

**DOKUZ EYLUL UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (ENGLISH)**  
**BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (ENGLISH) PROGRAM**  
**MASTER’S THESIS**

**ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND ENDOWMENT EFFECT:  
COMPARISON OF HEDONIC AND UTILITARIAN  
PRODUCTS**

**Gizem Yağmur SÖNMEZ**

**Supervisor**  
**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sümeyra Duman**

**İZMİR-2022**

## THESIS APPROVAL PAGE



## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that this master's thesis titled as "Anthropomorphism and Endowment Effect: Comparison of Hedonic and Utilitarian Products" has been written by myself in accordance with the academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that all materials benefited in this thesis consist of the mentioned resources in the reference list. I verify all these with my honor.

Date

23/09/2022

Gizem Yağmur SÖNMEZ

## **ABSTRACT**

### **Master's Thesis**

## **Anthropomorphism and Endowment Effect: Comparison of Hedonic and Utilitarian Products**

**Gizem Yağmur SÖNMEZ**

**Dokuz Eylul University**

**Graduate School of Social Sciences**

**Department of Business Administration (English)**

**Business Administration (English) Program**

Consumers interact with non-human entities from cars to mobile phones on a daily basis. Instead of being just machines, customers may attribute human-like features, beliefs and intentions to these goods. Prior researches have mainly focused on why people anthropomorphize and how anthropomorphism affects consumers' evaluation about brand and products.

The current research takes a different perspective by proposing that anthropomorphism leads customers to demand a higher price for a product they own, compared to the price they will be willing to pay to purchase the same item. Based on this promise, in this thesis, it is supported via two studies that consumers in seller position were willing to accept higher prices to sell the anthropomorphized item while consumers in buyer position indicated relatively lower prices. This impact of anthropomorphism is stronger for complex products rather than simple products. Furthermore, consumers in seller position are willing to accept higher prices when the anthropomorphized product has hedonic features as compared to the products with utilitarian features. The research concludes by discussing the managerial implications, limitations and directions for future researches.

**Keywords: Anthropomorphism, Endowment Effect, Willingness to Accept, Willingness to Pay.**

## **ÖZET**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi**

**Antropomorfizm ve Sahip Olma Etkisi: Hazcı ve Faydacı Ürünlerin  
Karşılaştırılması**

**Gizem Yağmur SÖNMEZ**

**Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi**

**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü**

**İngilizce İşletme Anabilim Dalı**

**İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Programı**

Tüketiciler, günlük hayatlarında arabalardan cep telefonlarına kadar insan olmayan birçok varlık ile etkileşime girerler. Müşteriler bu varlıkları yalnızca makine olmanın ötesinde değerlendirir ve onlara insanlara özgü özellikler, inançlar ve niyetler atfedebilirler. Önceki araştırmalar temel olarak insanların neden antropomorfizmi deneyimlediğine ve antropomorfizmin tüketicilerin marka ve ürün değerlendirmeleri üzerindeki etkisine odaklanmıştır.

Mevcut çalışma antropomorfizmin müşterilerin sahip oldukları bir ürünü satmak için kabul etmeye razı olacakları tutarın, aynı ürünü satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacakları tutara kıyasla daha yüksek olmasına yol açacağını öne sürerek farklı bir bakış açısı getiriyor. Bu önermeden hareketle, bu tezde satıcı konumundaki tüketicilerin antropomorfik ürünü satmak için talep ettikleri tutarın, alıcı konumundaki tüketicilerin aynı ürünü satın almak için ödeyecekleri tutardan daha yüksek olduğu yapılan iki çalışma aracılığı ile desteklenmiştir. Antropomorfizmin bu etkisi karmaşık ürünler için basit ürünlere kıyasla daha güçlüdür. Ayrıca, satıcılar antropomorfik ürün hazcı özelliklere sahip olduğunda yüksek fiyat talep etmeye daha isteklidirler. Araştırma yönetsel uygulamalar, sınırlamalar ve gelecek araştırmaların doğrultusu tartışılarak sona ermektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Antropomorfizm, Sahip Olma Etkisi, Kabul Etme İstekliliği, Ödeme İstekliliği.

# **ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND ENDOWMENT EFFECT: COMPARISON OF HEDONIC AND UTILITARIAN PRODUCTS**

## **CONTENTS**

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| THESIS APPROVAL PAGE | i   |
| DECLARATION          | iii |
| ABSTRACT             | iv  |
| ÖZET                 | v   |
| CONTENTS             | vi  |
| ABBREVIATIONS        | ix  |
| LIST OF TABLES       | x   |
| LIST OF FIGURES      | xi  |
| LIST OF APPENDICES   | xii |
| INTRODUCTION         | 1   |

## **CHAPTER ONE ANTHROPOMORPHISM**

|                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.1. DEFINITION OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM             | 3  |
| 1.2. ORIGINS OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM                | 4  |
| 1.3. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND ANIMISM               | 5  |
| 1.4. THE REASONS BEHIND ANTHROPOMORPHIZATION    | 6  |
| 1.5. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND CONSUMER EVALUATION   | 14 |
| 1.6. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP | 18 |

## **CHAPTER TWO ENDOWMENT EFFECT**

|                       |    |
|-----------------------|----|
| 2.1. ENDOWMENT EFFECT | 24 |
|-----------------------|----|

|                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2.1.1. Psychological Ownership                  | 31 |
| 2.1.2. Alternative Theories of Endowment Effect | 35 |
| 2.1.2.1. Attachment Theory                      | 35 |
| 2.1.2.2. Query Theory                           | 36 |
| 2.2. ENDOWMENT EFFECT FOR HEDONIC PRODUCTS      | 37 |
| 2.3. ENDOWMENT EFFECT AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM      | 39 |

