Juan Jose Blazquez-Resino[1]

ASSESSING CONSUMERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS WEB ADVERTISING IN THE SERVICE CONTEXT

The Internet gives consumers an unlimited access to information and a greater control of their contact with advertising. Web surfers can choose what commercial content they wish to see, when they are receptive to it, and whether they want to receive it in full volume. In this sense, the measurement of attitude to web advertising and its assessment by Internet users has become an essential element for the development of more profitable and efficient business communication strategies. Several studies have found a positive and direct relationship between Web advertising and user attitude. This paper analyzes the attitude of Internet users towards 3 different types of online advertising, as well as the overall attitude to advertising having an influence on the attitude towards each type of advertising.

Keywords: Internet, online advertising, advert formats, consumers' attitude, effectiveness.

Хуан Хосе Бласкес-Ресіно

ОЦІНЮВАННЯ СТАВЛЕННЯ СПОЖИВАЧІВ ДО ОНЛАЙН-РЕКЛАМИ В СЕРВІСНОМУ КОНТЕКСТІ

У статті показано, що Інтернет відкриває споживачам необмежений доступ до інформації та можливість контролю контакту з рекламою. Користувачі можуть обирати види комерційного контенту, з яким вони хотіли б ознайомитися, спосіб його розміщення і одержуваний обсяг. Оцінювання ставлення користувачів до онлайн-реклами стало важливим елементом у розвитку більш прибуткових і ефективних бізнес-стратегій. Ряд досліджень показав позитивний прямий зв'язок між рекламою і ставленням до неї Інтернет-користувачів. Проаналізовано ставлення Інтернет-користувачів до 3 різних типів онлайн-реклами, а також вплив загального ставлення до реклами на ставлення до різних її видів.

Ключові слова: Інтернет, онлайн-реклама, формати реклами, ставлення споживачів, ефективність.

Таб. 3. Літ. 63.

Хуан Хосе Бласкес-Ресино

ОЦЕНКА ОТНОШЕНИЯ ПОТРЕБИТЕЛЕЙ К ОНЛАЙН-РЕКЛАМЕ В СЕРВИСНОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ

В статье показано, что Интернет открывает потребителям неограниченный доступ к информации и возможность контроля контакта с рекламой. Пользователи могут выбирать виды коммерческого контента, с которым они хотели бы ознакомиться, способ его размещения и получаемый объем. Оценка отношения пользователей к онлайн-рекламе стала важным элементом в развитии более прибыльных и эффективных бизнес-стратегий. Ряд исследований показал положительную прямую связь между рекламой и отношением Интернет-пользователей. Проанализировано отношение Интернет-пользователей к 3 различным типам онлайн-рекламы, а также влияние общего отношения к рекламе на отношение к различным ее видам.

Ключевые слова: Интернет, онлайн-реклама, форматы рекламы, отношение потребителей, эффективность.

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Toledo, Spain.

Introduction. Internet is a non-conventional advertising channel whose characteristics make it unique and different from all others (Yoon and Kim, 2001; Wolin, Korgaonkar, and Lund, 2002). Hoffman and Novak (1996) presented a conceptual map based on objective characteristics of different media where web was placed in an intermediate position between dynamic and static advertising and as neither personal nor impersonal.

The communication tools provided by the Internet are less expensive, endure less noise, and show a higher potential for effectiveness than traditional media. Consequently, online communications require precise knowledge about the perception, attitude and value that users attribute to advertising. Moreover, Internet users show behaviors different from those displayed in other media, because they have an active role in the search of information and control over advertising contents received (Gallagher, Parsons and Foster, 2001). Altering the way advertising is designed and how it influences consumers' opinions and attitudes, interactivity is thus fundamental in the new medium because it allows feedback in communication (Chandon, Chtourou, and Fortin, 2003).

However, the possibility to carry out business transactions through the Internet has generated a long controversy on how to improve advertising effectiveness in this medium. The measurement of web advertising effectiveness does not follow established parameters. The most widely used measurement tools are those dealing with behavior, and yet there is no academic agreement on their suitability, because they are unable to include motivation, attitudinal or recall factors. Therefore, several authors consider it necessary to study how online advertising affects users' attitudes to advertising in general, specific websites, trademark familiarity, or value given to adverts. Thus they provide an initial list of measurement tools for advertising effectiveness (Brackett and Carr, 2001; Chen and Wells, 1999; Ducoffe, 1996).

