented product (computer) were lower when respondents were exposed to an expert endorser than when exposed to a non-celebrity, non-expert endorser. Thirdly, Friedman and Friedman (1979, as cited in Dean & Biswas, 2001) found support for the suggestions that expert endorsers are more effective for products with high financial, performance, or physical risk, and consumers are more effective for products low in risk. To be more precise, Friedman and Friedman (1979, as cited in Pornpitakpan, 2006) found that in cases of products associated with financial, performance, or physical risk (such as vacuum cleaners) expert endorsers were more effective than inexperienced endorsers. Fourthly, Freiden (1982, as cited in Pornpitakpan, 2006) concluded that in cases of technical products, an expert endorser elicited more favorable responses than a consumer endorser. To sum up, although the described studies had different contexts, all pointed in the same direction: in favour of expert endorsers.

In conclusion, the nature of the products plays an important role in the effectiveness of one endorser type over another. However, according to the above scientists, it seems that, in cases of products high

in physical risk, using expert endorser rather than consumer endorsers leads to more favourable consumer responses. This assumption leads to the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses:

H1: *Expert endorsers are more effective than consumer endorsers.*

H1a: *Expert endorsers are more effective than consumer endorsers in reducing consumers' perceived physical risks.*

H1b: *Expert endorsers are more effective than consumer endorsers in positively effecting consumers' attitudes toward an advertisement.*

H1c: *Expert endorsers are more effective than consumer endorsers in positively effecting consumers' product attitudes*

H1d: *Expert endorsers are more effective than consumer endorsers in increasing consumers' purchase intentions.*

2.2 Endorser's gender

Debevec and Iyer (1986) showed that the endorser's gender does have an influence on several consumer reactions (perceptions of the product's gender image, the respondents' attitudes toward the product, the message spokesperson, and the usage intention). In addition, Kanungo and Prang (1973) found that endorser's gender has the potential to positively influence perceived product quality and consumers' product attitudes. The question, however, is which gender is the most effective in positively changing consumer responses.

According to Pornpitakpan's (2006) literature review to the impact of endorser's gender on consumer responses may be referred as limited and inconclusive. Some studies found pros in favour of male endorsers; others found pros in favour of female endorsers. In addition, Lin et al. (2008) explored the gender differences in terms of positioning tour leaders as endorsers among 373 business school students. They found support for the assumption that the subjects would have greater purchase intentions when a travel brochure included a female tour leader's photo than when a brochure included a male tour leader's photo. Debevec and Kernan (1984) investigated the effect of males' and females' physical attractiveness on respondents' reactions to a slide show (designed to gain verbal and behavioural support for a local issue). Debevec and Kernan (1984) found that, in this case, attractive female models improved respondent's attitudes more than attractive male models. Peetz, Parks, and Spencer (2004, as cited in Sawatari, 2006) however, found that male athlete endorsers had an advantage over their female counterparts in improving a participant's purchase intention. The contexts of these previous studies, however, are not comparable to the context of the present study: innovative kitchen appliances with a high physical risk.

However, applying the credibility literature, (e.g., Fink, Parker, Cunningham, and Cuneen, 2012; Pornpitakpan, 2006; Wilson and Sherrell, 1993, as cited in van Mulken, and Hornikx, 2011) high-credibility sources are more persuasive and more effective in positively affecting consumer responses, which leads to the question what gender is perceived as the most credible. Results regarding this are mixed as well. The most recent studies, however, although not the same context as the current study,

found men as more credible sources than women. Namely, Weibel, Wissmath, and Groner (2008) conducted a study to investigate the effects of the gender and age of a newscaster on credibility. The results showed that male newscasters were perceived as more credible than their female counterparts. The same tendency was found by Armstrong and McAdams (2009) in their study about gender cues and their influence on perceptions of credibility in informational blogs: male blog writers were judged as more credible than female blog writers.

In conclusion, findings regarding endorser's gender on consumer responses are limited and mixed. Credibility, however, seems to be an important factor in persuading consumers, also in relation to the endorser's gender. Several studies showed that, in general, male sources are perceived as more credible than female sources. Therefore, this study assumes that this same tendency will occur. This leads to the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses:

H2: *Male endorsers are more effective than female endorsers.*

H2a: *Male endorsers are more effective than female endorsers in reducing consumers' perceived physical risks.*

H2b: *Male endorsers are more effective than female endorsers in positively effecting consumers' attitudes toward the advertisement.*

H2c: *Male endorsers are more effective than female endorsers in positively effecting consumers' product attitudes.*

H2d: *Male endorsers are more effective than female endorsers in increasing consumers' purchase intentions.*

2.3 Audience's gender

As mentioned, the audience's gender is an important factor in studying consumer responses: men and women need to be approached by marketers in different ways, since men and women process advertisements differently (selectivity hypothesis). In addition, Rossi and Rossi (1985) examined whether men and women differ in the perception of women in magazine advertisements. Male and female students rated ten target advertisements and ten control advertisements on appeal and perceived sexism. The findings showed women were more likely than men to find advertisements sexist. Furthermore, Wolin (2005) mentioned, based on two studies (Kates & Shaw-Garlock, 1999; Widgery & McGaugh, 1993), that, although it now seems less predominant, women are more negative than men toward stereotypical role portrayals in advertisements.

In relation to the present study, research has shown a difference between men and women regarding risky situations. Frequently, men are described as more risk-taking than women (e.g., Areni & Kiecker, 1993, as cited in Mitchell & Walsh, 2004). This could be explained by the fact that men tend to judge risks as smaller and less problematic (Slovic, 1999). In terms of consumer behaviour, men have a lower tendency to perceive product risk than their female counterparts (Darley & Smith, 1995). Croson and Gneezy (2009) investigated ten papers on gender differences with regard to general risk

preferences. They discovered the same tendency: men are willing to take risks more often than women.

Thus, although the above studies' contexts differ from this study, it seems that men generally have a lower perceived physical product risk than women. Combining this with the relationship among low levels of perceived risk, attitudes toward the advertisement, product attitudes, and purchase intentions, the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses are presented:

H3: *Men have more positive consumer responses than women.*

H3a: *Men have lower perceived physical product risk in comparison to their female counterparts.*

H3b: *Men have more positive attitudes toward the advertisement in comparison to their female counterparts.*

H3c: *Men have more positive consumers' product attitudes in comparison to their female counterparts.*

H3d: *Men have more positive consumers' purchase intentions in comparison to their female counterparts.*

2.4 Relationships between endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender

The interactions between the previous independent variables are not often studied, especially not within the context of the present study. Therefore, it is not possible to state founded hypotheses for all the interactions. However, it is possible for the interactions between endorser type and endorser's gender, and between endorser's gender and audience's gender. Therefore, the first two subsections elaborate on literature related to these interactions and provide the hypotheses regarding the interactions. Afterward, the third subsection will introduce the other interactions and a research question.

2.4.1 Relationship between endorser type and endorser's gender

The first possible interaction is between endorser type and endorser's gender. Freiden (1984) did not find an interaction effect between these two variables. However, Berry and Brownlow (1989, as cited by Deknock, 2012) found that the audience indicated a female endorser in the role of a typical consumer as more credible and a male endorser more credible in an expert role. This finding indicates that females are most successful in consumer roles and males in roles of expert endorsers. In addition, combining Berry and Brownlow's (1989) findings with Meyers-Levy's (1988) study, which found that an advertisement is more persuasive in cases of gender-appropriate sex roles, the male endorser in the role of an expert and the female endorser in the role of a consumer seem to be the gender-appropriate sex roles and therefore the best to use. This has led to the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses:

H4: *Advertisements are more effective when the endorser is pictured in a gender-appropriate role than when pictured in a gender-inappropriate role.*

H4a: When an endorser is pictured in a gender-appropriate role, the perceived physical risk is lower than in the case of a gender-inappropriate role.

H4b: When an endorser is pictured in a gender-appropriate role, the consumers' attitudes toward the advertisement are more positive than in the case of a gender-inappropriate role.

H4c: When an endorser is pictured in a gender-appropriate role, the consumers' product attitudes are more positive than in the case of a gender-inappropriate role.

H4d: When an endorser is pictured in a gender-appropriate role, the consumers' purchase intentions are more positive than in the case of a gender-inappropriate role.

2.4.2 Relationship between endorser's gender and audience's gender

Literature about the interaction between endorser's gender and audience's gender is mixed. Some studies found results in favour of same sex appeal; others found results in favour of opposite sex appeal. For example, Edwards and La Ferle (2009) found better consumer responses in cases of gender-congruence: women indicated female endorsers as more trustworthy and men indicated male endorsers as more trustworthy. To be more precise, Edwards and La Ferle (2009) examined the effectiveness of celebrity endorsements by exploring the relationship of a respondents' gender to the identification with the spokesperson and the processing of negative information about that celebrities' behaviour. Conversely, Simpson, Horton, and Brown's (1996) study resulted in better consumer responses in cases of non-gender-congruence. However, it is important to note the context of this study: the effects of male nudity in print ads on several consumer responses, focused on body oil and a wrench set. Although both studies are not comparable to the current study, it seems that gender-congruence is more applicable because of the role of trustworthiness, which is an important factor of credibility (Ohanian, 1990). Therefore, same sex appeal seems to have more positive influences on consumer responses in case of innovative products with high physical risks than opposite sex appeal.

However, apart from gender, some theories and findings may be useful in exploring the influence of endorser's gender on perceived physical product risk and other related consumer responses. First, according to the congruency theory, advertising models are more effective when their characteristics are perceived as similar to the characteristics of the consumers (Edwards & La Ferle, 2009). Secondly, Kelman (1961) mentioned that individuals are more likely to adopt a message when the sender is perceived as similar to themselves. Therefore, this statement agrees with the matching hypothesis. Thirdly, message effectiveness is increased when sources' perceive familiarity and similarity along with attractiveness (McGuire, 1985, as cited in Edwards & La Ferle, 2009).

Thus, since congruence, or similarity, has positive effects on consumer responses and opposite sex appeal seems to be more applicable in cases of other type of products (e.g. with a lower physical risk), the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses are presented:

H5: Advertisements are more effective when there is gender congruence between the endorsers and the consumer.

H5a: When there is gender congruence between the endorser and the consumer, the perceived physical product risk is lower than in cases of gender non-congruence.

H5b: When there is gender congruence between the endorser and the consumer, the consumers' attitudes toward the advertisement are more positive than in cases of gender non-congruence.

H5c: When there is gender congruence between the endorser and the consumer, the consumers' product attitudes are more positive than in cases of gender non-congruence.

H5d: When there is gender congruence between the endorser and the consumer, the consumers' purchase intentions are more positive than in cases of gender non-congruence.

2.4.3 Other relationships

Regarding other possible interactions, the literature is very limited. Darley and Smith's (1995) study provided minimal information about the possible interaction between endorser type and audience's gender. However, they found empirical support that men and women process advertising claims differently. The women's results showed that, in cases of increasing product risk, objective advertising claims caused more favourable responses than subjective advertising claims, in contrast to the men's results where no differences were found. This leads to the assumption that women prefer expert endorsers (objective) and men have no preference.

Furthermore, findings related to the interaction endorser type, endorser's gender and audience's gender does not exist. Because of this non-existent information and since the information about the interaction endorser type and audience's gender is limited and unclear the following research sub-question was drafted:

***SRQ:** To what extent do interaction effects exist between endorser type and audience's gender and among endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender in cases of innovative high physical risk products?*

3. Method

This chapter will describe the methodology of the study. The first section will introduce the experimental design. Section 3.2 will give information about the preliminary investigation, and the stimulus materials. Section 3.3 gives then information about the measures used and their reliability. Next, the study's procedure will be explained; more detailed information about the main study will be elaborated on here as well. Afterward, the study's sample will be described in section 3.5 and information the randomisation check will be presented in section 3.6. Finally, section 3.7 will explain the validity of the measures.