### **CHAPTER THREE**

#### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

|                                                                                           |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 3.1. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY                                                              | 42 |
| 3.2. MANIPULATION CHECK                                                                   | 44 |
| 3.3. STUDY 1: IMPACT OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM ON WTA AND WTP OF CUSTOMERS FOR COMPLEX PRODUCTS | 52 |
| 3.3.1. Procedure and Design                                                               | 52 |
| 3.3.2. Measures                                                                           | 53 |
| 3.3.3. Results                                                                            | 54 |
| 3.3.3.1 Demographics of Participants                                                      | 54 |
| 3.3.3.2. Hypotheses Testing                                                               | 54 |
| 3.4. STUDY 2: IMPACT OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM ON WTA AND WTP OF CUSTOMERS FOR SIMPLE PRODUCTS  | 57 |
| 3.4.1. Procedure and Design                                                               | 57 |
| 3.4.2. Measures                                                                           | 58 |
| 3.4.3. Results                                                                            | 58 |
| 3.4.3.1. Demographics of Participants                                                     | 58 |
| 3.4.3.2. Hypotheses Testing                                                               | 59 |
| 3.5. ENDOWMENT EFFECT FOR HEDONIC VS UTILITARIAN PRODUCTS                                 | 60 |

|            |    |
|------------|----|
| CONCLUSION | 64 |
| REFERENCES | 67 |
| APPENDICES |    |



## ABBREVIATIONS

|            |                       |
|------------|-----------------------|
| <b>WTP</b> | Willingness to Pay    |
| <b>WTA</b> | Willingness to Accept |



## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                            |       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| <b>Table 1:</b> Chi-Square Test Results of Anthropomorphism Check for Watch, Personal Assistant, and Robot | p. 48 |
| <b>Table 2:</b> Anthropomorphism Manipulation Results for Watch, Personal Assistant, and Robot Cleaner     | p. 48 |
| <b>Table 3:</b> Chi-Square Test Results of Anthropomorphism Check for Car and Thermos                      | p. 51 |
| <b>Table 4:</b> Anthropomorphism Manipulation Results for Car and Thermos                                  | p. 51 |
| <b>Table 5:</b> Chi-Square Analysis of Complex Product vs Income Level                                     | p. 55 |
| <b>Table 6:</b> ANOVA Results of Psychological Ownership for Seller-Buyer Position for Complex Products    | p. 55 |
| <b>Table 7:</b> GLM Results of Endowment Effect and Anthropomorphism for Complex Product                   | p. 56 |
| <b>Table 8:</b> Chi-Square Analysis of Simple Product vs Income Level                                      | p. 59 |
| <b>Table 9:</b> ANOVA Results of Psychological Ownership for Seller-Buyer Position for Simple Products     | p. 59 |
| <b>Table 10:</b> GLM Results of Endowment Effect and Anthropomorphism for Simple Products                  | p. 60 |
| <b>Table 11:</b> Descriptive Statistics of Selling and Buying Prices for Hedonic and Utilitarian Products  | p. 61 |
| <b>Table 12:</b> Tests Results of Between Subject Effects for Complex Products                             | p. 62 |
| <b>Table 13:</b> Tests Results of Between Subject Effects for Simple Products                              | p. 63 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|                                                                                          |       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| <b>Figure 1:</b> Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Watches             | p. 46 |
| <b>Figure 2:</b> Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Robot Cleaners      | p. 46 |
| <b>Figure 3:</b> Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Personal Assistants | p. 47 |
| <b>Figure 4:</b> Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Thermoses           | p. 50 |
| <b>Figure 5:</b> Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Cars                | p. 50 |



## LIST OF APPENDICES

|                                                                                  |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Appendix 1:</b> Survey 1- WTA for Anthropomorphic-Hedonic Products            | app. p. ii      |
| <b>Appendix 2:</b> Survey 2- WTP for Anthropomorphic-Hedonic Products            | app. p. vii     |
| <b>Appendix 3:</b> Survey 3- WTA for Non-Anthropomorphic Hedonic<br>Products     | app. p. xii     |
| <b>Appendix 4:</b> Survey 4- WTP for Non-Anthropomorphic Hedonic<br>Products     | app. p. xvii    |
| <b>Appendix 5:</b> Survey 5- WTA for Anthropomorphic Utilitarian Products        | app. p.<br>xxii |
| <b>Appendix 6:</b> Survey 6- WTP for Anthropomrohic Utilitarian Products         | app. p.<br>xxvi |
| <b>Appendix 7:</b> Survey 7- WTA for Non-Anthropomorphic Utilitarian<br>Products | app. p. xxx     |
| <b>Appendix 8:</b> Survey 8- WTP for Non-Anthropomorphic Utilitarian<br>Products | app. p. xxxiv   |

## INTRODUCTION

Product and brand anthropomorphism, or endowing brand and products with human-like features has a wide range of applications in marketing (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007). Marketers create anthropomorphized representation of products by attributing physical characteristics of human (e.g., a smile front of the car, shapes of body on perfume bottle), designing mascots to personify brands (e.g., the M&M Cand Man) or introducing product in human terms (e.g., spoke in first-person language). Comprehensively, anthropomorphism as a marketing strategy has been successful in improving consumer evaluations (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007) and favorable responses toward products (Delbaere, McQuarrie and Phillips, 2011). Therefore, prior studies in anthropomorphism literature have mainly focused on the impact of anthropomorphism on product evaluations (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007), and on consumer-brand relationship (Puzakova, Kwak and Rocereto, 2013). There is limited research in the literature which examines the impact of anthropomorphism on willingness to accept and willingness to pay (Kim and Kramer, 2015; Kim and Swaminathan, 2021, Yuan and Dennis, 2019). However, to the best of the author's knowledge, there is no study which examines the impact of anthropomorphism on both willingness to accept and willingness to pay. Therefore, in the present research, how willingness to accept and willingness to sell differs for anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic products will be examined. In addition, how the impact of anthropomorphism on the endowment effect changes for complex and simple products as well as products with hedonic and utilitarian features will be clarified.

The literature on anthropomorphism has shown that customers tend to attach more value to anthropomorphized products (Kim and Kramer, 2015:290; Kim and Swaminathan, 2021:469; Yuan and Dennis; 2019:85). On the other hand, research on the endowment effect has suggested that people demand higher price for a product that they own compared to their willingness to pay to purchase the same product that they do not own (Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler, 1991:194). Therefore, in the light of these two different perspectives of research, it is expected that when products were endowed with human-like characteristics (in other words anthropomorphized) customers tend to set a higher value for a product that they own compared to the price that they will be willing to pay to purchase the same product.

It is proposed by the literature that customers tend to anthropomorphize complex products more compared to simple products (Hart, Jones, and Royne, 2013:115) since the nature of complex products is more appropriate to be evaluated as human-like. Therefore, it is proposed that when making comparisons between complex and simple products, the endowment effect will occur higher for complex products. The literature also showed that the endowment effect will be higher for hedonic products rather than utilitarian products (Chan, 2015:1; Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000:68). When people own a product, functionality becomes less important in the evaluation process (Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000:68), in addition to this anthropomorphism also shifts the attention from the functionality to personal information about the product (Chandler and Waytz, 2010: 138). Based on these findings, this study suggests that when the hedonic and utilitarian features of products were considered, endowment effect will be higher for the hedonic products when compared to utilitarian ones. Additionally, in this study this effect is expected to be valid for complex products.

