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Abstract

The study presented here examines the effect of camera angles on purchase intention of jewelry by women. In this study the influence of three vertical camera angles was explored, the stimuli were either presented from a low (i.e. looking up), eye-level or high (i.e. looking down) camera angle. Ninety-eight respondents rated three different jewelry (necklace, bracelet, earrings) in one of the three camera angles. Twelve Likert Scales were used to measure affective response and three semantic differentials were used to measure purchase intention. The previously found beneficial effects of low camera angles were not found. Vertical camera angels had no significant effect on purchase intention. Furthermore, no main effect was found on affective response; the scores on affective response were not higher when the jewelry was photographed from a low camera angle. In addition a strong positive correlation was found between affective response and purchase intention.

In het hier gepresenteerde onderzoek is het effect van de camerahoek op de koopintentie van sieraden bij vrouwen onderzocht. In dit onderzoek werd de invloed van drie camera hoeken op de verticale as onderzocht, de stimuli werden gepresenteerd vanuit een lage, op oog niveau of vanuit een hoge camerahoek. Achtennegentig respondenten beoordeelden de drie verschillende sieraden (ketting, armband, oorbellen) vanuit een van de drie camerahoeken. Twaalf likert schalen werden gebruikt om de affectieve respons te meten en drie semantisch differentialen om de koopintentie te meten. De in eerder onderzoek gevonden voorkeur voor een lage camerahoek werd niet gevonden. Een verticale camerahoek had geen significant effect op de koopintentie. Daarnaast werd geen hoofdeffect van affectieve respons gevonden, de scores van affectieve respons waren niet hoger wanneer het sierrad was gefotografeerd vanuit een lage camerahoek. Daarentegen werd een sterke positieve correlatie gevonden tussen affectieve respons en koopintentie.
Introduction

Marketing and advertisement is becoming more and more important. You cannot read a magazine without getting exposed to advertisements or when you are driving the car, big billboards are trying to get your attention. Via internet, radio, television, newspaper and magazines you are being exposed to advertisements every day. Marketers are therefore very interested in knowing how consumers evaluate the photograph of their products which are in the advertisement.

One of the most important things by transmitting a message is the use of pictures in the advertisement. It seems that when there are pictures in the advertisement consumers remember the advertisement better and visual elements in the add are able to influence the attitudes of the consumer (Miniard, Bhatla, Lord, Dickson & Unnava, 1991).

Also the camera angle from which a scene is photographed has a great influence on the viewer’s perception of the person or object. Researchers Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1992) did some research into this effect. The effects from camera angles on faces are explained from one’s experiences when growing up. This explanation goes back to the childhood when for example children are looking up to their parents. People photographed from a low angle seem to look more dominant and powerful. When using a high camera angle and looking down on the person it makes the person weak, subordinate and inferior. This explanation gives an answer to the changing evaluations of faces, but gives only a limited explanation for the changing evaluation of objects found by Kraft (1987) and Meyers-Levy & Peracchio (1992). Meyers-Levy & Peracchio, (1992), Peracchio & Meyers-Levy, (1997 & 2005) did research at the influence of camera angles on products. According to these researchers, objects we look up to are generally evaluated positively, whereas objects we look down on are generally evaluated negatively. Camera angles can cause the impression of looking up or looking down at an object, by photographing an object from below or above respectively and can therefore influence how people see and evaluate products. These strategies are used by marketers to create the best possible effect of the product they want to sell. Meyers-Levy & Peracchio (1992) found that the camera angle alone was enough to change the evaluation of the subjects of the advertisement and the depicted product.

Furthermore, the researchers found that the level of motivation to analyze the depicted advertisement was of great importance to the size of the camera angle effect.
When the subject has a high motivation to process the advertisement, then it caused the camera angle effect to disappear that was found in lower levels of motivation.

The present study is investigating the influence of camera angles on the purchase intention of jewelry by women. Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1992) already found that product evaluations were more positive when the products were photographed from a low camera-angle than a high camera-angle or views at eye-level. In this study there will be three products, all jewelry, and the purchase intention and the affective response will also be measured. In line with earlier research, it is expected that products photographed from a low camera angle will be evaluated more favorably, have a higher affective response, and therefore will be purchased more.

The investigation of an effect between camera-angle, affective response and purchase intention can be summarized in the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: The purchase intention of women is expected to be higher when the jewelry is photographed from a low angle.