3.1 Experimental design

For this study, an experimental design was used in order to study the effect of two endorser types, two endorser genders, and two audience genders on several consumer responses, including the perceived physical product risk. The hypotheses were tested using a between-subjects design, since this design minimises carryover effects. This resulted in a two (endorser type) by two (endorser gender) by two (audience gender) design (see Table 1). Table 1 also mentions the final number of respondents per condition.

Table 1

Two (endorser type) x two (endorser gender) x two (audience gender) design, including numbers of respondents

	Expert		Consumer	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Male audience	31	42	41	41
Female audience	39	51	53	47

3.2 Stimulus materials

Four fictitious advertisements for a 3-in-1 boiling water tap, a product associated with high physical risk, were used to manipulate the independent variables. The advertisements all had the same layout and tone but differed in endorser type (expert versus consumer) and endorser's gender (male versus female). In order to eliminate influences like age and attractiveness, a preliminary investigation, consisting of three focus group sessions, was conducted to select the endorser models. Figure 1 shows the final endorser models. Appendix A contains more in-depth information about the focus group sessions and Appendix B contains photos of all ten possible endorsers.

The focus group sessions were also used to explore the photos' settings in relation to expert and consumer representations. Appendix A provides more detailed information about this topic as well. In addition, the chosen photo settings were based on a content analysis of advertisements in several magazines (Appendix C). The preliminary investigation, therefore, resulted in four different advertisements, as presented in Figure 2.



Figure 1. Final endorser models, representing experts as well as consumers

3.3 Instrument and measures

In order to collect the data, a questionnaire was used. The data was collected by online distribution of the questionnaire. Online distribution is preferred over offline distribution because of multiple advantages, such as increased speed, lower costs, increased time efficiency, increased accuracy, fewer socially desirable answers, and more highly motivated respondents because they can choose where and when they will complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed based on several variables, as discussed in the first two chapters. The following subsections will describe these variables and how they were measured. Before distribution, the questionnaire was tested among 11 subjects in order to discover ambiguities. These findings are presented in Appendix D. Furthermore, the constructs' Cronbach's alpha (α) levels will be presented.

3.3.1 Control variable: risk aversion

As stated, risk aversion can influence the consumers' perceived product risk and, consequently, the consumers' attitudes and purchase intentions. Because of this, the concept was measured with the questionnaire. Risk aversion was measured by Meertens and Lion's (2008) risk propensity scale. One of the seven questions from the scale is as follows: "I take risks frequently". In this study, the construct was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, in contrast to the original 9-point Likert scale. During their study, Meertens and Lion (2008) had an α of .77, and Olthof (2009) found this same α . The current study found an α of .81 ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.62$).

The figure displays four panels of AquaSpot 3-in-1 faucet advertisements, arranged in a 2x2 grid. Each panel features the AquaSpot logo at the top, followed by the text 'KOUD, WARM ÉN KOKEND WATER'. Below this is a large image of the faucet and a smaller inset photo of a testimonial. The bottom of each panel features the Inventum logo.

Top Left Panel: Testimonial from Anne, a 40-year-old mother of three children. The inset photo shows her in a kitchen. The text reads: "Mijn ervaring met de 3-in-1-kookkraan is werkelijk fantastisch! Ik kan hem iedereen aanraden."

Top Right Panel: Testimonial from Anne de Vries, a warm water expert. The inset photo shows her in a kitchen setting, pointing at a whiteboard. The text reads: "De 3-in-1-kookkraan is een waardevolle toevoeging voor iedere keuken. Iedereen zal er plezier van hebben."

Bottom Left Panel: Testimonial from Daan, a 40-year-old father of three children. The inset photo shows him in a kitchen. The text reads: "Mijn ervaring met de 3-in-1-kookkraan is werkelijk fantastisch! Ik kan hem iedereen aanraden."

Bottom Right Panel: Testimonial from Daan de Vries, a warm water expert. The inset photo shows him in a kitchen setting, pointing at a whiteboard. The text reads: "De 3-in-1-kookkraan is een waardevolle toevoeging voor iedere keuken. Iedereen zal er plezier van hebben."

Figure 2. Final stimulus materials

3.3.2 Attitude toward the advertisement

The attitude toward the advertisement construct was measured by five questions, which were based on Lee and Mason's (1999) scale. These scientists indicated an α of .91, and later, Lee (2000) found an α of .93. Examples of the items were "I do not like the advertisement" and "I find this an attractive advertisement". In order to match the other scales in this study, this construct was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree) instead of the original 7-point scale. The reliability check of the construct within this study showed an α of .88 ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.77$).

3.3.3 Product attitude

The construct, product attitude, is based on a three item scale of Van der Doest (n.d., as cited in Peters, 2005). Peters (2005) found three Cronbach's alpha levels, all above .7 (0.78, 0.74, and 0.9), for the scale. In addition, two questions were added to measure this study's construct. These questions were based on the attitude toward Lee and Mason's (1999) advertisement scale. The construct was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree). The final construct consisted of five questions (e.g., "The 3-in-1 boiling water tap is not appealing to me") and had an α of .87 ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 0.74$).

3.3.4 Purchase intention

The concept, purchase intention, is based on the Ajzen and Fishbein's reliable three item semantic differential scale (as cited in Oliver & Bearden, 1985). For this scale, Oliver and Bearden (1985) found an α of .96. The bipolar adjectives were measured on a 5-point scale and consisted of, according to Ajzen and Fishbein, likely-unlikely, probable-improbable, and possible-impossible. In this study, these adjectives were supplemented with certainly-uncertainly. The final α of this construct was .95 ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.99$).

3.3.5 Perceived physical product risk

Since a scale of this study's exact concept did not exist, the researcher had to create a scale. This scale was partly based on Cases's (2002) definition of perceived physical risk, on Tan's (1999) perceived product risk scale, and on Suplet, Suárez, and Martin's (2009) scale. It resulted in six questions about perceived physical risk measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree). An example of the questions is "I am afraid that the 3-in-1 boiling water tap will inflict physical damage on me". The α of this study's construct was .89 ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 0.77$).

3.4 Procedure

The participants were recruited by invitation via email and social media, as well as face-to-face. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions presented in Table 1 and required to complete an online questionnaire (see Appendix E). First, the respondents were asked questions regarding their backgrounds, one of which concerned gender. Other questions concerned the respondents' ages, living situations (partner, children, etc.), ownership of boiled water taps, and

current risk aversion levels. These questions were all asked to discover and explain later unexpected or unclear results. Furthermore, this portion of the questionnaire included a manipulation check. This check consisted of two questions: one about the endorser type and endorser's gender (What was the type and gender of the person central within the advertisement?) and one about the product (What product was central within the advertisement?). Afterward, the participants were exposed to one of the stimulus materials presented in Figure 2. Next to the exposure, the participants needed to answer questions about their attitudes toward the advertisement, their product attitudes, their purchase intentions, and their perceived physical product risk. At the end of the questionnaire, the participants could provide comments and were thanked for their participation.

3.5 Participants

Before conducting the analyses, the dataset, extracted from the online survey tool, was screened, i.e., unusable and/or unclear data were removed. A total of 514 respondents started the questionnaire. Unfortunately, 169 of these questionnaires were not suitable for further analysis because the respondents did not complete the questionnaires, answered one or both of the manipulation check questions incorrectly, were too young, or gave implausible answers. Table 2 shows the number of respondents who failed the manipulation check. Interpretation of this check shows that the female expert was frequently seen as the female consumer.

Table 2

Manipulation check: actual endorser type/gender versus mentioned endorser type/gender

	Male expert	Female expert	Male consumer	Female consumer	Total
Advertisement: Male expert	99	2	3	0	104
Advertisement: Female expert	0	70	1	31	102
Advertisement: Male consumer	9	0	91	1	101
Advertisement: Female consumer	2	8	0	99	109
Total	110	80	95	131	416

Note: Unfinished questionnaires were excluded from this check

Furthermore, the occurrences of values within cases were checked in order to discover respondents who provided the same answer to every item. These cases would eventually be deleted from further analysis. However, none of the respondents provided the same answer every time.

3.6 Randomisation check

In the end, data from 345 respondents (44.9% men and 55.1% women) was used in this study. Most of the respondents were highly educated (84.7% had an educational level of wo-master, wo-bachelor, or hbo). The participants were between 18 to 74 years old ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.62$). There were no significant differences between age ($F(7, 337) = .87$, $p = .53$), $\eta_p^2 = .02$. In addition, risk aversion did significantly differ between the conditions ($F(7, 337) = 2.4$, $p = .02$), $\eta_p^2 = .05$. However, a Post Hoc Tukey test did not indicate any significant differences with $p < .05$. Nevertheless, it did show some differences with $p < .1$ (see Table 3). Only 18 respondents were the owners of boiling water taps

(single or 3-in-1). Furthermore, 327 respondents did not have any boiling water taps in their households. Therefore, there were not great imbalances among the respondents. A slight imbalance was found between the female audience/female consumer endorser condition: a slightly larger number of women who lived together with a partner and children ($n = 17$). Additionally, the male audience/male expert condition had a slight overage of men who lived with their partner ($n = 17$). The same tendency was observed for the female audience/female consumer condition regarding familiarity with the 3-in-1 boiling water tap ($n = 24$). More detailed respondent data per condition is presented in Table 3.

3.7 Validity check of measures

After exploring the sample, the measures within the questionnaire were checked on validity. In doing so, two principal component analyses (rotated varimax) were conducted. The first principal component analysis was conducted for the 28 items in order to explore their underlying components. In this study, the factor analysis was appropriate since the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy value is .89, the Bartlett's test of sphericity value is significant ($p = .000$), and several correlation coefficients were above .3. The analysis resulted in six components with an initial eigenvalue greater than one which explained 68.32% of the total variance. The screeplot showed a change after five components, the number which was expected based on the theory. Therefore, it was decided to retain five components for further investigation. The five-component solution resulted in a 64.6% explanation of the total variance. The five rotated components and their items completely matched the theory. The results of the analysis, therefore, supported the use of the constructs, as expected based on the literature.