This study makes critical contributions to both anthropomorphism and the endowment effect literature by revealing how the endowment effect differs between anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized products. Also, this study diversifies the findings by revealing how this effect changes across product types (complex vs simple) and features (hedonic vs utilitarian).

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **ANTHROPOMORPHISM**

#### **1.1. DEFINITION OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM**

People tend to see the world (including animals, objects, brands, products, etc.) as humanlike. They can see images in clouds, familiar shapes in a bottle of perfume, or a smile in front of their cars (Guthrie, 1993:39). They consider responses of their pet as friendly, computer which is failing to work as vengeful, and plant with wilting leaves as wanting sunlight or water (Epley et al., 2008:151). Even though people are aware that cars are inanimate they still behave like they are alive. Most people feel attached to their cars (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007), and express love for their favorite brands (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014). Anthropomorphism spreads into people's lives, thoughts and actions. Anthropomorphism can be found in every aspect of human life such as religion, art, storytelling, marketing, and more. (Wan and Aggarwal, 2015:4). Anthropomorphism is a wide-ranging phenomenon that includes opinions from cognitive, developmental, and social psychology as well as neurosciences (Waytz, Cacioppo, and Epley, 2010:219).

Anthropomorphism is defined as “attributing human characteristics or behavior to a god, animal or object” (Soanes and Stevenson, 2005). As a wider perspective, psychologists have used anthropomorphism to define everything about nonhuman agents including mistaken or dispositional inferences. Guthrie (1993:3) used anthropomorphism as a systematic approach to explain religion and pointed out that anthropomorphism is familiar which can be felt by people all the time and becomes powerful in their thoughts. Anthropomorphism is endowing things or events with human-like features which occurs as a result of a person's wishful thinking of attributing life to an object based on any realized motion or noise coming from the non-human entity (Guthrie, 1993:39).

Even though Guthrie's (1993) definition was accepted by a variety of researchers, Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo (2007:865) expanded this understanding of anthropomorphism and claimed that anthropomorphism involves more than simply attributing life into nonliving. Therefore, anthropomorphism not only converts non-human agents into moral agents but also converts them into proper candidates to be in

a relationship with. Along with this, Fournier (1998:345) defines anthropomorphism as a type of brand relationship which enables brands to bear an active role in order to involve the relation as a participant.

## **1.2. ORIGINS OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM**

Even though anthropomorphism in marketing is considered as relatively a novel phenomenon, primal evidence of anthropomorphism has been seen over 30.000 years ago in sculptures that combine the head of a lion and the body of a human (Dalton, 2003: 7). The term anthropomorphism was first used by Xenophanes (6<sup>th</sup> Century B.C, as cited in Waytz, Cacioppo, and Epley, 2010:220) in order to explain how supernatural agents (e.g., gods) show a tendency to carry intensive physical similarities to their worshippers. Xenophanes also mentioned that if lions or horses are being able to paint their gods, they would paint them as lions and horses (Guthrie, 1993:63). This idea is also consistent for the humans, who considered their gods in the form of an actual human (Guthrie, 1993:63). Description of Xenophanes includes two basic methods of anthropomorphizing which were later explained by Guthrie (1993:39) and Epley (2007:867). The first method includes endowing nonhumans with humanlike physical traits (e.g., hand, face) while the second method includes ascription of a humanlike mind to nonhumans (e.g., emotions like joy or shame, intentions) (Waytz, Cacioppo and Epley, 2010:220).

As a word, anthropomorphism combines two Greek words “*anthropos*” which means human, and “*morphe*” which means shape. Therefore, anthropomorphism is defined as non-human entities which are endowed with a human shape or closer form (Wan and Aggarwal, 2015:3). Anthropomorphism does not appear only in Greek culture and spreads across others which can be seen in classics such as The Lion King or Alice in Wonderland. In addition to these stories, most of the Disney characters like Donald Duck reflect the prevalence of anthropomorphism in different areas (Wan and Aggarwal, 2015:3).

The origin of anthropomorphism is explained differently by researchers. Asquith (1997:29) explained anthropomorphism as directly related to cultural norms. According to Asquith (1997:29), anthropomorphism keeps Western and Japanese primatology away from each other. On the other hand, Davis (1997:336) suggested

that anthropomorphism originates from logical error which is named as “affirming the consequent”. The error occurs due to mistakes in design or people’s tendency to think of something as humanlike (Davis, 1997:336).

### **1.3. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND ANIMISM**

The psychological process of endowing brands/products with human-like personalities is defined as animism by Aaker (1997:347). In marketing literature terms anthropomorphism and animism are used interchangeably. Even though these two phenomena refer to different concepts, there are similarities between them since both involve nearly the same cognitive process (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:865). In animism, as the first step, people pay attention to living features that are attributed to an object. Then, they start to evaluate it as a living being. In detail, people first think of what they know about the living agents and then implement their current knowledge to an object in question. As a result, they perceive this object as a living being since it is endowed with features that refer to life itself. Anthropomorphism occurs in the same way; first people’s knowledge becomes activated by perceived features of humans in the object then they apply their knowledge to make inferences from it.

Fournier (1998:344) referred to animism while explaining the process of anthropomorphizing and indicated that animism refers to a need to anthropomorphize objects to be able to ease the interaction with the world. However, social psychologists split up between two different processes. Guthrie (1993:6) defined animism as someone’s wishful thinking of attributing life into an entity based on the observed movement or voice. According to Guthrie (1993:62), people do not only see the world as alive but they also see it as humanlike. In this regard, his explanation shows a great resemblance to animism. Both of these concepts originate from people’s attempts to find meaning and both of them occur as a consequence of overestimating it (Guthrie, 1993:62). Searching the world to find what concerns people the most such as living things, especially humans, people face with various distinct cases. Most of these cases occur throughout the illusion. This illusion includes both animating (ascribing life to the non-living) and anthropomorphizing (ascribing human characteristics to the

nonhuman) (Guthrie, 1993:63). Furthermore, anthropomorphism and animism can occur at the same time. For instance, when people start yelling at their computers that are failing to work, they both animate them by attributing life and anthropomorphize them by assuming that they can understand the language (Guthrie, 1993:63).