Hypothesis 2: The affective response of woman is expected to be more positive when the jewelry is photographed from a low angle.

Especially in these times when internet shopping is becoming more and more popular the way products are photographed in the advertisement is also becoming more important. With internet shopping consumers can only see the products on photographs and marketers want to sell as many products as possible. For marketers it is essential to know how to increase the purchase intention of the consumers. With purchase intention we mean: “What we think we will buy” (Blackwell, Miniard, & Engel, 2001). People working in advertising try to photograph their product in the best way possible. There is not much known about purchase intention considering jewelry but there is much more known about research in purchase with clothing and accessories. Most of this research has been done with online purchasing.

Yoh (1999) found that people who are younger and/or have higher incomes have a positive attitude towards internet clothing shopping, and have greater purchase intentions for internet clothing shopping. According to “Retail Online” (1998), people aged 26 to 45 use the internet as a source of information, but were more likely to purchase in a store, while people aged 18 to 26 use the internet to make a direct purchase. Purchase intention has been studied in the catalog, television, and internet shopping context. Individual characteristics (Shim &
Drake, 1990), situational factors (Shim & Drake, 1990), the amount of information (Kim & Lennon, 2000), and prior experience (Park & Stoel, 2002; Yoh, 1999) influenced purchase intention.

All scales used in this study have been used in earlier studies. The Emotional Quotient Scale, has been used by Wells (1965a) to measure the affective response. This scale has often been used to measure the feeling towards an advertisement and to answer the question “are consumers’ ratings firm enough to provide information about the effectiveness of the advertisement”? And more specifically for this research, “is the affective response giving any information or predictive value about the intention to buy the product”? The purchase intention has been measured while using the questionnaire from Kim and Lennon (2000). This questionnaire has been used because of its high reliability (α=.90) in the research of Park (2002) who investigated the role of several factors on the purchase intention of clothing products.

**Method**

**Participants:**
In order to examine the hypotheses and research questions presented above, an online experiment was conducted in which 98 subjects participated, all women. Participants were between 18 and 26 years of age (M= 20.6; SD: 1.545). All participants were students of the University of Twente and they received course credits for their participation. The survey was conducted in Dutch and all subjects were asked to wear correctional lenses if they usually wore them.

**Stimuli**
The stimuli used were all jewelry. One pair of earrings, one bracelet and one necklace (for a complete overview of the stimuli see Appendix B). These products were chosen because these are products you do not buy every day, jewelry is not a standard product. But it is also not a product you buy rarely, so you do not have to think about it for a very long time.

Each product was photographed from three different angles, three positions on the y-as (high, eye, low). Photographs were taken in a fixed setting, to make sure that all factors like lighting and shading would be the same in all photos. Products were shown without context, which means that the product is shown in full but not much space around it. The high-angle
and low-angle photos were taken from 18° above and below eye-level. This angle provides a strong camera angle (Kepplinger, 1987) and was chosen to be sure that the effect of camera angles would be clearly visible, but that the angle was not unnaturally extreme. See figure 1 for a complete overview of the stimuli.

Figure 1: complete overview of the stimuli

Low camera angle

Eye level camera angle

High camera angle

Questionnaires

Each picture had to be evaluated using 15 five point Likert Scale to measure affective response and three 5 point semantic differential to measure purchase intention. The survey was conducted via a website and could be filled in within the subject’s browser window. To ensure the reliability, every page of the survey, where a photo was displayed, looked the same. In total there were three different versions of the survey. Every survey had their specific camera-angle, so survey one displayed the pictures from the jewelry all in the low camera-angle. Randomization across the three versions was achieved by assigning the participants
randomly to one of the three conditions. For a complete overview of the questionnaire see Appendix A.

Procedure

After following the link to the survey the subjects were shown a welcome screen which explained what the study was about and why this study was conducted. The subjects were asked to wear glasses or contact lenses if they needed to. The subjects were told that all the answers would be confidential and that they could stop the survey any minute. Nothing was told about the goal of this research. After the explanation the subjects had to give informed consent.

After clicking “next” a few demographic questions were asked, about their age, education and nationality.

Then the first picture was displayed, it started with the necklace first every time. The scale was explained and in total 15 questions were asked. After the first 15 questions the participant had to click “next” and the bracelet and earrings followed with the same questions.

Finally the subjects were thanked for their participation and the research goals were explained. The subjects were given the possibility to contact the researcher for further information and remarks and they could leave their e-mail address if they wanted to achieve the results.