Table 3

Socio-demographic data per condition

	Male audience								Female audience								Total	
	ME (n = 42)		FE (n = 31)		FM (n = 41)		FC (n = 41)		ME (n = 51)		FE (n = 39)		MC (n = 47)		FC (n = 53)		N = 345	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Age	33.50	13.14	35.16	15.02	32.90	13.20	33.49	13.25	34.69	14.43	30.05	10.99	30.70	10.75	31.58	10.45	32.69	12.62
Risk averseness	3.16	0.62	2.98 ^{ab}	0.62	3.22	0.63	3.06	0.72	3.32	0.60	3.41 ^a	0.55	3.39 ^b	0.54	3.29	0.59	3.24	0.62
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Educational level																		
Wo-master	16	38.1	15	48.4	16	39.0	17	41.5	25	49.0	18	46.2	16	34.0	25	47.2	148	42.9
Wo-bachelor	1	2.4	1	3.2	3	7.3	3	7.3	4	7.8	4	10.3	4	8.5	3	5.7	23	6.7
Hbo	19	45.2	9	29.0	16	39.0	15	36.6	13	25.5	10	25.6	23	48.9	16	30.2	121	35.1
Mbo	5	11.9	2	6.5	6	14.6	6	14.6	5	9.8	7	17.9	2	4.3	5	9.4	38	11.0
Vwo									2	3.9					1	1.9	3	0.9
Havo	1	2.4	1	3.2					1	2.0			2	4.3	2	3.8	7	2.0
Vmbo			1	3.2					1	2.0					1	1.9	3	0.9
Primary school			2	6.5													2	0.6
None																		
Other																		
Living situation																		
With parent(s)/caretaker(s)	3	7.1	7	22.6	14	34.1	8	19.5	8	15.7	9	23.1	9	19.1	7	13.2	65	18.8
In lodgings	9	21.4	4	12.9	6	14.6	6	14.6	9	17.6	10	25.6	10	21.3	10	18.9	64	18.6
Alone	5	11.9	3	9.7	9	22.0	6	14.6	6	11.8	4	10.3	3	6.4	6	11.3	42	12.2
With partner	17	40.5	10	32.3	6	14.6	12	29.3	14	27.5	7	17.9	15	31.9	13	24.5	94	27.2
With children (without a partner)					1	2.4			3	5.9	2	5.1					6	1.7
With partner and children	8	19.0	7	22.6	5	12.2	8	19.5	11	21.6	7	17.9	10	21.3	17	32.1	73	21.2
Other							1	2.4									1	0.3
Familiarity 3-in-1 boiling water tap																		
Heard of it	19	45.2	19	61.3	30	73.2	29	70.7	28	54.9	19	48.7	29	61.7	24	45.3	197	57.1
Heard of it and used it	7	16.7	4	12.9	2	4.9	5	12.2	9	17.6	8	20.5	9	19.1	5	9.4	49	14.2
No	16	38.1	8	25.8	9	22.0	7	17.1	14	27.5	12	30.8	9	19.1	24	45.3	99	28.7
Ownership boiling water tap																		
Single	1	2.4	1	3.2	2	4.9	2	4.9	2	3.9	2	5.1	2	4.3	2	3.8	14	4.1
3-in-1	1	2.4	1	3.2			1	2.4	1	2.0							4	1.2
No	40	95.2	29	93.5	39	95.1	38	92.7	48	94.1	37	94.9	45	95.7	51	96.2	327	94.8

Mean scores followed by the same letter within the same row are significantly different a $p < .1$

4. Results

Two by two by two between-groups analyses of covariances were conducted in order to explore the influences of the independent variables (endorser type, endorser gender, and audience gender) on the dependent variables (perceived physical product risk, attitude toward the advertisement, attitude toward the product, and purchase intention), as well as the interaction effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables. Risk aversion scores were used as a covariate to control for individual differences. Before executing these analyses, preliminary analyses were performed to ensure influences of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. Section 4.1 will discuss the results related to the perceived physical product risk. Afterward, section 4.2 will focus on the dependent variable product attitude and its results. Next, the results of attitude toward the advertisement will be described in section 4.3. The last section of this chapter, section 4.4, will review the purchase intention.

4.1 Perceived physical product risk

The mean scores of perceived physical product risk do show slight differences between expert endorsers and consumer endorsers, respectively $M = 2.71$ and $M = 2.6$ (Table 4). In order to investigate the exact influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable perceived physical product risk, however, a two by two by two between-groups analysis of covariance was conducted (Table 5). This analysis did not show any significant effect of the independent variables. Risk aversion, the covariate, however, was significant. Two percent of the variance of perceived physical product risk can be explained by risk aversion.

No interaction effect between endorser type and endorser's gender was found. The same non-significance was apparent between audience's gender and endorser type and between audience's gender and endorser's gender. Furthermore, the interaction effect of endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender on perceived physical product risk was not significant.

Therefore, the hypotheses H1a, H2a, H3a, H4a, and H5a are unsupported.

Table 4

Means per independent variable for perceived physical product risk

		Expert endorser	Consumer endorser	Total
		M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Male audience	Male endorser	2.69(0.85)	2.64(0.91)	2.66(0.88)
	Female endorser	2.68(0.72)	2.50(0.76)	2.58(0.74)
	Total	2.68(0.79)	2.57(0.83)	2.62(0.82)
Female audience	Male endorser	2.68(0.77)	2.57(0.77)	2.62(0.77)
	Female endorser	2.80(0.65)	2.65(0.73)	2.72(0.70)
	Total	2.73(0.72)	2.60(0.75)	2.67(0.74)
Total		2.71(0.75)	2.60(0.79)	2.65(0.77)

Measured on a 5-point Likert scale

Table 5

Impact of independent variables on perceived physical product risk

	df	Error	F	p	η_p^2
Risk aversion	1	337	5.38	.02	.02
Endorser type	1	337	2.20	.14	.01
Endorser's gender	1	337	0.15	.70	.00
Audience's gender	1	337	0.10	.93	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender	1	337	0.20	.66	.00
Endorser type × audience's gender	1	337	0.00	.99	.00
Endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	0.80	.37	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	0.13	.72	.00

4.2 Attitude toward the advertisement

The means of attitudes toward the advertisement per condition did not show many great differences in scores (Table 6). However, a tendency in favour of consumer endorsers in comparison to expert endorsers is remarkable. A two by two by two between-groups analysis of covariance was conducted in order to explore the exact impact of the independent variables on attitude toward the advertisement (Table 7). Risk aversion had a significant influence on this attitude. However, just 1% of the variance in this attitude is explained by risk aversion. Furthermore, the analysis showed that endorser type did have a main effect on this attitude, but the effect size was small. This means that the proportion of the variance of attitude toward the advertisement can be explained by endorser type of just 1.8%. It was hypothesised (H1b) that expert endorsers should be more effective than consumer endorser in positively effecting this attitude; however, this analysis showed a significant opposite influence: the consumer endorsers were more effective in positively influencing the attitude towards the advertisement than the expert endorsers ($M_{\text{expert}} = 2.77$, $SD_{\text{expert}} = 0.78$ versus $M_{\text{consumer}} = 2.96$, $SD_{\text{consumer}} = 0.75$). Neither the endorser's gender nor the audience's gender had a significant main effect on attitude toward the advertisement.

Furthermore, no significant two-way or three-way interaction effects were found in the analysis. Therefore, all other expected relationships related to attitude toward the advertisement were not significant, which means H2b, H3b, H4b, and H5b can be rejected.

Table 6

Means per independent variable for attitude toward the advertisement

		Expert endorser	Consumer endorser	Total
		M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Male audience	Male endorser	2.88(0.80)	2.95(0.68)	2.91(0.74)
	Female endorser	2.55(0.86)	2.92(0.98)	2.76(0.94)
	Total	2.74(0.84)	2.94(0.84)	2.84(0.84)
Female audience	Male endorser	2.83(0.71)	2.97(0.71)	2.90(0.71)
	Female endorser	2.76(0.78)	3.00(0.67)	2.90(0.72)
	Total	2.80(0.74)	2.99(0.68)	2.90(0.71)
Total		2.77(0.78)	2.96(0.75)	2.87(0.77)

Measured on a 5-point Likert scale

Table 7

Impact of independent variables on attitude toward the advertisement

	df	Error	F	p	η_p^2
Risk aversion	1	337	3.97	.05	.01
Endorser type	1	337	5.94	.02	.02
Endorser's gender	1	337	1.04	.31	.00
Audience's gender	1	337	0.12	.73	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender	1	337	1.53	.22	.01
Endorser type × audience's gender	1	337	0.01	.92	.00
Endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	0.63	.43	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	0.24	.62	.00

4.3 Product attitude

The mean product attitude scores and standard deviations did not show major differences between the conditions (Table 8). A two by two by two between-groups analysis of covariance was conducted to explore the exact impact of the endorser type, the endorser's gender, and the audience's gender on product attitudes (Table 9). The covariate risk aversion was not significant. The other results did not show any statistically significant main effect of the independent variables.

Furthermore, the analysis did not find a significant interaction between endorser type and endorser's gender. Moreover, no significant interaction was found between endorser's type and audience's gender on product attitude or for endorser's gender and audience's gender on product attitude. Additionally, a three-way interaction effect on product attitude among all the independent variables was not found.

Therefore, this study did not find any support for hypotheses H1c, H2c, H3c, H4c, and H5c. Consequently, these hypotheses are unsupported.

Table 8

Means per independent variable for product attitude

		Expert endorser	Consumer endorser	Total
		M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Male audience	Male endorser	3.39(0.76)	3.40(0.61)	3.39(0.69)
	Female endorser	3.41(0.71)	3.52(0.86)	3.47(0.80)
	Total	3.39(0.73)	3.50(0.74)	3.43(0.74)
Female audience	Male endorser	3.37(0.75)	3.44(0.81)	3.41(0.78)
	Female endorser	3.38(0.69)	3.45(0.73)	3.42(0.71)
	Total	3.38(0.72)	3.45(0.76)	3.41(0.74)
Total		3.38(0.72)	3.45(0.75)	3.42(0.74)

Measured on a 5-point Likert scale

Table 9

Impact of independent variables on product attitude

	df	Error	F	p	η_p^2
Risk aversion	1	337	1.00	.32	.00
Endorser type	1	337	0.60	.44	.00
Endorser's gender	1	337	0.34	.56	.00
Audience's gender	1	337	0.15	.70	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender	1	337	0.10	.76	.00
Endorser type × audience's gender	1	337	0.01	.92	.00
Endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	0.25	.62	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	0.06	.81	.00

4.4 Purchase intention

The mean scores and standard deviations of purchase intention did not show great differences between the conditions as was expected (Table 10). A two by two by two between-groups analysis of covariance was completed in order to discover the impact of the independent variables on purchase intention (Table 11). Risk aversion, the covariate, was not significant. Interpretation of the other values indicated only non-significant effects, which means that endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender were not significantly related to purchase intention.

The analysis did not show any interactions between the independent variables and purchase intention; the effect of endorser type combined with endorser's gender was non-significant, as was audience's gender regarding endorser's type and audience's gender regarding endorser's gender. The same non-significant tendency was found when examining the possible three-way interaction between endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender.

Thus, the hypotheses H1d, H2d, H3d, H4d, and H5d are all unsupported and, therefore, cannot be accepted.

Table 10

Means per independent variable for purchase intention

		Expert endorser	Consumer endorser	Total
		M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Male audience	Male endorser	2.76(0.97)	2.67(0.92)	2.71(0.94)
	Female endorser	2.74(1.16)	3.02(0.99)	2.90(1.07)
	Total	2.75(1.04)	2.84(0.97)	2.80(1.00)
Female audience	Male endorser	2.82(0.98)	2.86(0.97)	2.84(0.97)
	Female endorser	2.85(0.98)	2.74(1.04)	2.79(1.01)
	Total	2.84(0.97)	2.80(1.00)	2.81(0.99)
Total		2.80(1.00)	2.82(0.98)	2.81(0.99)

Measured on a 5-point Likert scale

Table 11

Impact of independent variables on purchase intention

	df	Error	F	p	η_p^2
Risk aversion	1	337	0.81	.37	.00
Endorser type	1	337	0.60	.43	.00
Endorser's gender	1	337	0.40	.53	.00
Audience's gender	1	337	0.00	.99	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender	1	337	0.28	.60	.00
Endorser type × audience's gender	1	337	0.34	.56	.00
Endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	1.05	.31	.00
Endorser type × endorser's gender × audience's gender	1	337	1.26	.26	.00

5. Conclusions and discussion

Since more home appliances have high physical risks, because manufacturers adjust their products to consumers' time-saving and simplification needs, reducing perceived physical product risk should be an important focus for marketers. This study attempted to investigate how to reduce this risk dimension among consumers by manipulating the endorser type and the endorser's gender. Additionally, the study took into account the audience's gender. This chapter formulates conclusions and discussion points related to the study. The first section will introduce the conclusions, according to the independent variables. The second section will give some implications and the last section, section 5.3, will discuss the limitations of the study and will give some directions for further research as well.