The majority of research on web advertising has focused on banner advertising (Chatterjee, Hoffman, and Novak, 2003; Cho, Lee, and Tharp, 2001; Choi and Rifon, 2002), but there are also studies dealing with the comparison between web advertising and other mass media (Brackett and Carr, 2001; Dahlen, Murray, and Nordenstam, 2004; Gallagher, Parsons, and Foster, 2001; Leong, Huang, and Stanners, 1998; Yoon and Kim, 2001); research on the elements of advertising design (Baltas, 2003; Dreze and Hussherr, 2003; Lohtia, Donthu, and Hershberger, 2003); duration of exposition to advertising (Bucklin and Sismeiro, 2003; Danaher and Mullarkey, 2003; Danaher, Mullarkey, and Essegaier, 2006); or number of exposition sessions (Chatterjee, 2005; Dahlen, 2002; Dreze and Hussherr, 2003; Danaher, 2007). Other studies centering on different online formats, like pop-up ads (Edwards, Li, and Lee, 2002) or e-mail advertising (Chittenden and Rettie, 2003; Dufrene et al., 2005; Martin et al., 2003). Nevertheless, the studies that analyze different online advertising designs as a whole are limited (e.g., Burns and Lutz, 2006), and no research has dealt with the relationship between advertising type and effectiveness measured through attitude.

Taking this into consideration, this work has a double objective. On the one hand, it analyzes the attitudes of Internet users to different types of web advertising in order to use them to measure effectiveness. This analysis considers 3 types of advertising (Chaffey et al., 2006; Lavilla, 2002): static, dynamic and interactive one. On

the other hand, it divides the Internet users into groups according to their attitude to advertising and determines their main differentiating characteristics.

Web advertising effectiveness. Online advertising has now become an important part of marketing mix and a source of consumer information (Cheong and Morrison, 2008). However, web advertising does not simply advertise and distribute messages, it also facilitates the relationship with customers and cyber-trademark creation, offers certain services to consumers, generates online sales, and sends marketing messages to specific customers. In addition, it promotes a highly individualized service for a large number of consumers and a direct and interactive marketing. The main difference between web advertising and general advertising is the interactivity (Coyle and Thorson, 2001). Thus, some researchers (Hoffman and Novak, 1996; Leong, Huang, and Stanners, 1998) argue that traditional principles of mass media advertising do not apply to the web.

The growing popularity of online advertising has prompted many researchers to examine their effectiveness (Lees and Healey, 2005). The best indicator of effectiveness is always a confirmed increase in sales. Advertisers aspire to have information of the effectiveness of a campaign beforehand in order to guarantee the highest profitability of their investments. In this sense, a widely used and accepted measurement of effectiveness for web advertising is Clickstream. Clickstream data offer the capability to track interactions between a site and its visitors (e.g., a clickthrough, page view exposures or a purchase), offering the possibility to determine the relationship beween exposure and response to user behavior (Bucklin and Sismeiro, 2009). Some studies argue that some size and design elements of online ads have positive effects on clickthrough rate (Baltas, 2003; Chandon, Chtourou, and Fortin, 2003; Lohtia, Donthu, and Hershberger, 2003).

However, the inefficiency and imprecision of measuring the impressions of online advertising (Manchanda et al., 2006) have caused much dissatisfaction and have curbed the willingness to spend resources on banner ads. In addition, several studies in the academic and commercial sector report that most banner ads remain unnoticed by consumers, because incentives and interactivity reduce the clickthrough rate (Chatterjee, 2005; Dreze and Hussherr, 2003), proposing the concept of "Banner Blindness" to refer to the non-perception of banner ads (Benway, 1998; Hsieh and Chen, 2011). The question of how to design and assess web advertising is thus crucial (Ducoffe, 1996; Hoffman and Novak, 1997; Dreze and Zufryden, 1998).

Dreze and Hussherr (2003) suggest banners could be processed at a pre-attentive level that does not imply an immediate action. In this sense, several authors (Baltas, 2003; Lohtia, Donthu, and Hershberger, 2003) argue in favor of a special emphasis on traditional measures, like attitude or recall, when considering web advertising effectiveness, because online advertising has various effects on Internet users which go beyond clicking on advertising elements (Briggs and Hollis, 1997). According to the general media theory, consumers' choice to pay attention to any kind of web advertising depends on their beliefs and attitudes to advertising.

Attitude towards web advertising. Attitude to advertising has been defined as "a predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure situation" (MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch, 1986, p.130). In this sense, the academic literature conveys a positive correlation between

attitude to advertising and its perception (Cho, 1999; Ducoffe, 1996; Schlosser, Shavitt, and Kanfer, 1999; Shavitt, Lowrey, and Haefner, 1998). According to the general media theory, consumers' choice to pay attention to any kind of web advertising depends on their beliefs and attitudes toward advertising (Singh and Dalal, 1999).