In addition to Guthrie's (1993:63) perspective, Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo (2007:865) demonstrated that anthropomorphism is a wide-range phenomenon that includes more than attribution of life to non-living things (as referring to animism). Therefore, attributing human features to non-human things (animism) is not the same as seeing these things as complete humans (anthropomorphism) (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:865). In this aspect, anthropomorphism goes beyond behavioral or dispositional deductions about the non-human entity, in return it also requires imputing the human mind to the same entity. For instance, even though considering the fox as fast does not indicate anthropomorphic inference but considering the fox as vigilant does (Waytz, Cacioppo, Epley, 2010:220). Here, while the first inference is a simple definition for one of the fox's traits, the second inference refers to the mental quality of the animal. As another example, if someone says the motorcycle is making noises (yowl) like a wolf, this refers to animism. However, if someone says the motorcycle yells like his/her mother, it is anthropomorphism. If someone speaks with a dog, it is anthropomorphism since the dog is already a living being but if the someone speaks with the car it can refer to both animism and anthropomorphism (Guthrie, 1993:40).

Differentiating animism and anthropomorphism requires the determination of humanness in the target object. There are certain traits (such as face, hands, emotions, etc.) that distinguish humans from other living species (Karpinska-Krakiwicz and Eisend, 2021:107). The existence of mental capacity is one of these traits which creates a proper condition to claim humanness. Therefore, in the existence of humanlike features like face or movement, human-like mental states also can be implied (Morewedge, Preston and Wegner, 2007:2).

#### **1.4. THE REASONS BEHIND ANTHROPOMORPHIZATION**

There have been three main explanations for the tendency of people to attribute human-like characteristics to non-human entities. According to Guthrie's view

(1993:6), anthropomorphism is wishful thinking. People anthropomorphize because they want to have more relationships in their lives and they try to fill this gap caused by the absence of human relations with anthropomorphized objects. Another perspective of Guthrie's explanation (1993:6) suggests that people anthropomorphize because they wish to create more meaning from the world, they live in. People choose to use what they know to create a better understanding of what they do not know by attributing human-like features to entities around them. In this regard, Delbaere, McQuarrie, and Phillips (2011:127) attested that anthropomorphism creates the proper chance for customers to evaluate a wide range of products according to their own humanity which is a well-known framework for them. Lastly, Guthrie (1993:5) claims that making a bet that the world is human-like is a good bet because it minimizes the risk of unknown. According to this view, people anthropomorphize because when they see something as human or alive, they believe they can protect themselves.

Following Guthrie (1993), Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo (2007:865) offered a three-factor analysis that reveals why people are ready to anthropomorphize easily. The first factor of this model is accessibility and applicability of knowledge (also known as elicited agent knowledge) which suggests that the human schema converts to more accessible when people observe human-like features (such as voice, movement, shape, etc.) in the non-human entity. This makes the object more ready to be anthropomorphized. Even though, the anthropomorphic tendency of people is prevalent, they do not anthropomorphize all objects with the same ease.

The tendency to anthropomorphize can lean on observed specific traits. Tremoulet and Feldman (2000:947) demonstrated that simultaneous change in movement and speed can create an impression of animacy (something that is alive) even in the absence of observable features. For instance, if the speed of a non-human entity is closer to the speed of an actual human, the likelihood of people perceiving that object as human-like will be higher (Morewedge, Preston, and Wegner, 2004: 4). In this regard, non-human entities that move quickly will be seen as more human (e.g., insects) while others that move slowly are considered as less human (e.g., clock) (Morewedge, Preston and Wegner, 2004: 4). This sensory shows that what is known about the human experience will be applied naturally, easily, and completely more than any other knowledge (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:868).

Beyond observable physical features, people also use their own mental states as starting point to make inferences about others' mental states (non-human entities) which is also determined as anthropomorphism (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:868). In this respect, the term anthropomorphism has a closer relationship with egocentrism which defined as using one's own mental states and features as a starting point to make inferences about other humans (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:868). Considering an agent as possessing a humanlike mind has substantial consequences (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:865). First of all, considering an object to have a mind of its own lead to an interpretation that this object should be treated with care and concern (Gray, Gray and Wegner, 2007:619). Additionally, considering an object to have a mind also refers to taking it responsible for its actions since the object is capable of performing intentional behaviors (Gray, Gray and Wegner, 2007:619).

Implications of the first factor have also a wide range of examples in the marketing area. Marketers activate human schema by endowing brands or products with human-like traits as a strategy to affect consumers' minds. In this way, they encourage customers to evaluate products in human terms. For instance, marketers describe products in the first person by referring to them as "she" or "her". They also refer to the group of products as "product family" rather than "product line" (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:479). In this regard, whether customers think of the products as actual humans depends on the presence of traits that are in the same line with the sense of humanity (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:479).

Further, the effort of marketers goes beyond presenting the products in human terms to suggesting particular human categories as friends, spokesperson, helpers, or families (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:479). In line with this view, Guthrie (1993:80) presented three different forms of anthropomorphism which are the partial, the literal, and the accidental. Partial anthropomorphism occurs when people observe some human features in the object but do not evaluate the non-human entity as totally human. Partial anthropomorphism is mostly involved in a marketing context. For instance, customers endow products with human-like features and evaluate these objects as having a similar schema to humans. In contrast, when people see an object as an actual human due to a mistake, literal anthropomorphism occurs. Guthrie (1993:80) predicated this type of anthropomorphized reasoning on people's intention

to protect themselves from danger by again allowing themselves to make inferences about the world around them. In more detail, literal anthropomorphism occurs as a mistake by thinking of non-human agents as human or partially human. However, it is better to make mistaken inferences about seeing the stacked garbage bag in the dark as a robber than to make the mistaken inference about seeing the robber as a garbage bag. Guthrie (1993:80) meant this as an example by defining this type of anthropomorphism as peoples' intention to protect themselves.

Before Guthrie (1993), Fisher (1991:50) demonstrated that anthropomorphism is a categorical mistake that occurs as a result of evaluating the non-human world as human-like. In the same line with this finding of Fisher (1991:50), accidental anthropomorphism occurs when people observe some features of humans in non-human objects but evaluate the consequences of these as accidental (Guthrie, 1993:80). As an example, people may tend to see human faces in a cloud or a rock and they might think that this happens as an accident and another person may not observe the same features of humans. In this way of anthropomorphizing brands, marketers use attributed human-like features, mascots, or brand characters that have directly observable physical and psychological features (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:468). Delbaere, McQuarrie, and Phillips (2011:127) attested that using anthropomorphism in the form of mascots, brand animals or inanimate spoke characters increase the likelihood of consumers' emotional responses towards that particular brand. Consumers create favorable attributions to the personalities of brands and love these brands that evoke anthropomorphic feelings in them. This also shows that movements are not essential for an object to be considered as anthropomorphic.