5.1 Conclusions and theoretical implications

This study's research question was as follows: "To what extent are endorsers effective in positively affecting consumer responses to advertisements of products with physical risks?" This study did not investigate whether endorsers influence consumer responses but did investigate to what extent endorser characteristics, as in endorser type and endorser's gender, influence consumer responses. According to this study, only endorser type significantly influenced consumer attitudes toward the advertisement. Moreover, men and women audiences did not respond differently to the advertisement. In addition, interactions between the independent variables were not found. This section will present more in-depth information regarding the results and will link them to the literature. Per independent variable, the main results and the corresponding conclusions of the study will be presented. Section 5.1.1 will focus on endorser type, and section 5.1.2 will discuss the endorser's gender. Next, section 5.1.3, will elaborate on the audience's gender. The last section, section 5.1.4, will provide the conclusions related to all the possible interactions.

5.1.1 Endorser type

This study investigated whether an expert endorser or a consumer endorser is the most effective in improving the consumers' perceived physical product risk, attitudes toward the advertisement, product attitudes, and purchase intentions. Based on the scientific literature, it was expected that expert endorsers should be more effective than consumer endorsers. However, the study's results did not find support for this assumption. In fact, the results showed the opposite effect regarding the dependent variable attitude toward the advertisement; consumer endorsers were significantly better at improving the attitude toward the advertisement than expert endorsers. Endorser type did not have a significant impact on the other measured consumer responses.

As stated, these results conflicted with the theory, which found that expert endorsers seemed to be greater risk relievers than consumer endorser. Studies of Tan (1999), Biswas et al. (2006), Friedman and Friedman (1979, as cited in Dean & Biswas, 2001 and in Pornpitakpan, 2006), and Freiden (1982, as cited in Pornpitakpan, 2006), all found results in favour of expert endorsers as the most effective risk relievers. These studies, however, used different situational contexts and/or

perceived product risk dimensions than the current study. The context, as well as the perceived product risk dimension can, therefore, both be an explanation of the current study's unexpected results. Furthermore, although the above studies did use products somewhat comparable to the current study, it is still possible that the nature of the products was overly different and affected the results.

Another explanation could be found in persuasion by credibility and/or similarity. Since experts, in general, persuade by credibility and consumers by similarity, and most studies indicated expert endorsers as the most successful, it was expected that credibility for this kind of product was more important than similarity. However, none of these studies did use exactly the same type of product as within this study. Therefore, it is possible that similarity should have had more influence than expected on beforehand and should have had a more central position within the study. Moreover, this study perhaps has overestimated the influence of credibility. To conclude, although the studies as elaborated in the literature review did use products and/or contexts which were somewhat comparable to that of the present study it is possible that the finding of Friedman and Friedman (1979; as cited in Lin, Wang, & Chen, 2008) is still applicable: the effectiveness of endorsers varies according to the nature of the product.

Therefore, based on the current study, consumer endorsers are slightly more effective than expert endorsers in cases of innovative high physical risk kitchen appliances. However, this only applies when the goal is to positively affect attitudes toward the advertisement. When improving consumers' perceived physical product risk, product attitudes, or purchase intentions, there was no difference found in using expert or consumer endorsers.

5.1.2 Endorser's gender

The results of the present study did not find any significant relationships between endorser's gender and the dependent variables perceived physical product risk, attitudes toward the advertisement, product attitudes, and purchase intentions. This is in contrast to what was expected. The assumption was that male endorsers were more effective than female endorsers. Although not all of the literature agreed with this expectation, it was at least expected that one should be more effective than the other since many studies did find significant better effects of one of the genders over the other (e.g. Debevec & Iyer, 1986; Debevec & Kernan, 1984; Kanungo & Prang, 1973; Lin et al., 2008; Peetz, Parks, & Spencer, 2004 as cited in Sawatari, 2006; Porpitakpan, 2006).

Since scientific literature found that high-credibility sources are more effective and persuasive and male endorsers seemed to be perceived as more credible, it was expected that male endorsers would provoke better consumer responses than female endorsers. However, during the preliminary investigation, the male and female endorsers were chosen based on similarity. Therefore, it is possible that this credibility effect, just as age and attractiveness, was already covered here and that both

endorsers were perceived with the same credibility level, and credibility would, therefore, not influence the results.

Furthermore, this unexpected result may be explained by literature on stereotypical advertisement and product gender. Several studies have shown that in consumer responses to advertisements and spokespersons, the purchase intention and actual behaviour are more positive in cases of gender stereotypical advertisements than in cases of non-gender stereotypical advertisements (Courtney & Whipple, 1983, as cited in Nijhof, 2011). Gender stereotypical advertisements are advertisements which mirror what is expected from the endorser's gender, for example, males as career men and females as mothers or boys playing with toy cars and trucks and girls playing with dolls. Moreover, this study's chosen product cannot be referred as a typical feminine product, because of the home appliance character, or as a typical masculine product, because of the industrial and technical character. Therefore, it may be referred to as a neutral product and, therefore, is acceptable as stereotypical for men and women. Together this leads to the explanation that, with this type of product, the male and female endorsers can both be seen as stereotypical and, therefore, both as appropriate endorsers for the product. If so, the findings, the non-significant influence of endorser's gender, of the present study make sense.

In sum, this study indicated that it does not matter whether advertisements use a male endorser or a female endorser in cases of innovative products with physical risks. However, this is only the case for this specific type of product and these specific endorsers.

5.1.3 Audience's gender

This study investigated whether a male audience responded differently to advertisements than a female audience. Based on the theory, it was expected that men would have more positive consumer responses than women. Overall, the results of this study showed that women had higher mean scores than men on the consumer responses (with the exception of product attitude), but these differences were not significant. Therefore, the present study did not find any significant influences of audience's gender, for men or for women. This means that this study's consumer responses did not differ between male and female respondents. The risk aversion level, however, did differ between the male and female audiences.

This non-gender difference could be caused by the study's advertised product. Worth, Smith, and Mackie (1992, as cited by Nijhof, 2011) found that consumers prefer products which match their preferred gender characteristics. As mentioned, the product in the advertisement could be seen as both a feminine product, because of the home appliance character, and a masculine product because of the industrial and technical character. Combining this with congruency literature leads to the following: men will choose masculine products and women feminine products. However, since this product is neither typically masculine nor typically feminine, it is possible that both females and males appreciated it in the same way. This is a plausible explanation for the current study's findings.

In addition, although beyond the scope of this study, a significant difference between the male and female audience on the level of risk aversion was found. This supports Darley and Smith's (1995) statement that men have a lower tendency to perceive product risks than their female counterparts. Even so, this result also supports what Areni and Kiecker (1993, as cited in Mitchell & Walsh, 2004), Slovic (1999), and Croson and Gneezy (2009) found: men are more risk-taking than women and tend to judge risks as smaller and as less problematic.

To sum up, this study did not find support for an influence of audience's gender on consumer responses to advertisements of innovative products with physical risks. Furthermore, this study found support for the fact that men and women differ on their level of risk aversion, whereas the men's level is lower than that the women's level.

5.1.4 Relationships between endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender

This study also investigated the interaction effects between the independent variables. Based on the theory, several hypotheses about the interactions between endorser type and endorser's gender and between endorser's gender and audience's gender were created. Regarding the other possible interactions, a sub-question was posed. This section will explain the results of the study related to these interactions.

First, the interaction between endorser type and endorser's gender was examined. Based on Berry and Brownlow (1989, as cited in Deknock, 2012) and Meyers-Levy (1988), it was expected that gender-appropriate sex roles of the endorsers should lead to more positive consumer responses. The results of the study supported neither this assumption nor the opposite. Therefore, the study's results are consistent with the results of Freiden (1984). An explanation could be that the view of gender-appropriate sex roles changed during the last decades and that a female expert and a male consumer became more normal roles. However, as the manipulation check showed: the female expert endorser was seen as a female consumer endorser many more times than the male expert endorser was indicated as a male consumer endorser.

Second, this study investigated the interaction effect of endorser's gender and audience's gender on consumer responses. Several theories and studies indicated gender-congruence in order to gain the best consumer responses. Therefore, it was expected that gender-congruence should be more effective than non-gender-congruence, but the results of this study did not support this assumption. However, as mentioned, some studies did find support for opposite sex appeal (e.g., Simpson, Horton, & Brown, 1996). Since Simpson et al.'s study did have a completely different context than the current study, it was expected that their results were not applicable to this study. However, since this study did not find significant influences, it is possible that opposite sex appeal took place concurrently with same sex appeal. If so, it make sense that the effect is not visible in the results.

Furthermore, a sub-research question was posed for the other interactions. This question was as follows: "To what extent do interaction effects exist between endorser type and audience's gender and among endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender in the case of innovative high physical risk products?" This question can be answered by the following: in case of innovative high physical risk products there are no interactions between endorser type and audience's gender and among endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender. So, although Darley and Smith's (1995) findings led to the assumption that women prefer expert endorsers, because of the objective character, and men should have no preference in case of risky products, the present study did not find any results which confirm this assumption. However, as Darley and Smith (1995) found when risk was low, objective and subjective claims ended in the same favourable responses. Based on this, it seems it is possible that the 3-in-1 boiling water tap is not perceived as risky at all. If so, it makes sense that there is no interaction between endorser type and audience's gender.

Furthermore, the scientific did not investigate the relation between endorser type, endorser's gender, and audience's gender until now. Therefore, there was not expected anything founded regarding this relation. The present study did not find a significant influence on any of the dependent variables as well. However, that does not necessarily mean that this relation never exist. It is possible that it does exist when studying it in another context.

5.2 Practical implications

As mentioned, this study has contributed to the literature, since this is the first study which tried to examine the impact of endorser type, endorser's gender, audience's gender and their interactions on consumer responses in the case of a high physical risk product. Even so, the results are not consistent with what was expected based on earlier studies. Therefore, a great portion of the risk relieving effect of endorsers is underexposed and needs to be investigated further. Specific research directions will be discussed in the following section.

This study also offers a practical implication for risk relieving among consumers during product advertisements. First, the study's results indicated that one form of endorser type (expert versus consumer), endorser's gender (male versus female), or audience's gender (male versus female) does not elicit more positive influences on perceived physical product attitude, attitude toward the advertisement, product attitude, and purchase intention than the other form. The only exception is that consumer endorsers lead to significantly better attitudes toward the advertisement than expert endorsers. Therefore, if the goal is to achieve favourable consumer attitudes toward advertisements for innovative high physical risk products, it is recommended that a consumer endorser, instead of an expert endorser, is used.

5.3 Limitations of the study and directions for further research

Like any experimental study, this study had its limitations. The first limit concerns the study's product. Within this study, just one type of product with high physical risk, a 3-in-1 boiling water tap, was used. Further research needs to be conducted in order to discover whether the choice for this specific

product influenced the study's results. More specifically, the nature of the product might influence the effectiveness of the endorsers to a greater degree than was accounted for in this study. Therefore, more research is needed in order to gain a better understanding of the important factors, besides the product's risk level, of the product's nature (e.g., products' perceived gender). Even so, during the study it is not measured whether the used product was perceived as risky. Future studies are right to measure this perceived product risk level before or during the actual study. Moreover, for external generalisation duplication of this research is recommended with other products that present a physical risk as well. In addition, Petty, Cacioppo, and Goldman (1981) and Feick and Higie (1992) already showed that personal involvement plays a role within the relation of endorser type and consumer responses. During the present study, although it did not have a central position, it was assumed that the used product could be indicated as high involvement. However, since the findings are not in line with the findings of Petty, Cacioppo and Goldman (1981) and Feick and Higie (1992) further research is needed to investigate this relation further.