In the online context, Chen and Wells (1999, p. 28) developed the construct "Attitude toward site" and defined it as "Web surfers' predispositions to respond favorable or unfavorably to web content in natural exposure situations". Different studies have attempted to analyze the effect of webpage backgrounds complexity (e.g., interactivity and vividness) on the attitudes to a given site (Coyle and Thorson, 2001; Hsieh and Chen, 2011; Jee and Lee, 2002; Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar, 2000). Other research has instead focused on the analysis of the advertising developed and included in websites (Choi and Rifon, 2002; Kim and Lee, 2011; Wolin, Korgaonkar, and Lund, 2002) concluding that advertisement and websites with design creativity have a positive effect on consumers' attitude.

Nevertheless, researches have rarely taken into account the effect of different advertising formats or the effect of their different characteristics, like animation or exposition, on the attitude to advertising. However, webmasters have improved designs and interactivity of web advertising as well as created new advertising formats. The increasing use of animation in online advertising is based on the belief that dynamic images show a greater potential for attracting attention and enhancing persuasion. Taking into account that animated ads are considered more appealing that static ones, it can be concluded that the former have a greater potential to attract attention than the latter (Yoo, Kim, and Stout, 2004).

In this sense, Li and Bukovac (1999) observed that animated ads improve advertising recall and that banner size has a positive effect on understanding. Cho, Lee and Tharp (2001) observed that the format of a wholly unwilling exposure leads to desirable effect and to a favorable attitude to advertising, trademark, and purchase probability. Supporting this observation, Brown (2002) examined the use of unfolding menus in banner advertising and concludes that consumers exposed to adverts with unfolding menus show a higher degree of attention and persuasion. Burns and Lutz (2006) created a construct called "attitude to the format," and developed their argument around 6 different online advertising formats. Although only 3 formats — banner, pop-up and interstitial - were considered as informative, their conclusions indicate that factors like entertainment and annoyance intimately relate to the attitude to the format in all cases. The authors also observe a significant positive relationship between the attitude to format advertising in general and toward format in particular.

Nevertheless, an increased number of elements in web advertising does not always lead to the increased number of visitors (Lee et al., 2004). Adelaar et al. (2003) found that the presence of a video did not generate the impulse buying intent that was expected, nor did the display of video increase a positive feeling about the content-related product. Moore, Stammerjohan and Coulter (2005) did not find a background color — text color contrast effect, and observe that attitude to a website was more positive for those who did not recall or recognize the ad, regardless of advertiser-website congruity/incongruity.

Other researchs have shown that increasing advertising complexity over an optimal point may negatively affect attitude and response, confirms the inverted U rela-

tionship between animation level and attitude to advertising. Creative formats that use animation, audio, video, richmedia, pop-ups or slow moving banners may be perceived as intrusive. Yoo, Kim, and Stout (2004) supported the notion that animated ads have a greater capacity to attract attention, generate better recall probability, influence a positive attitude to advertising far better than static ads, but attitude were lower in high animation conditions. Geissler, Zinkhan, and Watson (2006) supports the argument that web page complexity influences attention, attitude, and buying intent, and therefore, establishes an inverted U relationship between web complexity and communication effectiveness.

Thus, the main objective of this paper is to analyze online advertising effectiveness in relation to net surfer attitude and to take into consideration the differences between advertising types contemplated in academic literature. Chaffey et al. (2006) and Lavilla (2000) describe 3 basic types of web advertising: static, dynamic or interactive, and animated. The main differences between these formats are different levels of animation and the exposition time required for the perception of an advertising message. The literature has confirmed that different animation levels have different effects on the attitude to advertising (Cho, Lee, and Tharp, 2001; Li and Bukovac, 1999; Yoo, Kim, and Stout, 2004); and there is a positive relationship between duration of communication and advertising effect (Bucklin and Sismeiro, 2003; Danaher and Mullarkey, 2003). Furthermore, the attitude to a specific kind of advertising is potentially influenced by consumers' attitudes to advertising in general (Gong and Maddox, 2003; Petty and Cacioppo, 1986). Consequently, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: The assessment of web advertising depends on the type of advertising.

H2: The attitude toward advertising in general affects the attitude toward the type of advertising presented.

On the other hand, diverse studies have analyzed different responses to online advertising in relation to customer characteristics, mainly demographic. For instance, customer's experience proves to be an important factor in consumer response to Web advertising (Bruner and Kumar, 2000; Dahlen, 2001; Ward and Lee, 2000). Bhatnagar and Papatla (2001) proposed a division of consumers in segments according to their different idiosyncratic search points and thresholds. This division also includes a segment-membership function, specified in terms of consumer demographics that can be used to identify the demographics associated with different focal groups. Thus, the following hypothesis can be contemplated:

H3: Different customer typologies exist in relation to their attitude to advertising in general and to online advertising in particular.