Results

Data were analyzed with an ANOVA. The mean scores on affective response and purchase intention of the respondents are shown in table 1. According to table 1 the high camera angle receives the highest score for affective response and for purchase intention, although the differences are small.

The hypothesis will be discussed in the same order as presented in the introduction. Cronbach’s alpha was +.854 for the scale of affective response and the Cronbach’s alpha for the scale of purchase intention was +.863. The high reliability coefficient allows the assumption that the scales did indeed measure one underlying factor.
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics from the purchase intention and the affective response*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective response low view</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective response eye view</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective response high view</td>
<td>84.27</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective response total view</td>
<td>81.28</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention low view</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention eye view</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention high view</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention total view</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1:** The purchase intention of women is expected to be higher when the jewelry is photographed from a low angle.

The first hypothesis predicted that the scores on purchase intentions would be higher for jewelry photographed from a low angle than for jewelry photographed from high angles or at eye level. However, no main effect on purchase intention was found, $F(2,95) = 1.433, P = .244$. There is no significant effect between the three camera angles on the purchase intention of women.

**Hypothesis 2:** The affective response of women is expected to be more positive when the jewelry is photographed from a low angle.

This hypotheses predicted that the scores on affective response would be higher when the jewelry was photographed from a low angle compared to jewelry photographed from a high angle or at eye level. No main effect was found on affective response, $F(2.95) = 2.023, P = .138$.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between affective response and purchase intention. There was a strong positive correlation between affective response and purchase intention, $r = .655, p=0.001$. In table 2 the correlations are shown compared by group.
Table 2

*Correlation between affective response and purchase intention compared by group/camera angle.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera angle</th>
<th>Correlation $r$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

*Conclusions*

Based on previous research (Kraft, 1987; Meyers-Levy and Peracchio, 1992) it was expected that products photographed from a low camera angle would get a better product evaluation and a higher purchase intention. However, in this research vertical camera angles had no significant effect on the purchase intention. Moreover, no significant effect was found on the affective response. A strong positive correlation was found between affective response and purchase intention.

Between the three camera angles no significant effect was found. These results are surprising, since the effects of low camera angles were widely accepted in previous research. Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1992) clearly indicate a preference for low camera angles. In this study the high camera angle indicated a preference, although not significant. Meyers-Levy and Peracchio used a camera angle of 40° whereas an 18° angle was used in the present study, which indicates one of the differences between these two studies. According to Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1992) consumers evaluate products photographed from a low angle as more superior, strong and dominant because they look up to these products. In this research jewelry is used which is small and fragile. These products do not need to be strong and superior. Maybe there is a difference in the evaluation between big, massive products and small, little products? This is something that should be investigated in further research. Another explanation can be that that consumers normally see their jewelry from above (except earrings) and therefore prefer the high camera angle.
In this study no main effect on affective response was found, so the camera angle had no significant effect on the feeling towards the advertisement. In addition a strong positive correlation between affective response and purchase intention was found, so when consumers have a higher affective response they have a higher intention to purchase the product.

No significant main effect on affective response but a positive correlation between affective response and purchase intention leads to a lot of other questions and needs to be investigated in further research. The scale in this study to rate affective response is usually used to measure the feeling towards an advertisement, in this study the affective response was measured to investigate if this would give information or a predictive value about the purchase intention. In this research there was no ‘standard’ advertisement and it is possible that the correlation is the result of the ‘boring’ advertisement without any information. According to Park and Stoel (2002) consumers have a higher purchase intention when there is a greater amount of information available. Other studies that investigated camera angle effect with pictures of objects did so with context. In the study of Kraft (1987) the stimulus was part of a story and in the study of Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1992) of an advertisement. The present study aimed to isolate the camera angle effect from context, so this indicates one of the differences.

Limitations of the study

There were some limitations with the online setting of this survey. The participants conducted the survey within their own browser window, so the setting in which the survey was filled in was not controllable. The size of the subjects screen might have influenced the size of the stimulus as well as the exposure time of the stimuli cannot be controlled within this setup. The size of an image has been positively correlated to perceived arousal by earlier studies (Detenber, B.H.& Reeves, B.A., 1996). Likewise Allen (2000) and Then and Delong (1999) found that a large size image might influence purchase decisions. The participants in this survey were all students from the University of Twente. They received credits for their participation, this could have led to less serious participation and this may have influenced the validity of this study.