Second, studying the variables in another context can lead to new/other findings as well: It is interesting to investigate what happens with the influences of the variables on consumer responses when studying it in the context of a tv-commercial or for example during a live demonstration. Also, using other endorser types, such as CEO's, students, workers (for the specific product as in this study probably a cleaning lady/man), would be interesting.

Third, the sample was not completely representative of the whole adult population. Although a reliable sample was attempted, most of the respondents came from the researcher's network. This resulted in a sample in which most of the respondents were highly educated and were between 22 and 27 years old. Therefore, the findings' external generalisations could be constrained. Further research should examine whether this study's results are also representative of people with a lower level of education and/or elderly people. Even so, it would be interesting to measure responses of other populations when using endorser models of various ages (children, teenagers, and/or elderly).

The fourth limitation concerns the audience's gender. The present study only measured whether the respondent was a man or a woman with one question. However, consumers' preferred gender characteristics do not necessarily match their own gender. Further research is needed to investigate the exact role of preferred gender characteristic factors.

Fifth, respondents may have been primed during the study. The risk aversion construct was measured before the exposure to the advertisement and before the questions addressing the dependent variables. This may have affected the way the respondents viewed the advertisement and, consequently, answered the dependent variable questions. It was a conscious choice to measure risk aversion before the manipulation, since the dependent variables also could have had an influence on the given answers to the risk aversion question. However, examining the impact of this choice in further research is recommended.

The final limitation concerns the study's advertisements. Although these advertisements were constructed as realistically as possible, several respondents indicated the advertisements were amateurish. During future studies, this should be taken into account and a professional should possibly be hired to design the advertisements. Moreover, according to the manipulation check the female expert was indicated as a female consumer. Therefore, further research is right to perform this check before the actual study. In doing so, these studies will reduce the likelihood of excluding many respondents for analyses.

In sum, this study tried to examine the relationship between endorser characteristics and audience's gender on several consumer responses. Most results of this study were not expected based on previous studies' findings. Therefore, further studies within this area are needed in order to gain a more complete and reliable understanding of all possible influences.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Amos, C., Holmes, G., & Strutton, D. (2008). Exploring the relationship between celebrity endorser effects and advertising effectiveness. *International Journal of Advertising*, 27(2), 209-234. Retrieved from <http://www.hull.ac.uk/hcbWeb/media/research/Amos-Holmes-Strutton-IJA-2008.pdf>
- Armstrong, C. L., & McAdams, M. J. (2009). Blogs of information: How gender cues and individual motivations influence perceptions of credibility. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(3), 435-456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01448.x>
- Bao, Y., Zheng Zhou, K., & Su, C. (2003). Face consciousness and risk aversion: Do they affect consumer decision-making?. *Psychology & Marketing*, 20(8), 733-755. doi:10.1002/mar.10094
- Berens, G., Riel, C. B. V., & Bruggen, G. H. V. (2005). Corporate associations and consumer product responses: the moderating role of corporate brand dominance. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(3), 35-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.3.35.66357>
- Biswas, D., Biswas, A., & Das, N. (2006). The differential effects of celebrity and expert endorsements on consumer risk perceptions. The role of consumer knowledge, perceived congruency, and product technology orientation. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(2), 17-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2006.10639231>
- Cases, A. (2002). Perceived risk and risk-reduction strategies in Internet shopping. *The international review of retail, distribution and consumer research*, 12(4), 375-394. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09593960210151162>
- Chen, C. C., Chen, P. K., & Huang, C. E. (2012). Brands and consumer behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 40(1), 105-114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2012.40.1.105>
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *The science of persuasion*. Scientific American, 284, 76-81.
- Consumer Reports. (2014). *Save time in the kitchen: Prepare faster, tastier meals with our top products and practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.consumerreports.org/cro/magazine/2014/02/save-time-in-the-kitchen/index.htm>
- Croson, R., & Gneezy, U. (2009). Gender differences in preferences. *Journal of Economic literature*, 448-474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jel.47.2.448>
- Currás-Pérez, R., & Sánchez-García, I. (2012). Satisfaction and loyalty to a website: The moderating effect of perceived risk. *EsicMarket*, 141, 183-207. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2168310>
- Darley, W. K., & Smith, R. E. (1995). Gender differences in information processing strategies: An empirical test of the selectivity model in advertising response. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(1), 41-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1995.10673467>
- Dean, D. H., & Biswas, A. (2001). Third-party organization endorsement of products: an advertising cue affecting consumer prepurchase evaluation of goods and services. *Journal of Advertising*, 30(4), 41-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2001.10673650>

- Debevec, K., & Iyer, E. (1986). The influence of spokespersons in altering a product's gender image: Implications for advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 15(4), 12-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1986.10673033>
- Debevec, K., & Kernan, J. B. (1984). More evidence on the effects of a presenter's attractiveness some cognitive, affective, and behavioral consequences. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11, 127-32. Retrieved from <http://www.acrwebsite.org/search/view-conference-proceedings.aspx?id=6229>
- Deknock (2012). *Onderzoek naar de impact van wetenschappelijk cues in reclame op ad credibility*. Communicatiewetenschappen, Universiteit Gent, Gent. Retrieved from http://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/001/894/759/RUG01-001894759_2012_0001_AC.pdf
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Edwards, S. M., & La Ferle, C. (2009). Does gender impact the perception of negative information related to celebrity endorsers?. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15(1-2), 22-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10496490902837940#>
- Feick, L., & Higie, R. A. (1992). The effects of preference heterogeneity and source characteristics on ad processing and judgements about endorsers. *Journal of Advertising*, 21(2), 9-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1992.10673364>
- Fink, J. S., Parker, H. M., Cunningham, G. B., & Cuneen, J. (2012). Female athlete endorsers: Determinants of effectiveness. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 13-22. <http://dx.doi.org/0.1016/j.smr.2011.01.003>
- Freiden, J. B. (1984). Advertising spokesperson effects-An examination of endorser type and gender on 2 audiences. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 24(5), 33-41.
- International Markets Bureau. (2010). *Consumer trend report: Convenience*. Retrieved from http://www.gov.mb.ca/agriculture/market-prices-and-statistics/tradestatistics/pubs/canada_convenience_trend_report_en.pdf
- Jarvenpaa, S.L., Tractinsky, N., & Vitale, M. (2000). Consumer trust in an Internet store. *Information technology and management*, 1, 45-71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1999.tb00337.x>
- Kang, M. (1997). The portrayal of women's images in magazine advertisements: Goffman's gender analysis revisited. *Sex roles*, 37, 979-996. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02936350>
- Kanungo, R. N., & Pang, S. (1973). Effects of human models on perceived product quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0037042>
- Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public opinion quarterly*, 25(1), 57-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/266996>
- Lee, Y. H. (2000). Manipulating ad message involvement through information expectancy: effects on attitude evaluation and confidence. *Journal of Advertising*, 29(2), 29-43. <http://dx.doi.org/0.1080/00913367.2000.10673607>
- Lee, S., Lee, J. H., & Garrett, T. C. (2013). A Study of the Attitude toward Convergent Products: A Focus on the Consumer Perception of Functionalities. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(1), 123-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2012.00991.x>

- Lee, Y. H., & Mason, C. (1999). Responses to information incongruity in advertising: The role of expectancy, relevancy, and humor. *Journal of consumer research*, *26*(2), 156-169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/209557>
- Lin, C. T., Wang, K. C., & Chen, W. Y. (2008). Female tour leaders as advertising endorsers. *The Service Industries Journal*, *28*(9), 1265-1275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02642060802230239>
- McCracken, G. (1989). Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of consumer research*, 310-321. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2489512>
- Meertens, R. M., & Lion, R. (2008). Measuring an Individual's Tendency to Take Risks: The Risk Propensity Scale1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(6), 1506-1520. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00357.x>
- Meyers-Levy, J. (1988). The influence of sex roles on judgment. *Journal of consumer research*, 522-530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/209133>
- Meyers-Levy, J., & Maheswaran, D. (1991). Exploring differences in males' and females' processing strategies. *Journal of consumer research*, *18*(1), 63-70. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2489485>
- Mitchell, V. W., & Walsh, G. (2004). Gender differences in German consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *3*(4), 331-346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cb.146>
- Nijhof (2011). *Cars for women: Welk effect heeft een op vrouwen gerichte advertentie van een "mannelijk" product op de vrouwelijk consument?*. Communication Studies, University of Twente, Enschede. Retrieved from <http://purl.utwente.nl/essays/60907>
- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. *Journal of advertising*, 39-52. Retrieved from <http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/24018828/621117008/name/4188769.pdf>
- Oliver, R. L., & Bearden, W. O. (1985). Crossover effects in the theory of reasoned action: A moderating influence attempt. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 324-340. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/254377>
- Olthof (2009). *Risicoreductie en reclame-uitingen: Een onderzoek naar de effecten van schadelijke forumberichten en reparatie-advertenties op de risicoperceptie van consumenten*. Toegepaste Communicatiewetenschap, University of Twente, Enschede. Retrieved from <http://purl.utwente.nl/essays/59588>
- Peters (2005). *Tekst in advertenties: wel of niet noodzakelijk? Een onderzoek naar het effect van verbale verankering op het begrip en de waardering van advertenties*. Communicatiestudies, University of Utrecht, Utrecht. Retrieved from http://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/8265/verslag_definitief_nogmaals.doc?sequence=1
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *41*(5), 847. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.41.5.847>
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades' evidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *34*(2), 243-281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02547.x>

- Roselius, T. (1971). Consumer rankings of risk reduction methods. *Journal of marketing*, 35(1), 56-61. Retrieved from <http://140.117.77.118/2011/vanessa/%E6%96%87%E7%8D%BB%E8%B3%87%E6%96%99-Perceived%20Risk/Consumer%20Rankings%20of%20Risk%20Reduction%20Methods.pdf>
- Rossi, S. R., & Rossi, J. S. (1985). Gender differences in the perception of women in magazine advertising. *Sex Roles*, 12(9-10), 1033-1039. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2FBF00288103.pdf>
- Sawatari, Y. (2006). The Impact of the Gender of Celebrity Athlete Endorser on Consumers of Athletic Shoes. Retrieved from <http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/etd/2067>
- Simpson, P. M., Horton, S., & Brown, G. (1996). Male nudity in advertisements: A modified replication and extension of gender and product effects. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24(3), 257-262. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/226623442_Male_nudity_in_advertisements_A_modified_replication_and_extension_of_gender_and_product_effects/file/72e7e52442aff18535.pdf
- Slovic, P. (1999). Trust, emotion, sex, politics, and science: Surveying the risk-assessment battlefield. *Risk analysis*, 19(4), 689-701. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1999.tb00439.x>
- Suplet, M. R., Suárez, M. G., & Martín, A. M. D. (2010, July). Customer perceptions of perceived risk in generic drugs: the Spanish market. 8-th International Congress of the International Association on Public and Nonprofit Marketing" New Approaches in Public and Nonprofit Marketing Research & Practice", Valencia, 17-19 June 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/inno/v19n34/v19n34a05.pdf>
- Tan, S.J. (1999). Strategies for reducing consumers' risk aversion in Internet shopping. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 16(2), 16-180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/07363769910260515>
- Thwaites, D., Lowe, B., Monkhouse, L. L., & Barnes, B. R. (2012). The impact of negative publicity on celebrity ad endorsements. *Psychology & Marketing*, 29(9), 663-673. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mar.20552>
- Tripp, C., Jensen, T. D., & Carlson, L. (1994). The effects of multiple product endorsements by celebrities on consumers' attitudes and intentions. *Journal of consumer research*, 535-547. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2489757>
- Van Mulken, M., & Hornikx, J. (2011). The influence of scientese on ad credibility and ad liking. *Information Design Journal*, 19(2), 92-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/idj.19.2.02mul>
- Wang, A. (2005). The effects of expert and consumer endorsements on audience response. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 45(04), 402-412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0021849905050452>
- Weibel, D., Wissmath, B., Habegger, S., Steiner, Y., & Groner, R. (2008). Playing online games against computer-vs. human-controlled opponents: Effects on presence, flow, and enjoyment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5), 2274-2291. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2007.11.002>
- Wolin, L. D. (2003). Gender issues in advertising—An oversight synthesis of research: 1970-2002. *Journal of advertising research*, 43(01), 111-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0021849903030125>