Empirical research. The procedure used for this research has been a laboratory experiment. The research sample was recruited from customers of a business providing public Internet connection services. The establishment was chosen taking into account the average number of customers who used the services per week. 108 people were selected for this study. The sample consists of 46.3% men and 43.7% women, all of them with higher education. 3 different groups were exposed to one of different types of advertising: dynamic, static and interactive. The selection of advertising types was done at random.

The questionnaire had 3 main parts: Internet use habits; perception and awareness of diverse web advertising formats, i.e. general assessment of advertising, perception of different formats, awareness of different formats, and global assessment of this type of advertising; and finally, demographic characteristics. To measure the users' perception of diverse advertising typologies an adaptation to web advertising of scales developed by Beltramini and Evans (1985) and the scale proposed by Wells (1964) was used.

Results. Before verifying the first hypothesis it is necessary to make a reliability analysis of the scale used. Cronbach's alphas for each advert type are the following: static advertising (0.841); dynamic advertising (0.898); animated advertising (0.900). Consequently, this scale can be accepted for 3 types of advertising. In addition, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been used to test the relationship beetwen the characteristics of advertising and 3 types of advertising. The results in Table 1 refute the presence of a relationship between attitude to advertising and advertising typology, but there seems to be a positive dependence between advertising presentation format and some characteristics influencing the assessment of advertising.

Table 1. **Analysis of variance (ANOVA)**

	STATIC		DYNAMIC		ANIMATED	
	F	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
Informative	5.038	**.006**	8.588	**.000**	8.558	**.000**
Stimulating	6.470	**.002**	6.691	**.001**	6.744	**.001**
Motivating	4.089	.015	17.779	**.000**	7.799	**.000**
Attractive	7,.341	**.001**	21.794	**.000**	17.542	**.000**
Dynamism	.856	.474	7.943	**.000**	6.679	**.001**
Comprehensive	.333	.802	1.451	.246	.162	.921
Convincing	,581	.632	6.939	**.001**	6.684	**.001**
Easy to remember	7.313	**.001**	3.389	.029	2.563	.072
Innovator	7.074	**.001**	9.005	**.000**	9.164	**.000**
Entertaining	12.010	**.000**	5.142	**.005**	4.470	**.010**
Pleasant	6.960	**.001**	4.169	.013	5.386	**.004**
Useful	7.139	**.001**	3.733	.020	13.995	**.000**

Because static advertising presents major significant characteristics, it is necessary to include "pleasant" and "useful" in addition to the precedent characteristics. It is also worth considering "easy to remember." Dynamic advertising presents different characteristics but coincides with animated typology in "stimulating", "dynamism," and "convincing."

In order to analyze whether the attitude to advertising in general has influence on the attitude to each type of advertising, the correlation between 3 types and the sample total is considered. The results are displayed in Table 2. If the total sample is considered, the results indicate that the attitude to advertising in general influences attitude to online advertising. However, if advertising types are considered separately, only in static advertising has the attitude to advertising in general a significant influence on the attitude to a specific type. In contrast, this influence does not appear in the formats with images and longer exposition time. Hypothesis 2 is thus verified only for static advertising.

Table 2. **General attitude to advertising — attitude toward each type**

			Attitude towards type
Sample total	Attitude towards advertising in general	Pearson	.264(**)
		Sig (bilateral)	.006
Static advertising	Attitude towards advertising in general	Pearson	.478(**)
		Sig (bilateral)	.004
Dynamic advertising	Attitude towards advertising in general	Pearson	.099
		Sig (bilateral)	.562
Animated advertising	Attitude towards advertising in general	Pearson	.261
		Sig (bilateral)	.124