The products used in this study were all jewelry, which are rather flat. The 18° camera angle had to be clearly visible, according to Kepplinger (1987), but the differences between the three camera angles were quite small, what may have led to these results.
In this study there were three groups in total, each group represented a camera angle. Group one evaluated the jewelry all from a low camera angle, group two at eye level and group three from a high camera angle. This could have led to a response tendencies by the respondents which might have influenced the validity.

Further research

The present study only showed photographs of jewelry, while usually the jewelry is showed in an advertisement with written information or the jewelry is showed worn by a woman. The effect of the context with jewelry on a camera angle is something that should be analyzed in further research. Other research done with camera angles included the context. In earlier research by Kraft (1987) was the stimulus part of a story and Meyers-Levy and Peracchio (1992) used an advertisement.

Then en Delong (1999) found that the consumer will have a higher intention to buy a product online when the trader shows more visual information. They suggested that there are three important visual aspects of the presentation of the products: pictures of the product in its end use, showed together with similar items and photographs from the products from different camera angles such as front and back.

According to Then en Delong (1999) 89% of the clothing shoppers preferred a realistic human model to display the characteristics and to see how it will fit the body. Despite this research was about clothing products, it is possible this is the same with jewelry. This should be investigated in further research.

The camera angle used in this study was 18° above and 18° below eye level. According to Keppinger (1987) this provides a strong camera angle and was chosen to be sure that the effect of this angle would be clearly visible, but not unnaturally extreme. As said before the products in this study were jewelry and these products were rather flat. The 18° camera angle was not clearly visible in the suggested way. In further research with jewelry the researcher would suggest a higher camera angle to make sure that the angle would be clearly visible.

In this study the average age was 20 years old and most respondents came from two studies. A suggestion for further research might be more spreading in age and education.

In conclusion, this research provides not many answers, but many suggestions and ideas for further research. Purchase intention depends on many other aspects besides the camera angle.
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Appendix A

Pagina: 1

Het beoordelen van foto's van sieraden!

Start

Pagina: 2

Hartelijk dank dat je mee wilt doen aan het volgende onderzoek.

Dit onderzoek maakt deel uit van de bachelorthese uitgevoerd aan de Universiteit Twente. Het onderzoek gaat over de beoordeling van foto's van sieraden door vrouwen. Het onderzoek duurt ongeveer 5 minuten en zal in totaal uit 3 foto's bestaan. Bij elke foto wordt naar jouw beoordeling gevraagd aan de hand van een aantal items. Verder worden er nog naar een aantal demografische gegevens van je gevraagd, zodat ik een zo duidelijk mogelijk beeld krijg. Alle gegevens worden vertrouwelijk behandeld en anoniem verwerkt. Je kan ten allen tijde het onderzoek stopzetten door je web-browser te sluiten. Bij vragen kan je altijd contact opnemen met de onderzoeker: c.engbers@student.utwente.nl

Mocht je lenzen of een bril nodig hebben zou je dan je lenzen in willen doen of je bril op willen zetten?

1. Toestemming voor deelname:
"Met complete kennis, geef ik vrijwillig toestemming om deel te nemen aan deze studie" *

☐ "Ik stem vrijwillig toe om deel te nemen aan deze studie"
☐ "Ik wil niet deelnemen aan deze studie" (sluit nu alsjeblieft je web-browser)
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Wil je ons nu alsjeblieft de volgende informatie over jouw persoonlijke situatie geven?
De informatie wordt vertrouwelijk behandeld.

2. Leeftijd (in jaren) *


3.

Nationaliteit

- Nederlands
- Duits
- Anders

4.

Studie

- Psychologie
- Onderwijskunde
- Communicatiewetenschap
- Anders

Dan volgt hierna de eerste foto.
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5.

**Stel je voor dat deze foto in een advertentie zou staan. Kun je bij deze foto aangeven in hoeverre je het eens bent met een aantal stellingen aan de hand van onderstaande schaal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stelling</th>
<th>zeer mee oneens</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>zeer mee eens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel mij aangetrokken tot deze advertentie.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waarschijnlijk zou ik deze advertentie overslaan als ik deze zou tegenkomen in een tijdschrift.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dit is een hartverwarmende advertentie.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze advertentie zet mij aan tot het kopen van het product.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik heb weinig belangstelling voor deze advertentie.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik vind deze advertentie vervelend.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel me goed bij deze advertentie.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dit is een geweldige advertentie.