Appendix A

Preliminary investigation - detailed results

- *Stage 1 Making combinations:* During this stage the subjects were presented ten photos, five photos of a male and five photos of a female (the ten photos can be found in Appendix B). The subjects needed to make five combinations of one male and one female, based on similarity. Think about factors such as attractiveness, and age.
- *Stage 2 Choosing combinations:* During this stage the combinations which were made on at least two thirds of the time were chosen to go further with in stage 3.
- *Stage 3 Choosing the best combination:* During this stage the subjects needed to choose the best combination to represent both, the male and the female, an expert as well as a consumer.
- *Stage 4 Discussing the setting:* Within this stage the setting of the expert photo and consumer photo were discussed.

Session 1 - 3 female participants

Stage 1 Making combinations

	1	2	3	4	5
A	1	1			1
B			3		
C	1				2
D	1	2			
E				3	

Stage 2 Choosing combinations

As presented above photos 3-B and 4-E were combined three out of three times. Photos 2-D and 5-C were both combined two out of three times.

Stage 3 Choosing the best combination

During this stage it became clear that, according to the participants, the combinations 3-B and 4-E were not the best in order to represent both, the male and female, an expert as well as a consumer. The three participants agreed together that the best combination would be 2-D.

Stage 4 Discussing the setting

Same clothes (no influence of clothes).

When, for example, there is green in the background then this should be in both settings (otherwise influence of colours). Maybe no background setting is the best.

Consumer: Beautiful home, nice kitchen, cosy, dog, cat. At least it needs to look nice; otherwise consumers will not buy the tap

- ➔ Title: Frequent user,
- Job: pharmacist

Expert: Fabric, laboratory, bubbling things in the back, no white coat, in the office. Experimental, exposing things in the back (taps etc.)

- ➔ Title: Independent expert in boiling taps, technical expert in the area of kitchen appliances, sustainability expert
- Job: Working at Inventum, good job.

Session 2 - 3 male and 2 female participants

Stage 1 Making combinations

	1	2	3	4	5
A		2			3
B	1		3	1	
C	1	2			2
D	3		2		
E		1		4	

Stage 2 Choosing combinations

As presented above the photos 4-E were combined four out of five times. Photos 1-D, 3-B and 5-A were combined three out of five times.

Stage 3 Choosing the best combination

During this stage the participant agreed that the best combination was 5-A in order to represent both, the male and female, an expert as well as a consumer. 1-D did not look like consumers, and 3-B looked did not looked like experts.

Stage 4 Discussing the setting

Clothes: Both casual chic.

Consumer: Since the product is a bit luxury the clothes of the consumer should not be too decent (like a stereotypical household wife).

Expert: No suit, casual jacket, jeans + shirt + colbert

Consumer: kitchen, home

- ➔ Title: Satisfied user

Expert: Kitchen centre or laboratory.

- ➔ Title: Product Manager Boiling Water, Kitchen specialist, Boiling water specialist, maybe plumber?

Session 3 - 1 male, 2 female participants*Stage 1 Making combinations*

	1	2	3	4	5
A	2			1	
B		1	2		
C	1	2			
D					3
E			1	2	

Stage 2 Choosing combinations

The photos 5-D is combined three out of three times. Furthermore, Photos 1-A, 2-C, 3-B and 4-E are combined two out of three times.

Stage 3 Choosing the best combination

According to the participants, the best combination to represent both, the male and female, an expert as well as a consumer is combination 2-C.

Stage 4 Discussing the setting

Clothes

Consumer: White blouse, white polo, jeans

Expert: Suit, jacket, colbert, maybe a white lab jacket (not necessarily)

Consumer: Living kitchen, cooking island, rural, dining table, herbal plants, sunlight, teapot, cookies, high tea, kids in the background, schoolbag on the ground, kitchen dresser.

Expert: Clean environment, no big smile, clipboard + pencil, checking, design kitchen (RVS), industrial kitchen

Title

Consumer: Mister/Miss Jansen, three kids: Joep, Mieke, and Jantje. Hobbies: sailing, fishing

Expert: Expert pure water, expert warm water systems, expert home safety, expert safe cooking, expert safe living, expert kitchen appliances, expert boiling water, expert boiling water and design, owner kitchen school, owner cooking school, owner restaurant, owner Bed & Breakfast, owner high tech kitchen store, biologist/H2O expert, water management, water kitchen planning, Vereniging Eigen Huis, Professor/PhD/engineer Industrial Design

Total results

Stage 1 Making combinations

-

Stage 2 Choosing combinations

As presented in Table XX the photos 4-E are combined 9 out of 11 times, and the photos 3-B 8 out of 11 times.

	1	2	3	4	5
A	3	3		1	4
B	1	1	8	1	
C	3	4			4
D	4	2	2		3
E		1	1	9	

Stage 3 Choosing the best combination

Although combination 4-E is made the most these persons on the photos are not the best to use within this study. Namely, the participants within the study agreed all that these persons were too young to represent an expert. Therefore combination 3-B seems the best. However, combination 3-E is doubtful as well. During the sessions some participants mentioned that these persons were not the best to represent an expert as well. However, during another session (session 3) these persons were indicated as experts and not as consumers. Therefore, these persons will be used as endorsers during the main study.

Stage 4 Discussing the setting

Title:

Consumer: Frequent/satisfied user - personal information (name, job, hobbies, kids)

Personal information

Expert: (Independent/technical/sustainability) expert in X, product manager X, specialist in X, owner of something with food or kitchens, consumer organisation in living (VVE), professor industrial design

Someone independent

Clothes:

Consumer: casual chic, not like housewife/-man, simple

Jeans, classy top/blouse

Expert: casual chic, chic,

Chic, but not too chic

Setting:

Consumer: Beautiful home/kitchen (rural), family (kids/animals), cosy

Cosy kitchen

Expert: Fabric, laboratory, office, taps in background, design/industrial kitchen, clean environment, no big smile, clipboard + pencil checking

Depends from title

Appendix B

Preliminary investigation - Photos endorsers



5.



A.



B.



C.





D.



E.

Appendix C

Content analysis endorser advertisements

Brand	Name product	Product type	Magazine	Endorser	Gender	Clothes	Background	Additional
B&B Italia	Bend-Sofa	Bank	Elle decoration NL	Consumer	Male	Pants (black), Colbert (black), T-shirt (white with print) Dress (black)	Studio (black)	Sound system
Carrieres Hainaut Verenna Poliform	du de Blauwe Steen	Belgisch blauwe hard steen Meubels	Elle decoration NL Elle decoration NL	Model	Female Female		Blauwe steen Kitchen	Plants Olive oil Lamp Water can
Leolux	Shuffle	Bank	Elle decoration NL	Child model	Female	Dress (beige)	Purple	
Jori	Shiva	Bank	Elle decoration NL	Model	Male	Pants (dark grey), Blouse (white) Colbert (black)	Living room	Magazine Vases
Beurer	Elle by Beurer	Gezichtsverzoring, Ontharing, Manicure/pedicure, Haarverzoring	Elle decoration NL	Model	Female			
Dubarry of Ireland		Laarzen, kleding en tassen	Gooisch	Consumer	Male	Jeans (blue) Dubarry jacket (green) Dubarry boots (brown) Suit (black)	Forest Barn	Dog Bag (brown)
DIYA custom suits		Suits	Gooisch	Consumer	Male Female	Suit (blue)		
Radio 100% NL		Radio	Gooisch	Expert	Male Male Male Male	Jeans (blue) Blouse (blue) Jeans (blue) Vest (grey) Shirt (white) Jeans (blue) Blouse (black) Vest (black) Jeans (blue) Blouse (purple with flowers) Colbert (black)	Sofa (orange)	
Skyradio		Radio	Gooisch	Consumer	Female	Top (pink) Legging (black with pink)	Street	Water
Andreelon		Droog shampoo	Vriendin	Consumer	Female	Vest (grey) Top (green) Jeans (blue) Blouse (white)	Living room	
Dove	Dove color care	Shampoo, après- shampoo, conditioner	Vriendin	Consumer	Female			

NTI			Opleidingen	Vriendin	Model	Female	Shirt (white)	Blue sky	
CDA			politieke partij	Vriendin	Expert	Male	Suit (grey)		
Vodafone	Vodafone	Mobile	Weten waar je telefoon is	Grazia	Consumer	Male	Hoodie (blue)		
Calvin Klein	Calvin Klein One		Parfum	Grazia	Consumer	Male and female	jeans/short		
Jupiler			Bier	Boodschappen	Consumer	Male	Jeans blouse (brown)	Skyline	
Peka			Peka aardappeltjes	Boodschappen	Consumer	Child Male	Shirt (white)	Kitchen	Cutting board
Fa	Fa Shower+Lotion		Douche body lotion	Boodschappen	Consumer	Female	Dress (White/beige)	Beach	Wooden chair
Fernandes	Fernandes cherry bouquet			Boodschappen	Consumer	Females and females	Top (white/light yellow/light grey)	Dining table	Food, drink
Plus	Plus Sappen en Smoothies		Sappen en smoothies	Plus Zomer	Expert	Female	Workwear	Orange tree	
El Picu			Mixdrank	Plus Zomer	Consumer	Male	Pants (green)	Dancing people	
Campofrio			Vleeswaren	Plus Zomer	Model	Female	Shirt (white)		
Plus	Klaverland kaas		Kaas	Plus Zomer	Expert	Male	Spanish dress (red)	Meadow with cows	
Pellegrin	Water		Water	Plus Zomer	Consumer	Males, females and children	Jeans (blue)		
Plus	Huismerk ijsjes		Ijsjes	Plus Zomer	Expert	Female	Workwear	Dunes	
Asics			sportkleding en schoenen	Runner's world	Consumer	Female	Clothes and shoes of the brand	Street and mountains	
Asics, Run2day, Viva, le Champion	Dam tot Dam loop 2013		Hardloopwedstrijd	Runner's world	Consumers	Female	Black sport clothes		
Scholten Awater, de Gelderlander, Asics, Green Choice, Sky Radio, AA drink	Zevenheuvelenloop		Hardloopwedstrijd	Runner's world	Consumer	Female	Black sport pants	Live view of last year?	
						Male	Red/pink sport top	Street/nature	
							Black/blue sport clothes		
Several brands	Ladies Groningen	Run	Hardloopwedstrijd	Runner's world	Consumers	Female	Black/green sport clothes		
Bever	Trail Running			Runner's world	Consumer	Females and females	Sport clothes	Live view of last year?	
						Male	Blue sports wear + bag	Mountains	
Sigma			Sport horloge	Runner's world	Consumer	Male	Yellow sport shoes		Green watch
Sigma			Sport horloge	Runner's world	Consumer	Female	Sport clothes (grey)		Pink watch
Several brands	Marathon Zwolle		Hardloopwedstrijd	Runner's world	Consumer	Male	Sport clothes (white)		
							Sport pants (black)	Running track	
Several brands	TCS Amsterdam marathon		Hardloopwedstrijd	Runner's world	Consumers	Consumers	Sport top (green)		
Herzog	Herzog Compression prevention	Sport &	Compressiekous	Runner's world	Consumer	Female	Sport clothes (black)		
							Compression stock (pink)		