Another good example is proposed by Aggarwal and McGill (2007:474) who showed that customers consider queues of soft drink bottles which vary by size as "family" instead of "product line". Similar to this, customers tend to recognize facial expressions of humans such as smile or frown at different objects like cars, clocks, or watches (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:472; Landwehr, McGill, and Herrman, 2011:144). Aggarwal and McGill (2007: 472) revealed that consumers are more likely to evaluate a car with a smiling grille as a person compared to a car with a frowning grille. This also leads to a positive consumer evaluation. Consumers evaluate the smiling car better since the smile creates a better fit to a person schema to

anthropomorphize the object. It has been shown that anthropomorphism affects the emotion that consumers receive from the object and this emotion has power to lead their decision. Landwehr, McGill, and Herrman (2011) have provided support for the above findings. They revealed that cars endowed with emotional expressions are liked by customers as well as reaching better selling rates in the market. Therefore, companies go to any greats to apply shapes that are both emotionally attractive and all of a piece with brand image. In line with this, product designers pay more attention to expressions that the product spreads since it has an impact on the product's success (Landwehr, McGill, and Herrman, 2011:145).

The elicited agent knowledge factor is based on the knowledge structure of people which leads this factor to be considered as perceptual. On the other hand, the second and third factors of the model offer a more motivational perspective. Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo (2007:871) explained the tendency of people to anthropomorphize the object with effectance and sociality motivation. Effectance motivation as the first motivational factor involves understanding and minimizing the uncertainty which leads to predictability and control in the environment that individual and non-human agents live in (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:871). Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo (2007:872) explained this factor in two main subtitles; the need for closure and the desire for control. According to this, people who are high in need of social closure tend to involve the process of anthropomorphizing more and correcting observable features less during making inferences about non-human entities (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:872).

Individuals are inclined to assume that they are in control of the everyday events in their lives. Therefore, their need for control, triggers the activation of anthropomorphizing of non-human entity's behavior both in the present time and in the future (Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007:873). Epley et al. (2008:150) proved this with an experiment which revealed that people who have a stronger need for control tend to anthropomorphize animals with unpredictable moves. On the contrary, people who have a low desire for control, evaluate both predictable and unpredictable animals as non-anthropomorphic (Epley et al., 2008:151). Kim and McGill (2011:194) offered support for this idea and indicated that in the condition of anthropomorphized entities (slot machine or cancer disease) which are associated with risk, the impact of

anthropomorphism on customers may not be positive. While anthropomorphized products give the perception of maintaining control, Hur, Koo, and Hofmann (2015:20) revealed that anthropomorphism also restrains the self-control of customers over tempting products (such as cookies). The reason behind this is that anthropomorphizing the tempting product eliminates the conflict of using it. In other words, anthropomorphized products lead customers to involve making internal reasoning less for the causes of their consumption decisions.

As a third factor of analysis, Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo (2007:875) explain the basis of sociality motivation as creating a social connection that actually can be satisfied by non-human agents in the absence of actual human connection. Based on this motivational factor, searching for any source of social connection leads to an increase in people's tendency to anthropomorphize non-human agents. People who feel lonely or isolated, tend to improve the situation by anthropomorphizing non-human agents. This motivational factor has found support from different academics throughout the years. Baumeister and Leary (1995:521) demonstrated in their study that people's need for belongingness activates the process of anthropomorphizing the non-human object since they feel lonely, and they are more likely to look for alternative forms of social connection. Even though being isolated from other people is unpleasant (Baumeister and Leary, 1995:521), humans have the ability to create new social interactions in the environment which is lacking from actual humans (Epley et al., 2008:147). As in line with previous findings (Baumeister and Leary, 1995:571; Epley, Waytz and Cacioppo, 2007:871; Epley et al., 2008:146) Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto (2009:418) demonstrated that certain personality traits have an impact on increasing people's tendency to anthropomorphize. Customers with a strong need for social interactions and those who suffer from chronic loneliness can have a more potent tendency to anthropomorphize products and brands since those customers see anthropomorphism as a way to meet their need for social interactions.

Customers tend to use what they know about the social world to make interpretations or judgments about anthropomorphized entities. The extent of this application is higher when the anthropomorphized entity is in question as compared to non-anthropomorphized entities (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Kim and McGill, 2011). As suggested by Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto (2009), certain personality

traits of customers may affect their tendency while involving anthropomorphizing process. Researchers expend this finding with another study and revealed how independent and interdependent personality traits of customers influence their decisions toward distributive injustice (Kwak, Puzokova, and Rocereto, 2017:851). According to the results of the paper, independent customers evaluate the distributive injustice (such as no refund for a faulty product) as unfair when the product or brand is anthropomorphized. The main reason behind their negative response is their anticipation to experience more equal and fair interchanges with the brands as they do with other people on daily basis. On the contrary, interdependent customers evaluate the distributive injustice as less unfair when the product or brand is humanized since they are more interested in the needs of others in relationships.

The impact of personality traits of customers on anthropomorphism was also studied by Toure-Tillery and McGill (2015:32) as related to the concept of trust. It is indicated in the study that customers who have a low level of trust tend to be convinced by humanized messengers more as compared to real spokespersons. The authors also revealed that these customers think anthropomorphized messengers as possessing more goodwill than real humans. On the other hand, customers who have a high level of trust are relatively less cautious about the entity that is trying to convince them. Therefore, the responses of these customers do not differ from the ones that are expressed toward actual humans. Customers with high trust levels think that both actual human (spoke-persons) and anthropomorphized messengers perform with goodwill.

Several studies in the literature (Baumeister and Leary, 1995; Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007; Epley et al., 2008; Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto, 2009) suggested that socially excluded customers prefer anthropomorphized brands. Thus, this preference is directed by customers' strong need for social interactions and their motivation to convert non-human agents into proper relationship participants. Chen, Wan, and Levy (2017:25) expanded this idea by proposing that the types of relationships that customers aim to create with the anthropomorphized brands actually differ according to the characterization of the social isolation. Researchers examined two different types of brand relations which are fling and partners. Results of this study suggested that socially isolated customers who blamed themselves for this exclusion

of social interaction with others display a higher preference for partner brands. As opposite, socially isolated customers who blame others for this exclusion display a higher preference for fling brands. From a different aspect, the study also revealed the effect of anthropomorphism on customers' attitudes toward a brand and their willingness to pay for anthropomorphized items. Therefore, socially isolated customers tend to exhibit a more affirmative attitude toward anthropomorphized brands and show a higher willingness to buy that product.