** The correlation is significant at 0.01 (bilateral).

Table 3. **Cluster analisys**

VARIABLES	CLUSTER 1		CLUSTER 2		CLUSTER 3		ANOVA	
	M	%	M	%	M	%	F	Sig.
Attitude towards advertising in general	3.38	45.3	2.12	15.2	3.52	57.1	20.733	.000
General advertising - Informative	3.58	58.5	2.52	6.0	3.95	66.7	21.751	.000
General advertising — Necessary	3.58	58.5	2.67	24.2	3.19	33.4	10.455	.000
General advertising — Pleasant	3.28	37.7	2.27	6.1	3.19	47.6	14,352	.000
General advertising — Useful	3.83	69.8	2.85	24.2	4.05	91.1	21.907	.000
General advertising — Interesting	3.51	47.2	2.27	0.0	3.67	57.1	37.512	.000
General advertising - Entertaining	3.79	67.9	2.36	48.5	3.48	52.4	27.719	.000
General advertising — Easy information search	3.74	64.2	2.36	15.2	3.95	90.5	32.201	.000
Convincing	3.17	30.1	2.18	3.0	3.19	38.1	17.869	.000
General advertising — Improves organization image	3.70	58.5	2.82	21.3	3.38	52.4	7.951	.001
General advertising - Motivating	3.34	45.3	2.39	6.1	3.33	33.3	18.096	.000
Typology — Informative	3.49	49.0	2.88	24.2	2.00	4.8	25.887	.000
Typology — Interesting	3.25	35.9	2.45	12.1	1.90	0.0	26.842	.000
Typology — Motivating	3.15	18.9	2.39	6.1	1.81	0.0	32.883	.000
Typology - Attractive	3.75	64.1	2.55	9.1	1.57	4.8	75.101	.000
Typology — Dynamism	3.40	45.3	3.00	27.3	1.76	9.5	22.166	.000
Typology — Convincing	2.96	18.9	2.42	6.1	2.00	4.8	13.462	.000
Typology — Recall	3.47	49.1	3.30	44.6	2.43	14.3	7.294	.001
Typology — Novelty	3.64	60.4	3.21	36.4	1.76	0.0	34.912	.000
Typology — Entertainment	3.40	45.2	2.12	6.1	1.71	0.0	39.846	.000
Typology — Pleasant	3.72	58.5	3.06	30.3	2.67	9.5	15.546	.000
Typology — Usefulness	3.21	35.8	2.52	6.1	1.81	0.0	29.047	.000
Attitude towards advertising	3.43	43.4	2.64	6.1	2.10	0.0	39.756	.000
Assessment of advertising	3.38	41.5	2.85	15.2	2.43	4.8	18.740	.000
Sex	**H**	**M**	**H**	**M**	**H**	**M**	3.286	.041
	39.6	60.4	63.6	36.4	33.3	66.7		
% customers in each cluster	49.6		30.8		19.6		P<0.01	

* M = Mean, 5-point Likert scale; % = positive evaluation.

Finally, the cluster analysis is used to identify homogenous groups of customers differentiated by their attitude to advertising, Internet experience and demographic characteristics. This technique is used to offset Hypothesis 3. The method applied to analyze the groups is the K-means, which belongs to the non-hierarchical methods

appropriate for an elevated number of samples. The K-means procedure is used because of its superiority to hierarchical clustering methods with respect to considering outliers and because it is least affected by irrelevant attributes or a large number of cases.

As shown in Table 3, the ANOVA results show that differences between items, scale, and clusters are statistically significant at 99%, p<0.01. All of them have a discriminant capability when the significance level is higher than 0.05. The solution of 3 groups is selected. The results from the cluster and discriminant analysis demonstrate significant differences between 3 groups. Consequently, these results support the third hypothesis (H3). The results also show that it is possible to differentiate 3 consumer groups, so the next step in this research is to examine the most relevant characteristics of each group depending on their attitudes to advertising characteristics.

Group 1 (Positive attitude to advertising). It is the most numerous group, 49,6% of the total sample. The customers included in this group have a positive attitude to advertising in general. This characteristic causes their attitude to and assessment of Internet advertising to be positive.

Group 2 (Negative attitude to advertising). This second group consists of 30.8% of the total sample. Its members display a negative attitude to advertising in general, as well as towards Internet advertising. In spite of this, they think that, as a whole, advertising is entertaining, useful, and necessary and that online advertising is informative, pleasant, and facilitates later recall.

Group 3 (Positive attitude to advertising but negative to the medium). This is the smallest group and amounts to 19,6% of the total sample. This group has a positive attitude to advertising in general, yet they do not consider the Internet as an adequate medium for advertising campaigns because their attitude to online advertising is quite negative.

Discussion. Taking into account 3 different types, this research has analyzed Internet advertising effectiveness and has measured it through consumers' attitude towards online advertising (Chaffey et al., 2006; Lavilla, 2002).

However, because there are no differences between advertising typology and its effects, the first conclusion of this research could be to affirm that the introduction of animation in web advertising has no effect whatsoever on its global assessment. Internet users tend to agree that advertising is "informative," "interesting," "attractive," "innovative" and "entertaining". Zhang (2000) considers that animation of an advertisement to improve information search is counterproductive because animation will distract users' attention from a central task. Nonetheless, some variables are relevant in order to distinguish among different advertising types. Bruner and Kumar (2000) establish that complexity has a negative impact on websites, while interest has a positive one. It thus proves that the relationship between website complexity and communication effectiveness can be represented by an inverse and curvilinear function; in other words, to achieve optimal effectiveness, a website must display a reasonable degree of complexity but not be too complex because this would mean that users will be distracted (Geissler, Zinkhan, and Watson, 2006; Yoo, Kim, and Stout, 2004). However, this work provides evidence to support the notion that there are differences among 3 advertising types. Static advertising is perceived by consumers as more useful, easier to remember, and more pleasant.