Dit soort advertenties vergeet ik snel.

Dit is een fascinerende advertentie.

Ik ben dit soort advertenties zat.

Deze advertentie laat me koud.

### 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>waarschijnlijk</th>
<th>onwaarschijnlijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je het sieraad/de sieraden zou proberen die je vandaag op de foto(s) hebt gezien?

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je het sieraad/de sieraden koopt die je toevallig op de foto(s) van vandaag hebt gezien?

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je bewust het sieraad/de sieraden, van de foto(s) die je vandaag hebt gezien, uitzoekt om te kopen?

**Dit was de eerste foto. Hierna komen nog 2 foto's.**
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7.

Stel je voor dat deze foto in een advertentie zou staan. Kun je bij deze foto aangeven in hoeverre je het eens met een aantal stellingen aan de hand van onderstaande schaal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>zeer mee oneens</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel mij aangetrokken tot deze advertentie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waarschijnlijk zou ik deze advertentie overslaan als ik deze zou tegenkomen in een tijdschrift.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dit is een hartverwarmende advertentie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze advertentie zet mij aan tot het kopen van het product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik heb weinig belangstelling voor deze advertentie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik vind deze advertentie vervelend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ik voel me goed bij deze advertentie.  

Dit is een geweldige advertentie.  

Dit soort advertenties vergeet ik snel.  

Dit is een fascinerende advertentie.  

Ik ben dit soort advertenties zat.  

Deze advertentie laat me koud.  

8.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>waarschijnlijk</th>
<th>onwaarschijnlijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je het sieraad/de sieraden zou proberen die je vandaag op de foto(s) hebt gezien?</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je het sieraad/de sieraden koopt die je toevallig op de foto(s) van vandaag hebt gezien?</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je bewust het sieraad/de sieraden, van de foto(s) die je vandaag hebt gezien, uitzoekt om te kopen?</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dit was de tweede foto. Hierna komt nog 1 foto.

verder
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Stel je voor dat deze foto in een advertentie zou staan. Kun je bij deze foto aangeven in hoeverre je het eens met een aantal stellingen aan de hand van onderstaande schaal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>zeer mee oneens</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel mij aangetrokken tot deze advertentie.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waarschijnlijk zou ik deze advertentie overslaan als ik deze zou tegenkomen in een tijdschrift.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dit is een hartverwarmende advertentie.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze advertentie zet mij aan tot het kopen van het product.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik heb weinig belangstelling voor deze advertentie.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik vind deze advertentie vervelend.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ik voel me goed bij deze advertentie.

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je het sieraad/de sieraden zou proberen die je vandaag op de foto(s) hebt gezien?

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je het sieraad/de sieraden koopt die je toevallig op de foto(s) van vandaag hebt gezien?

Hoe waarschijnlijk is het dat je bewust het sieraad/de sieraden, van de foto(s) die je vandaag hebt gezien, uitzoekt om te kopen?

Dit was de laatste foto. Druk op verder a.u.b.
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Bedankt voor je deelname aan deze studie! Je medewerking is heel erg waardevol.

In deze studie werd je gevraagd om je mening en koopneiging te geven over 3 verschillende foto’s. In totaal zijn er drie verschillende versies van dit onderzoek. De foto’s zijn namelijk gemaakt onder een verschillende camerahoek (eye-level, above eye-level, below eye-level). Jij hebt van elk sieraad een foto gezien gemaakt onder dezelfde camerahoek. In dit onderzoek wordt er gekeken naar de effecten van de camerahoek op de productbeoordeling en de koopintentie.

Bespreek a.u.b. niet de details van deze studie met vrienden, die in de toekomst misschien ook willen meewerken aan deze studie. Als je dit doet zouden deze respondenten bevooroordeeld kunnen zijn en dit kan leiden tot onjuiste data voor deze studie.

Als je opmerkingen of vragen hebt over deze studie, dan kun je contact opnemen met Carola Engbers (c.engbers@student.utwente.nl)
Deze studie werd gecontroleerd en goedgekeurd door de Ethische Commissie van de Universiteit Twente.

11.

Als je graag een kopie wilt ontvangen van de resultaten vul dan hier je e-mailadres in:

[Input field]

Versturen
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Bedankt!