Not only the personality traits of customers, but also their financial status can affect their tendency to anthropomorphize. Kim and McGill (2018:15) revealed that products that are endowed with human-like features can be perceived differently based on the financial status of the customers. According to this study, customers with high financial status tend to perceive the non-human agents that are endowed with human-like traits as more anthropomorphic and reported higher liking rates as compared to customers with low financial status.

The literature demonstrates that customers' motivation to create social interaction can affect their desire toward anthropomorphized products (Baumeister, and Leary, 1995; Epley, Waytz, and Cacioppo, 2007; Epley et al., 2008; Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto, 2009). Nevertheless, customers can not always turn to anthropomorphized products to satisfy their social interaction needs. In relation to this, Wan (2018:1) suggests that the desirability of the humanized products is associated with the mindset of the customers as well as the main intention of the consumption. Therefore, the study proposed that the match between the consumption intention of the products (functional or not) and the mindset of the customers (functional or social) can affect the preference for anthropomorphized items. Customers who have a time mindset evaluate social interactions as useful in order to create an emotional connection with others. On the contrary, customers with a money mindset evaluate social interactions as useful in order to take advantage of beneficial skills of others. The same outcomes are valid when customers think about their social interactions with humanized products rather than actual humans. Hence, Wan (2018:4) advocates that customers with a money mindset prefer anthropomorphized products when the functionality of the product is emphasized. This effect loses its validity when the functionality of the product is hidden.

Mainly, these studies show that when people consider the non-human object as humanlike, they tend to apply social features which are innately used in social connections (Wan and Aggarwal, 2015:9). Waytz, Cacioppo, and Epley (2010:228) demonstrated that people have a higher tendency to treat the non-human agent with care when they consider this entity as having a mind of its own. Therefore, this leads customers to evaluate anthropomorphized brands and products with the same consciousness and care.

## **1.5. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND CONSUMER EVALUATION**

The studies in the literature of anthropomorphism mainly answer the question of why people anthropomorphize and what triggers the process of anthropomorphizing. Recent studies (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Aggarwal and McGill, 2012; Puzakova, Kwak, Rocerato, 2013) have shifted the focus from why people anthropomorphize to how anthropomorphism affects consumer evaluation. It has been shown by various studies (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:470; Epley, Waytz and Cacioppo, 2007:868) that anthropomorphism can also offer an easier way for customers to understand products since evaluating the products in human terms will ease the process of anthropomorphizing the stimuli.

According to Aggarwal and McGill (2007:470), products that are endowed with human-like characteristics are considered as stronger nominees to establish long-term success in the market. The authors focus on the specific form of anthropomorphizing, which is, presenting the product in human terms. According to this study, when the car is considered as carrying a smile anthropomorphism becomes connected to the enhanced value of the item. However, the same result cannot be claimed when the car is considered as carrying a frown instead of a smile. Therefore, anthropomorphism can lead to positive evaluations of customers based on represented human schema through the brand or product. It has been revealed that the front face of the product (as valid for cars or watches) is the main consideration point for customers to create an initial expression about the product (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:470).

Findings that were presented by Aggarwal and McGill (2007) later was expanded with another study and it has been shown that products with high fWHR

(bizygomatic width divided by upper-face height) face are considered as more dominant compared to one with low  $fWHR$  face (Maeng and Aggarwal, 2017:2). This finding is consistent when people consider other human-beings with the same face ratios. However, the same result is not valid in the concept of liking and willingness to pay decisions of customers. Maeng and Aggarwal (2017:2) proposed that products with high  $fWHR$  are liked and preferred by customers while human faces with high  $fWHR$  are liked less. Furthermore, customers show a higher willingness to pay for products with high  $fWHR$  since the dominant faces of these are associated in customers' minds as representing their own dominance status.

Another study that emphasizes the attribution of the product with human-like features was conducted by Han et al., (2019) in the context of sustainability. Han et al. (2019:352) demonstrated that message for environmental actions was more convincing when the message includes feasibility appeals compared to the message that includes desirability appeals. However, the message with desirability appeal becomes more convincing when the advertisement includes anthropomorphic features (a reusable mug with a smile on it, spoke in the first person).

Even though the majority of studies in anthropomorphism and consumer behavior literature demonstrate positive outcomes of endowing products with humanlike features, anthropomorphism does not always lead to positive attitudes towards brands and products. Since consumers' relations with brands and products are complicated, the role that brands carry or the features that a particular product imbues have a major impact on the direction of this relationship. In this regard, Aggarwal and McGill (2007:477) provide evidence for the situation that anthropomorphized product does not always result in a positive evaluation. According to this study, anthropomorphized products that were named as "evil twins" were evaluated as less favorable by the participants compared to products that are anthropomorphized as just "twins".

In another research, Aggarwal and McGill (2012:318) examined the differences between two roles of anthropomorphized brands; servant and partner. Servant brands are the ones that are preferred by customers to fulfill a specific task or accomplish a job. On the other hand, partner brands are the ones that are evaluated as co-producers of meeting the need of customers. According to the results of the study

run by Aggarwal and McGill (2012:318), liking the partner brand leads to assimilating behavior that is interrelated with the brand image since the shared action is the proper way to be involved in an interaction with the co-producer (partner-brand). As opposite, disliking the brand which is presented as a partner lead to acting contrastive to the brand image and undermines the willingness to work together with that brand. Therefore, it has been shown that there will be an assimilation effect for anthropomorphized partner brands if they are liked by the customer and the opposite effect if they are disliked. However, for anthropomorphized servant brands, opposites of behaviors that are observed for anthropomorphized partner brands will be valid. For anthropomorphized servant brands liking the brand will lead to inviting the brand to accomplish the job which contrasts with the brand's image. On the other hand, the best way to interact with an anthropomorphized servant brand that is disliked by the customer will occur by preventing the need to have that brand around.