BRITA	recovery BRITA waterfilterkraan	3-way	waterfilterkraan	designvakbladkeukens (dvk)	Consumer	Female	Vest (green/blue) Top (green/blue)	Cosy kitchen	Glass in hand Watertap kitchendresser Fruit bowl on
Silestone	Silestone kwartsoppervlakken		Kwartoppervlakken	designvakbladkeukens (dvk)	Consumer	Female	Pants (black) Blouse (orange)	Kitchen dresser with water tap	paintings on wall Cosy but design living room
MIELE	M		Inbouwapparaten	designvakbladkeukens (dvk), Wonen.nl keukens	Consumer	Male	Pants (grey) Blouse (blue)	Kitchen	Laptop, sunglassesx mobile phone, keys, magazine, bag on floor Ovendish
NEFT	NEFT Flex Inductie kookplaat		kookplaat	Keuken Techniek	Consumers	Male	Blouse (brown/purple)	Kitchen	
Art of kitchens			keuken	Keuken Techniek	Consumer	Female	(Shirt (blue))		
MFLOR			designvloer	Keuken Techniek	Consumer	Female	Blouse (brown/purple)	Kitchen	Herbal plants, gambas? Two small photos
Essential			Gordijnen	Keuken Techniek	Consumer	Female	Shirt (green), jeans	Living room	Laptop on lap, coffee in hand
Eurocol				Keuken Techniek	Expert	Male	(kleine extra foto met vrouwelijk hoofd) Working clothes (white shirt, black pants)	Living room	Garden
MIELE			Inbouwapparaten	Keuken techniek	Consumer	Female	Blouse (beige) jeans	Rijksmuseum (nachtwacht in background) Design ktichen	Bucket wit cement bag Pepper/salt Balsamic vinegar Tabasco Wine Vegetables Dining table (set with dishes and glasse of wine and plant)
Keukenspecialist			Kitchen store	Wonen.nl keukens	Consumer	Female	Shirt (strepen) Jeans blouse Blouse (blue white strepen) Jeans Shirt (black)	Women is lying aon the kitchen dresser	Wine, vegetables, pots
Ikea				Wonen.nl keukens	Consumer	Male	Pants (beige) Jeans blouse	Cosy modern kitchen	Cooking, vegetables,

Inspiratiehuis 20/20					Child (male) Female	Shirt (blue) Jeans vest (blue) blouse (bordeaux) pants (beige)	Living kitchen	pots, olive oil, plants, bowls
Stedin		Talenten Opleidingsprogramma	Techno!	Consumer	Male	Blouse (blue) Pants (bordeaux) Blouse (black)	grey	vegetables, pots
KIVI NIRIA		Koninklijk Instituut van Igenieurs	Techno!	Consumer	Male	Blouse (purple blocks) Sweater (black)	Harbour	Technical elements are named: Bouw/technische bedrijfskunde/maritieme techniek)
in4jaargenieur.nl			Techno!	Consumer	Male	Blouse (light blue) Polo (blue)	Schoolboard	
Kneipp	Kneipp Natuurlijk Zacht-producten		Libelle	Consumer	Female	-		Flowers
Libelle Academy		Libelle Academy	Libelle	Consumer	Female	Dress (pink/orange)	Beach palmtree	+ Guitar
Libelle Academy			Libelle	Consumer	Female	Shirt (blue/white gestreept) Pants (blue/white) Hat (beige/grey) Colbert (blue/white) Blouse (white)	Beach/boat	
Leef.nl		Ladival	Libelle	Consumer	Boy	Blue pakje Pet (blue)	Beach	
Postnl			Libelle	Consumers	Male	Shirt (blue) Sarong (green/red/brown)	Moskee	Nature
					Female	Top (flowers green) Sarong (blue/ligh blue) Sarong shoulders (black/white)		

Appendix D

Findings pretest questionnaire

Vrouw - 21 jaar - HBO

- Intro: Naar beoordelingen van advertenties? Dat is wel erg globaal.
- Opleiding: Ik kan er maar één aanklikken, maar heb VWO gedaan en doe nu HBO.
- *Manipulatiecheck: Ze weet niet meer of ze een expert of consument gezien heeft. Ze vult het verkeerd in.*
- Purchase intention: Onmogelijk? Het kan wel!

Vrouw - 24 jaar - WO-master

- Intro: Het lijkt alsof ik twee dingen te doen krijg door het 'en in opdracht van'.
- Intro: Meedoen klinkt een beetje vreemd. Ik zou er meewerken van maken.
- Risk averseness: Gaat het specifiek over iets? Of algemeen? Oja ik snap het al: algemeen.
- *Risk averseness: De stelling 'Ik houd niet van situaties waarin ik niet weet wat er gaat gebeuren.' Is een beetje onduidelijk door de dubbele ontkenning.*
- Advertentie: Er staat niet bij hoe lang ik moet kijken.
- Advertentie: Warmwaterexpert? Grappig.
- Attitude towards the product: Waren het allemaal 3-in-1-kookkranen? Mmm, ik denk dat het om de grote links ging.
- Purchase intention: Ik ben niet op zoek naar een kraan. Ik overweeg het dus ook niet echt, maar als ik op zoek zou zijn dan wel.

Vrouw 25 jaar - WO-master

- Intro: Is het niet 'doe ik een onderzoek' in plaats van 'doe ik onderzoek'. Nee, het staat er wel goed.
- Intro: Kokendwaterpakket? Wat houdt dat in? Kan ik zelf denk ik ook wel maken.
- *Risk averseness: De stelling 'Ik houd niet van situaties waarin ik niet weet wat er gaat gebeuren.' wordt 2x gelezen.*
- Advertentie: Oh, als dit het kokendwaterpakket is dan wil ik hem wel winnen!
- Attitude towards the product: Goede kwaliteit? Dat kan ik toch niet zeggen op basis van de advertentie?
- Purchase intention: Dit hangt allemaal een beetje samen. Het is allemaal hetzelfde.
- Product risk: Fysieke schade? Dat zou kunnen, maar nee...
- *Kokenwaterpakket winnen: Dit wil ze wel winnen, maar ze vergeet haar e-mailadres in te vullen.*

Vrouw - 33 jaar - MBO

- Geboortjaar: Ik vind dit altijd al wel best persoonlijk.
- Opleiding: Met dat helemaal uitgeschreven worden? Wat een gedoe.

- Risk averseness: Wat een rare stelling: 'Ik neem geen risico's met mijn gezondheid.' Wie zegt daar nou oneens?
- *Advertentie: Ze keek niet goed naar de advertentie. Klikte snel verder. Later bleek ook dat ze niet goed had gekeken.*
- *Attitude towards the ad: Ze vinkt aan in de verkeerde regel.*
- Attitude towards the product: Ik heb de kookkraan niet gezien?
- Purchase intention: Wat raar: dit is vier keer hetzelfde.
- Product risk: Fysieke schade? Grappig!

Vrouw - 43 jaar - MBO

- Manipulatiecheck: Dat zal denk ik geen expert geweest zijn?
- Attitude towards the ad: Ik ben niet zo van advertenties. Vind ze vooral irritant.
- Product risk: Voor fysieke schade ben ik wel bang inderdaad.
- Product risk: 'Ik neem geen risico's met mijn gezondheid.' Ik vind gezondheid wel wat ver gezocht.
- *Verzenden: Dit duurt erg lang. Er moet meerdere keren geklikt worden.*

Vrouw - 57 jaar - MBO

- Geboortjaar: Dit is wel ingesteld op oude mensen. Normaal moet ik altijd heel ver scrollen naar het geboortjaar, maar nu niet.
- *Klikt mannelijke expert aan i.p.v. mannelijke consument*
- Attitude towards the ad / Attitude towards the product: Als ik belangstelling zou hebben voor de kraan dan zou ik de advertentie wel leuk vinden, maar dat heb ik niet dus dat is nu anders.
- Purchase intention: Ik dacht dat ik hier één van de vier moest kiezen, maar ik moet ze allemaal invullen.
- Bekend met de 3-in-1-kookkraan: Ik heb er wel van gehoord, maar ik heb er nog nooit mee gewerkt.

Man - 23 jaar - HBO

- Intro: Wat is een kokendwaterpakket?
- *Risk averseness: Hij vergeet de risicomijder/risicozoeker vraag in te vullen.*
- Product risk: Fysieke schade? Grappig! Maar ja het zou inderdaad wel kunnen.

Man - 26 jaar - WO-master

- Geboortjaar: Kan dit niet andersom? Nu moet ik helemaal naar beneden scrollen.
- Risk averseness: 'Ik neem geen risico's met mijn gezondheid.' Dit is een ontkenning.
- Risk averseness: Wat is een risico?
- Risk averseness: *De stelling 'Ik houd niet van situaties waarin ik niet weet wat er gaat gebeuren.' wordt een paar keer gelezen.* Lastig om te begrijpen door de ontkenningen.
- Advertentie: Hoe lang moet ik hier naar kijken? Dit staat er niet bij.

- Attitude towards the product: Goed product? Hoe kan ik dat weten? Kwaliteit kan ik ook niet weten.
- Purchase intention: Dit is allemaal hetzelfde.
- Product risk: Ik maak me zorgen over dat ik of een vriend/familieid zich zal branden of pijn zal doen aan de 3-in-1-kookkraan. Die zin loop niet lekker. *De stelling wordt meerdere keren gelezen.*
- Product risk: De stelling 'Ik geloof dat gebruik van de 3-in-1-kookkraan gevaar kan opleveren voor mijn gezondheid.' is hetzelfde als 'Ik denk dat de 3-in-1-kookkraan een risico vormt voor mijn gezondheid.'
- Bekendheid 3-in-1-kookkraan: Ik wist dat het bestond, maar ik weet niet hoe het werkt.

Man - 30 jaar - HBO

- Balkje met procenten: Dit is waar ik ben tijdens de sessie denk ik.
- Balkje met procenten: Wat raar, hij blijft op 0% staan. *Pagina 3*
- Attitude towards the ad: Hier moet ik telkens goed over na denken. De ene stelling is met een ontkenning en de andere niet.
- Purchase intention: Overwegen? Dit is een striktvraag: het is allemaal hetzelfde.
- Algemeen: Doordat de ene stelling ontkenkend was en de andere niet focus ik me meer op wat er staat dan dat ik nadenk of het er echt eens of oneens mee ben.