Second, these results prove that attitude to advertising in general has a direct influence on the attitude to web advertising. Nevertheless, when different advertising types are taken into account, it is only in static advertising that general attitude to advertising affects the attitude to online advertising. This result may be attributed to the fact that consumers perceive complex and dynamic adverts as dissimilar from advertising in other media. It could explain why their beliefs and attitudes to advertising in general are not transferred to their attitudes towards online advertising.

Finally, this paper has shown that consumers can be divided into 3 groups according to their attitudes to advertising. Similar works have proved that Internet experience and other demographic characteristics are relevant to assess consumer behaviour and response to marketing actions (Bruner and Kumar, 2000; Dahlen, 2001). This work, however, has been unable to include these demographic and experience-based differences in its analysis, because of the fact that results refuted the discrimination capacity of these variables. This may be attributed to the homogeneity of the sample used in this research.

The results of this work allow us to propose the following implications of this research. First, this paper demonstrates that attitude-based measures are a good method to measure web advertising effectiveness. Also, a belief that the Clickthrough rate is the only valid method to measure the effectiveness of a given online advertising campaign should be revised by advertisers because this tool only provides information on consumers' behavior. Attitude-based variables are useful tools to improve the measurement of advertising effectiveness because they provide information on Internet users' assessment and perception of online ads.

Second, firms should contemplate using dynamic and complex advertising elements in relation to their communication objectives. When a campaign is directed to attract attention to an advertising element, static advertising will provide a higher recall rate; in contrast, if the main aim of a campaign is to motivate consumers, advert animation would yield better results. It is also necessary to carry out more research on the text-based adverts present in websites, because of their high rate of visits per customer. Admittedly, not all visits will lead to purchase, but an analysis of the number of effective visits would be very useful.

Finally, the analysis of the differences perceived among consumer groups in relation to their attitude to online advertising provides information on their main characteristics, which is fundamental in the design of communication strategies adapted to specific groups. Internet advertising has a great growth potential and market segmentation will probably be necessary for higher advertising effectiveness.

References:

1. *Adelaar, T., Chang, S., Lancendorfer, K.M., Lee, B., & Morimoto, M.* (2003). Effects of media formats on emotions and impulse buying intent. Journal of Information Technology, 18(4), 247-266.

2. *Baltas, G.* (2003). Determinants of internet advertising effectiveness: an empirical study. International Journal of Market Research, 45(4), 505-513.

3. *Beltramini, R.F. & Evans, K.R.* (1985). Perceived Believability of Research Results Information in Advertising. Journal of Advertising, 14(3), 18-24.

4. *Benway, J.P.* (1998). Banner blindness: The Irony of Attention Grabbing on the World Wide Web. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 42nd Annual Meeting, 1, 463-467.

5. *Bhatnagar, A. & Papatla, P.* (2001). Identifying Locations for Targeted Advertising on the Internet. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 5(3), 23-44.

6. *Brackett, L.K. & Carr, B.N.* (2001). Cyberspace Advertising vs. Other Media: Consumer vs. Mature Student Attitudes. Journal of Advertising Research, 41(5), 23-33.

7. *Briggs, R. & Hollis, N.* (1997). Advertising on the Web: Is There Response before Click-Through? Journal of Advertising Research, 37(2), 33-45.

8. *Brown, M.* (2002). The Use of Banner Advertisements with Pull-Down Menus: A Copy Testing Approach. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 2(2), 74-84.

9. *Bruner, G.C. & Kumar, A.* (2000). Web Commercials and Advertising Hierarchy-of-Effects. Journal of Advertising Research, 40(1/2), 35-42.

10. *Bucklin, R.E. & Sismeiro, C.* (2003). Web site design rules of thumb challenged by study on browsing. Marketing News, 37(16), 22-22.

11. *Bucklin, R.E. & Sismeiro, C.* (2009). Click Here for Internet Insight: Advances in Clickstream Data Analysis in Marketing. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 23(1), 35-48

12. *Burns, K.S. & Lutz, R.J.* (2006). The Function of Format: Consumer Responses to Six On-line Advertising Formats. Journal of Advertising, 35(1), 53-63.

13. *Chaffey, D., Mayer, R., Johnston, K., & Ellis-Chadwick, F.* (2006), Internet marketing: strategy, implementation and practice. 2? Ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

14. *Chandon, J.L., Chtourou, M.S., & Fortin, D.R.* (2003). Effects of Configuration and Exposure Levels on Responses to Web Advertisements. Journal of Advertising Research, 43(2), 217-229.