According to Fournier (1998:361), customers may envision brands as suitable marriages, committed partners, or slaves as a result of attributing particular roles to brands. Aggarwal (2004:87) proposes that customers tend to use interpersonal relationship norms to direct their behavior toward a brand that they are interacting with. Hence, it is suggested that customers and brands have exchange relationship norms like families, friends, and business partners. It is stated as the main consequence that attributing specific roles to brands has an impact on customers' motivation to interact with anthropomorphized brands and the response that customers show toward that version of brand prime (Aggarwal and McGill, 2012:310).

Aggarwal and Wan (2014:12) also focused on this negative aspect of anthropomorphism in their study and suggested that the product (brand) is more likely to be evaluated as a person when it serves a specific goal. Therefore, since the servant role does not match with the schema of "friend", the anthropomorphized product does not receive a positive evaluation. When the product is perceived as mainly functional and accomplishing a particular goal, consumers' will to create social connection decreases since it is evaluated as "using a person" to complete a job is socially improper. As opposite, the anthropomorphized product is perceived as a partner if it is produced to be consumed for its own sake.

Another study that focuses on the negative downstream of brand anthropomorphism was published by Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocerto (2013). The study elicited that brands that are endowed with anthropomorphic features can face negative publicity when they are evaluated as responsible for their wrongdoings (Puzakova, Kwak, Rocerato, 2013:81). It was also demonstrated that the negative publicity of a brand caused by wrongdoings of the product has a more unfavorable impact on brand impression when the brand is anthropomorphized. People's willingness to punish a brand for its negative actions is driven by the degree of how customers are perceiving this brand as responsible. When customers perceive the brand as performing negative actions intentionally, their consideration for this wrongdoing will be more negative for the anthropomorphized brand than those non-anthropomorphized brand (Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto, 2013:82).

The extent of brand devaluation will also differ according to customers' personalities. It was shown that entity theorists who believe in the stability of personality traits evaluate the wrongdoings of the brand as a manifestation which is the credible lead for future actions (Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto, 2013:82). In contrast, incremental theorists who believe in malleability in personality traits prefer not to create an impression according to single negative action. Therefore, they are less likely to take the anthropomorphized product as responsible for its wrongdoings (Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto, 2013:82).

In another study, Puzakova, Rocereto, and Kwak (2013:513) examined the effect of anthropomorphized messages on customers' willingness to provide personal information. They demonstrated that when the message is customized by including anthropomorphic features, customers display a negative attitude toward recommendation agents. In addition, customers will be unwilling to provide personal information to an anthropomorphized agent and they will show high resistance to the advertisement. Findings that outlined the negative aspect of the brand or product anthropomorphism show that this may not always be the optimal strategy to enhance customer evaluations. Humanization of the brands or products is not always the main indicator for customers to establish a positive relationship.

Even though anthropomorphism is considered as one of the main antecedents of brand love (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014:388), anthropomorphizing the brands

does not always lead to favorable responses from the customers. Delgado-Ballester and Palazon (2019:160) present evidence which reveals that anthropomorphized brands can be treated less positively in the context of brand love when these brands are considered as unattractive. In brief, the findings of this study suggest that customers experience a positive attitude toward the anthropomorphized brands only in the condition of liking the human version of them.

These studies show that brand/product anthropomorphism can turn into a successful strategy to maintain a strong customer-brand relationship only if it was applied carefully and properly.

## **1.6. ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP**

Even though anthropomorphism does not always lead to an establishment of a long-term relationship with brands, it is a necessary antecedent of the consumer-brand relationship. Therefore, it is substantial that brands and products should be seen as humans in order to maintain a relationship. (Fournier, 1998:344). Fournier (1998:344) demonstrated that people tend to form a relationship with brands since they tend to treat these brands as similar to how they treat other people. Marketers encourage this tendency of customers by anthropomorphizing the brands and products. Brands that are endowed with human-like images, personalities, and characteristics can urge the relationships (Fournier, 1998:344).

Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocereto (2019:418) reveal the importance of anthropomorphism as an antecedent of the consumer-brand relationship. According to this study, self-brand image congruity between the customer and brand is considered as the main antecedent of brand anthropomorphism while this relation is moderated by effectance and sociality motivation. Additionally, in the same line with Guthrie's (1993:4) explanation of the anthropomorphism process, the study proposed that process of anthropomorphism occurs in an automatic manner. This automatic process of attributing human-like features to non-human entities then leads to a beginning of a relationship. When a brand or product is anthropomorphized once, it becomes a candidate to be a relationship partner for customers. These anthropomorphized brands or products have an impact to change the emotional route of customers' experience.

Hence, endowing products with humanlike features and characteristics leads customers to show more positive evaluation while they are interacting with the anthropomorphized entity (Wang et al., 2007:145).

Even when no anthropomorphic indications are presented, some consumers still feel distinct social emotions while engaging with products. These emotions may include brand love (Schultz, Kleine, and Kerman, 1989), trust (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel, 2004), and loyalty (Chandler and Waytz, 2010). Rauschnabel and Ahuvia (2014:372) demonstrated that anthropomorphism is one of the main predictors of brand love toward customers' favorite brands. Researchers revealed that even though the quality of the product is an important antecedent of brand love, it becomes comparatively less sufficient in predicting brand love in the existence of anthropomorphism. Rauschnabel and Ahuvia (2014:388) also presented that anthropomorphism leads to a positive relationship and the researchers examined this relationship in the concepts of cognitive consistency, self-extension and self-congruence. Cognitive consistency means that the mind of the customers tends to favor positive information regarding the brand. Therefore, when customers endow brands with human-like features, the brand turns out to be a potential candidate for a relationship as well as becoming more lovable by the customers. Self-extension as another concept connects anthropomorphism and brand love. Anthropomorphism allows customers to create integration between brand and self-identity which enables the establishment of strong customer-brand relationships. In this regard, anthropomorphism has the power to turn customer-brand relationships into real interpersonal relationships.

Customers are inclined to favor brands and products that enable them to present their actual, ideal, or social selves (Aaker, 1999:353). Therefore, this self-congruity between the branded product and customers occurs as one of the main antecedents of brand anthropomorphism (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:469). In this context, anthropomorphism does not occur only based on similarities between the external aspect of branded product and the customer-self. Instead, internal features such as motivations or emotions also affect how customers perceive these products as human-like. When customers see part of themselves (externally or internally correlated) in the brand or product, they become more ready to build a relationship with these objects

in the same way they do with other people (Fournier, 1998:344). As related to the self-congruity concept, Guido and Peluso (2015:16) found that anthropomorphism is one of the antecedents of brand personality. It has been revealed by the study that attributing human-like external features to products enhances the perception of customers regarding human body distinctiveness. It was also concluded that this result can be an advantageous strategy in order to endow products with brand personality which are consistent with customers' self-identities.