Man - 49 jaar - HBO

- Risk averseness: 'Veiligheid eerst.' Hoe wordt dat bedoeld? Thuis? In het algemeen?
- *Manipulatiecheck: Twijfel tussen expert en consument. Kiest voor consument, dat is fout.*
- Attitude towards the product: Goede kwaliteit? Dat kan ik niet beoordelen. Ik doe wel neutraal.
- Attitude towards the product: Ik doe hier mijn algemene beeld, niet per se die van de kraan in de advertentie.
- Bekendheid 3-in-1-kookkraan: Ja en nee. Ik doe nee, want ik wil er bekender mee worden.
- Algemeen: Ik heb de tekst 'Anne de Vries - Warmwaterexpert' niet gelezen.

Man - 59 jaar - HBO

- Intro: Is het niet Inventum BV?
- Intro: Dit doeleinde? Dat klinkt raar, volgens mij is het dit doel.
- Risk averseness: De laatste vraag (risicomijder/risicozoeker) sla je erg snel over. Ik wilde eerst al verder klikken.
- Attitude towards the product: Van goede kwaliteit? Dat kan ik niet beantwoorden. Ik ken de kraan niet; ik heb er geen verstand van. Ik vul hem eerst niet in; kijken wat er gebeurt.
- Niet ingevuld: Oh dat kan niet. Nou dan vul ik neutraal in.
- Product risk: 'Ik geloof dat gebruik van de 3-in-1-kookkraan gevaar kan opleveren voor mijn gezondheid.' Die vraag is hetzelfde als de tweede 'Ik denk dat de 3-in-1-kookkraan een risico vormt voor mijn gezondheid.'

- Product risk: Oh deze is weer hetzelfde als die van net. 'Ik ben bang dat de 3-in-1-kookkraan fysieke schade zal toebrengen aan een vriend/familieid.' en 'Ik maak me zorgen over dat ik of een vriend/familieid zich zal branden of pijn zal doen aan de 3-in-1-kookkraan.'
- Kokendwaterpakket winnen: Wat is een kokendwaterpakket?

Appendix E

Main study - questionnaire

Beste deelnemer,

In het kader van mijn afstuderen voor de Master Communication Studies aan de Universiteit Twente en in opdracht van Inventum BV doe ik onderzoek naar beoordelingen van advertenties. U kunt mij helpen bij dit onderzoek door deze vragenlijst in te vullen. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost **ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten van uw tijd**.

De vragenlijst bestaat uit drie delen, waarbij het belangrijk is dat u weet dat het gaat om **uw mening** en dat **ernooit een goed of fout antwoord** is. Allereerst zullen er enkele vragen over uw achtergrond gesteld worden. In het tweede deel zal er een advertentie getoond worden, waarna er enkele vragen zullen volgen die betrekking hebben op deze advertentie. Tot slot zullen er nog enkele overige vragen gesteld worden.

Meedoen aan dit onderzoek is **geheel anoniem**; de gegevens zullen vertrouwelijk behandeld worden en u hoeft uw naam niet te vermelden. Door mee te doen met dit onderzoek kunt u **kans maken op één van de vijf kokendwaterpakketten**. Om mee te dingen naar één van de prijzen is het noodzakelijk dat u uw e-mailadres achterlaat. Uiteraard zal deze alleen gebruikt worden voor het op de hoogte stellen van de winnaars.

Bij voorbaat dank voor uw medewerking.

Lotte Wolbers

Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw

In welk jaar bent u geboren?

Wat is het niveau, of vergelijkbare niveau, van uw huidige of hoogst genoten opleiding?

- Wo-master (wetenschappelijk onderwijs)
- Wo-bachelor (wetenschappelijk onderwijs)
- Hbo (hoger beroepsonderwijs)
- Mbo (middelbaar beroepsonderwijs)
- Vwo (voortgezet onderwijs - voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs) / gymnasium
- Havo (middelbaar onderwijs - hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs)
- Vmbo (middelbaar onderwijs - voorbereidend middelbaar beroepsonderwijs) / mavo/ mulo

- Basisonderwijs
- Geen
- Anders, namelijk:

Welke situatie beschrijft het best uw huidige woonsituatie?

- Wo-master (wetenschappelijk onderwijs)
- Wo-bachelor (wetenschappelijk onderwijs)
- Hbo (hoger beroepsonderwijs)
- Mbo (middelbaar beroepsonderwijs)
- Vwo (voortgezet onderwijs - voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs) / gymnasium
- Havo (middelbaar onderwijs - hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs)
- Vmbo (middelbaar onderwijs - voorbereidend middelbaar beroepsonderwijs) / mavo/ mulo
- Basisonderwijs
- Geen
- Anders, namelijk:

Geef aan in hoeverre u het oneens/eens bent met de onderstaande stellingen. Denk niet te lang na over uw antwoord: Over het algemeen geldt dat de eerste ingeving de beste is.

Veiligheid eerst. (*Safety first*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik neem **geen** risico's met mijn gezondheid. (*I do not take risks with my health*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik ga risico's liever uit de weg. (*I prefer to avoid risks*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik neem regelmatig risico's. (*I take risks regularly*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik houd **niet** van situaties waarin ik **niet** weet wat er zal gaan gebeuren. (*I really dislike not knowing what is going to happen*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Over het algemeen zie ik risico's als een uitdaging. (*I usually view risks as a challenge*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik zie mijzelf als een ... (*I view myself as a ...*)

risicomijder	1	2	3	4	5	risicozoeker
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	--------------

Bekijk de onderstaande advertentie goed. Er zullen hierna enkele vragen gesteld worden die betrekking hebben op deze advertentie.

AquaSpot[®]
IntelliProtect[™]

KOUD, WARM ÉN KOKEND WATER



"Mijn ervaring met de 3-in-1-kookkraan is werkelijk fantastisch! Ik kan hem iedereen aanraden."

Anne, 40 jaar, 3 kinderen - Tevreden gebruiker



AquaSpot[®]
IntelliProtect[™]

KOUD, WARM ÉN KOKEND WATER




"De 3-in-1-kookkraan is een waardevolle toevoeging voor iedere keuken. Iedereen zal er plezier van hebben."

Anne de Vries - Warmwaterexpert




AquaSpot[®]
IntelliProtect[™]

KOUD, WARM ÉN KOKEND WATER



"Mijn ervaring met de 3-in-1-kookkraan is werkelijk fantastisch! Ik kan hem iedereen aanraden."

Daan, 40 jaar, 3 kinderen - Tevreden gebruiker



AquaSpot[®]
IntelliProtect[™]

KOUD, WARM ÉN KOKEND WATER



"De 3-in-1-kookkraan is een waardevolle toevoeging voor iedere keuken. Iedereen zal er plezier van hebben."

Daan de Vries - Warmwaterexpert



De persoon die ik zojuist in de advertentie gezien heb was een...

- vrouwelijke expert
- mannelijke expert
- vrouwelijke consument
- mannelijke consument

Het product dat centraal stond in de advertentie was een ...

- mengkraan (een kraan voor koud en warm water)
- solo-kookkraan (een losse kraan voor alleen kokend water)
- 3-in-1-kookkraan (een kraan voor koud, warm en kokendwater)

De volgende stellingen hebben **betrekking op de eerder getoonde advertentie**.

Geef aan in hoeverre u het oneens/eens bent met de onderstaande stellingen. Denk niet te lang na over uw antwoord. Over het algemeen geldt dat de eerste ingeving de beste is.

Ik vind de advertentie aantrekkelijk. (*The ad is attractive to me*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

De advertentie spreekt mij aan. (*The ad is appealing to me*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de advertentie niet leuk. (*I dislike the ad*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de advertentie interessant. (*The ad is interesting to me*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de advertentie slecht. (*I think the ad is bad*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik vind de 3-in-1-kookkraan een goed product. (*I think the 3-in-1 boiling water tap is a good product*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik heb een positieve indruk van de 3-in-1-kookkraan. (*My impression of the 3-in-1 boiling water tap is positive*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik geloof dat de 3-in-1-kookkraan van goede kwaliteit is. (*I believe the 3-in-1 boiling water tap has a good quality*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

De 3-in-1-kookkraan spreekt mij niet aan. (*The 3-in-1 boiling water tap is appealing to me*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik vind de 3-in-1-kookkraan een leuk product. (*I think the 3-in-1 boiling water tap is a nice product*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Als ik op zoek zou zijn naar een nieuwe kraan dan zou ik overwegen om de 3-in-1-kookkraan uit de advertentie te kopen.

Zeer onwaarschijnlijk <i>unlikely</i>	1	2	3	4	5	Zeer waarschijnlijk <i>likely</i>
Zeer onaannemelijk <i>improbable</i>	1	2	3	4	5	Zeer aannemelijk <i>improbable</i>
Zeer onzeker <i>uncertainly</i>	1	2	3	4	5	Zeer zeker <i>certainly</i>
Zeer onmogelijk <i>impossible</i>	1	2	3	4	5	Zeer mogelijk <i>possible</i>

Geef aan in hoeverre u het oneens/eens bent met de onderstaande stellingen.

Ik ben bang dat de 3-in-1-kookkraan mij fysieke schade zal toebrengen. (*I am afraid that the 3-in-1 boiling water tap will inflict physical damage on me*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik denk dat de 3-in-1-kookkraan een risico vormt voor mijn gezondheid. (*I think the 3-in-1 boiling water tap is a risk for my health*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik ben van mening dat gebruik van de 3-in-1-kookkraan veilig is. (*Using the 3-in-1 boiling water tap is, in my opinion, safe*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik maak me zorgen dat ik of een vriend/familielid zich zal branden of pijn zal doen aan de 3-in-1-kookkraan. (*I am worried that the 3-in-1 boiling water tap can cause harm to me or a member of my family/or friend*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik geloof dat gebruik van de 3-in-1-kookkraan gevaar kan opleveren voor mijn gezondheid. (*I believe that using the 3-in-1 boiling water tap can cause danger to my health*)

Helemaal mee oneens	1	2	3	4	5	Helemaal mee eens
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Ik zal (mijn) kinderen met een veilig gevoel bij de 3-in-1-kookkraan in de buurt laten komen. (*I feel*

safe to let (my) children in the neighbourhood of the 3-in-1 boiling water tap)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

Ik ben bang dat de 3-in-1-kookkran fysieke schade zal toebrengen aan een vriend/familielid. (*I am afraid that the 3-in-1 boiling water tap can cause harm to me or a member of my family/or friend*)

Helemaal mee oneens 1 2 3 4 5 Helemaal mee eens

De onderstaande vragen gaan over kookkranen **in het algemeen**. Het gaat hier dus **niet** specifiek om de kookkraan en/of het merk uit de advertentie.

Was u voorafgaand aan dit onderzoek bekend met een 3-in-1-kookkraan (koud, warm en kokend water uit één kraan)? Zo ja, geef dan aan welk merk 3-in-1-kookkraan.

- Ja, ik had er van gehoord en ik heb er wel eens gebruik van gemaakt
- Ja, ik had er van gehoord, maar ik heb er nog geen gebruik van gemaakt
- Nee

Is er een kookkraan aanwezig in uw huishouden?

- Ja een solokraan (een losse kraan voor alleen kokend water)
- Ja, een 3-in-1-kookkraan (één kraan voor koud, warm en kokend water)
- Nee

Met de eventuele gegevens die u hierna invult zal **vertrouwelijk** worden omgegaan. Ze zullen dan ook **alleen gebruikt worden voor het doel zoals beschreven bij de vraag**.

Wilt u kans maken op een kokend waterpakket? Zo ja vul dan uw e-mail adres in.

- Ja
- Nee

Eventuele opmerkingen naar aanleiding van dit onderzoek kunt u hieronder kwijt

Uw antwoorden zijn nu opgeslagen. Hartelijk dank voor het invullen van deze vragenlijst.