15. *Chatterjee, P.* (2005). Changing Banner Ad Executions on the Web: Impact on Clickthroughs and Communication Outcomes. Advances in Consumer Research, 32(1), 51-57.

16. *Chatterjee, P., Hoffman, D.L. & Novak, T.P.* (2003). Modeling the Clickstream: Implications for Web-Based Advertising Efforts. Marketing Science, 22(4) 520-541.

17. *Chen, Q. & Wells, W.D.* (1999). Attitude toward the Site. Journal of Advertising Research, 39(5), 27-37.

18. *Cheong, H. & Morrison, M.* (2008). Consumers' reliance on product information and recommendations found in UGC. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 8(2), 38-49.

19. *Chittenden, L. & Rettie, R.* (2003). An evaluation of e-mail marketing and factors affecting response. Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 11(3), 203 - 217.

20. *Cho, C.* (1999). How Advertising Works on the WWW: Modified Elaboration Likelihood Model. Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 21(1), 33-55.

21. *Cho, C., Lee, J., & Tharp, M.* (2001). Different Forced-Exposure Levels to Banner Advertisements. Journal of Advertising Research, 41(4), 45-56.

22. *Choi, S.M. & Rifon, N.J.* (2002). Antecedents and Consequences of Web Advertising Credibility: A Study of Consumer Response to Banner Ads. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 3(1), 57-75.

23. *Coyle, J.R. & Thorson, E.* (2001). The Effects of Progressive Levels of Interactivity and Vividness in Web Marketing Sites. Journal of Advertising, 30(3), 65-77.

24. *Dahlen, M.* (2001). Banner advertisements through a New Lens. Journal of Advertising Research, 41(4), 23-30.

25. *Dahlen, M.* (2002). Thinking and feeling on the World Wide Web: the impact of product type and time on World Wide Web advertising effectiveness. Journal of Marketing Communications, 8(2), 115-125.

26. *Dahlen, M., Murray, M., & Nordenstam, S.* (2004). An empirical study of perceptions of implicit meanings in World Wide Web advertisements versus print advertisements. Journal of Marketing Communications, 10(1), 35-47.

27. *Danaher, P.J.* (2007). Modeling Page Views Across Multiple Websites with an Application to Internet Reach and Frequency Prediction. Marketing Science, 26(3), 422-37.

28. *Danaher, P.J. & Mullarkey, G.W.* (2003). Factors Affecting Online Advertising Recall: A Study of Students. Journal of Advertising Research, 43(3), 252-267.

29. *Danaher, P.J., Mullarkey, G.W., & Essegaier, S.* (2006). Factors Affecting Web Site Visit Duration: A Cross-Domain Analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 43(2), 182-194.

30. *Dreze, X. & Hussherr, F.* (2003). Internet Advertising: Is Anybody Watching?. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 17(4), 8-23.

31. *Dreze, X. & Zufryden, F.* (1998). Is Internet Advertising Ready for Prime Time? Journal of Advertising Research, 38(3), 7-18.

32. *Ducoffe, R.H.* (1996). Advertising Value and Advertising on The Web. Journal of Advertising Research, 36(5), 21-35.

33.   *Dufrene, D.D., Engelland, B.T., Lehman, C.M., & Pearson, R.A.* (2005). Changes in consumer attitudes resulting from participation in a permission e-mail campaign. Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 27(1), 65-77.

34.   *Edwards, S.M., Li, H., & Lee, J.* (2002). Forced Exposure and Psychological Reactance: Antecedents and Consequences of the Perceived Intrusiveness of Pop-Up Ads. Journal of Advertising, 31(3), 83-95.

35.   *Gallagher, K., Parsons, J., & Foster, K.D.* (2001). A Tale of Two Studies: Replicating "Advertising Effectiveness and Content Evaluation in Print and on the Web. Journal of Advertising Research, 41(4), 71-81.

36.   *Geissler, G.L., Zinkhan, G.M., & Watson, R.T.* (2006). The influence of home page complexity on consumer attention, attitudes, and purchase intent. Journal of Advertising, 35(2), 69-80.

37.   *Gong, W. & Maddox, L.M.* (2003). Measuring Web Advertising Effectiveness in China. Journal of Advertising Research, 43(1), 34-49.

38.   *Hoffman, D.L. & Novak, T.P.* (1996). Marketing in hypermedia computer-mediated environments: Conceptual foundations. Journal of Marketing, 60(3), 50-68.

39.   *Hoffman, D.L. & Novak, T.P.* (1997). New Metrics for New Media: Toward the Development of Web Measurement Standards. World Wide Web Journal, 2(1), 213-246.

40.   *Hsieh, Y.C. & Chen, K.H.* (2011). How different information types affect viewer's attention on internet advertising. Computers in Human Behavior, 27(2), 935-945.

41.   *Jee, J. & Lee, W.* (2002). Antecedents and Consequences of Perceived Interactivity: An Exploratory Study. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 3(1), 27-43.

42.   *Kim, G. & Lee, J.H.* (2011). The effect of search condition and advertising type on visual attention to Internet advertising. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 14(5), 323-325.

43.   *Lavilla, M.* (2002), La Actividad Publicitaria en Internet, 2. Ed. Madrid: Ed. Ra - Ma.

44.   *Lee, S., Lee, W., Kim, H., & Stout, P.A.* (2004). A Comparison of Objective Characteristics and User Perception of Web Sites. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 4(2), 91-111.

45.   *Lees, G. & Healey, B.* (2005). A Test of the Effectiveness of a Mouse Pointer Image in Increasing Click through for a Web Banner Advertisement. Marketing Bulletin, 16, 1-6.

46.   *Leong, E.K., Huang, X., & Stanners, P.* (1998). Comparing the Effectiveness of the Web Site with Traditional Media. Journal of Advertising Research, 38(5), 44-51.

47.   *Li, H. & Bukovac, J.L.* (1999). Cognitive Impact of Banner Ad Characteristics: An Experimental Study. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 76(2), 341-353.

48.   *Lohtia, R., Donthu, N., & Hershberger, E.K.* (2003). The Impact of Content and Design Elements on Banner Advertising Click-through Rates. Journal of Advertising Research, 43(4), 410-418.

49.   *MacKenzie, S.B., Lutz, R.J., & Belch, G.E.* (1986). The Role of Attitude toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: A Test of Competing Explanations. Journal of Marketing Research, 23(2), 130-143.

50.   *Manchanda, P., Dube, J., Khim Yong Goh, K.Y., & Chintagunta, P.K.* (2006). The Effect of Banner Advertising on Internet Purchasing. Journal of Marketing Research, 43(1), 98-108.

51.   *Martin, B., Van Durme, J., Raulas, M., & Merisavo, M.* (2003). Email Advertising: Exploratory Insights from Finland. Journal of Advertising Research, 43(3), 293-300.

52.   *Moore, R.S., Stammerjohan, C.A., & Coulter, R.A.* (2005). Banner advertiser-web site context congruity and color effects on attention and attitudes. Journal of Advertising, 34(2), 71-84.

53.   *Petty, R.E. & Cacioppo, J.T.* (1986). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of persuasion", in: L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology 19, New York: Academic Press, 123-205.

54.   *Schlosser, A.E., Shavitt, S., & Kanfer, A.* (1999). Survey of Internet Users' Attitudes toward Internet Advertising. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 13(3), 34-54.

55.   *Shavitt, S., Lowrey, P., & Haefner, J.* (1998). Public Attitudes Toward Advertising: More Favorable than You Might Think. Journal of Advertising Research, 38(4), 7-22.

56.   *Singh, S.N. & Dalal, N.P.* (1999). Web Home Pages as Advertisements. Communications of the ACM, 42(8), 91-98.

57.   *Stevenson, J.S., Bruner, G.C., & Kumar, A.* (2000). Web Page Background and Viewer Attitudes. Journal of Advertising Research, 40(1/2), 29-34.

58.   *Ward, M.R. & Lee, M.J.* (2000). Internet shopping, consumer search and product branding. Journal of Product and Brand Management, 9(1), 6-18.

59.   *Wells, W.D.* (1964). EQ, Son of EQ, and the Reaction Profile. Journal of Marketing, 28(4), 45-52.

60. *Wolin, L.D., Korgaonkar, P., & Lund, D.* (2002). Beliefs, attitudes and behaviour toward Web advertising. International Journal of Advertising, 21(1), 87-113.

61. *Yoo, C.Y, Kim, K., & Stout, P.A.* (2004). Assessing the Effects of Animation in Online Banner Advertising: Hierarchy of Effects Model. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 4(2), 71-90.

62. *Yoon, S. & Kim, J.* (2001). Is the Internet More Effective Than Traditional Media? Factors Affecting the Choice of Media. Journal of Advertising Research, 41(6), 53-60.

63. *Zhang, P.* (2000). The Effects of Animation on Information Seeking Performance on the World Wide Web: Securing Attention or Interfering with Primary Tasks? Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 1(1), 1-28.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 12.11.2012.

ERRATA NOTE

ERRATA NOTE:

Issue # 6 (144), 2013, page 548 -
The right affiliation to be read as:
Sladana Dimitrijevic, Faculty of Science,
University of Kragujevac, Serbia.