In the line with the above findings, it was revealed that brands can experience similar feelings that customers do through their personality traits. Customers refer to brands with words like "love", "think" or "hate" to comprehend emotions and intentions of the brands (Huang et al., 2020:1). Huang et al. (2020:1) proposed that anthropomorphism includes the capacity of brands to experience similar feelings that actual humans do such as pain, desire, joy, and anger. Gray et al. (2007:619) advocated that people are inclined to realize human or nonhuman minds. In this regard, two different dimensions were offered which are named as "experience" and "agency". The experience contains mental states which are associated with feeling and perception of experiencing emotional capacities like pleasure, pain or hunger.

In the light of this study, Huang et al., (2020:3) offered similar dimensions which are called think and feel. The feel dimension contains the capacity of possessing emotions and perception. As a part of this dimension, brands are able to express some emotions when they face with a certain situation. For example, one of Google's news was titled as "Big Brands Feel Pain as Consumers Pull Back" (Maloney and Blackstone, 2017). This title was created by attributing some emotions to a non-human agent (brands). On the other hand, the think dimension suggests that brands can be evaluated as agents who have their own minds, consciousness, goals, and intentions. In addition, brands can be evaluated as capable of completing certain tasks such as information collection, planning, organizing, etc. For example, one of the news of P&G was titled as "P&G plans new strategy to attract younger customers" which focuses on the goal of the brand like actual humans (Yuan, 2018).

Consistent with what the literature suggests, marketers have started to reflect the personality traits of brands and products via different advertisement tools. For example, one advertisement of Apple was exhibited with the line "There is iPhone.

And then there is everything else” which aims to mention the unnecessary of buying another phone while Apple exists (Awad, and Youn, 2018:1). This refers to arrogant personality traits which are examined by Awad and Youn (2018) in the context of anthropomorphism. According to this study, narcissistic human features in relation to arrogance can influence customers’ attitudes toward anthropomorphized brands. It was also proposed that narcissistic customers display a more favorable attitude toward arrogant brands when the brands are anthropomorphized since they experience similarities between their selves and the brands’ personalities. These customers can go even beyond only favoring the brand but they can also fall in love with the anthropomorphized brand due to observable reflection of their selves on the non-human agent (Awad, and Youn, 2018:2).

Since customers tend to favor similar external and internal features of themselves in different non-human entities. It will not be surprising to see the same result as in the context of gender-based research. Bont, Kerckhove and Geuens (2018:12) advocated in their study that male customers are inclined to prefer products with a package that is shaped consistent with a male body figure. Likewise, female customers are inclined to prefer products with a package that is shaped consistent with a female body figure.

The literature contains various studies which emphasize the positive impact of endowing brands and products with human-like features, representing them to the customers like they are actual human beings who are worthy of their favorable attitude and care (Aggarwal and McGill, 2012; Delgado-Ballester and Palazon, 2019; Epley, Waytz and Cacioppo, 2007; Fournier and Alvarez, 2012; Guido and Peluso, 2015; Rauschnabel and Ahuviva, 2014). These findings raise an important question; how to build a brand that can be perceived as a real human. Portal, Abratt, and Bendixen (2018:2) offer “The Human Brand Model” in order to provide a road map. According to this model, customers create perceptions about other people according to two different dimensions which are named as “warmth” and “competence”. The warmth dimension occurs when an individual senses that another person (brand) has good intentions while the competence dimension occurs when another person (brand) is able to bear the same intentions. Therefore, the warmth dimension contains being trustworthy or friendly, the competence dimension contains features like intelligence

or confidence. It has been proposed that these two dimensions in brands maintain the brand anthropomorphism and convert brands into strong relationship partners which are worthy of customers' loyalty (Fournier and Alvarez, 2012:182).

Furthermore, anthropomorphism turns brands and products into possible relationship partners for customers (Portal, Abratt, and Bendixen, 2018). With time this relationship can take the form of attachment (Thomson, MacInnes, and Park, 2005:79) or brand love (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014:372). As a consequence of these emotions, customers may become dependent on an object, and they can feel stressed in the absence of the particular product (Thomson, MacInnes, and Park, 2005:79). Moreover, this attachment which is created by the anthropomorphic tendency of the customers leads to evaluating brands and the products as family members, friends, or someone they care about (Chandler and Waytz, 2010: 107). Chandler and Waytz (2010:141) demonstrated in their study that customers will be less likely to replace their used products when they perceive them as endowed with human-like features and characteristics. In customers' minds, it will be improper to give up on their old products since these are considered as "family members" or "friends" instead of the old product. Evaluating a product in human terms transforms the way customers see the product. In the time customers start considering the personalities of their cars instead of functional features as objects, they express unfavorable intentions to replace their cars (Chandler and Waytz, 2010:138).

Normally, objects are interpreted according to how they function but when it comes to interpreting people, functionality becomes less important. Therefore, the same idea becomes valid while evaluating an object. Anthropomorphism turns customers more sensitive to interpersonal figures (such as considering the product as "warm" or "cold") while evaluating an object which is endowed with human-like features (Chandler and Waytz, 2010:138). The findings of the study which is conducted by Chandler and Waytz (2010:138) present that anthropomorphism can disconnect replacement intentions and the quality of the product. As coherent with the literature, customers can hesitate to replace the product that they own since it is considered as replacing a close friend or family member will not be proper behavior to display.

Even though anthropomorphism and its relation with consumer decisions were studied in different contexts, there are limited studies that reveal the effect of anthropomorphism on consumer decisions in selling and buying aspects. Here, Yuan and Dennis (2019:469) offered evidence that shows customers will be more willing to pay for a product when the product is anthropomorphized. During the valuation process of the product, functionality occurs as one of the main criteria that customers base on. However, this study showed that participants will be willing to pay more for products (e.g., laptop) when it was presented with anthropomorphic features compared to the original form of the product. The authors also revealed that anthropomorphism affects the price that customers are willing to pay by increasing the attachment toward the product. In other words, attachment which is created by anthropomorphism decreases the impact of functionality of the product in the decision-making process (Yuan and Dennis, 2019: 469).

These findings found support from another study which was conducted by Kim and Swaminathan (2021:85) who suggested that anthropomorphism increases the selling prices of used products. They also extended this finding by revealing the mediation effect of customers' attitudes toward the past. According to this, product owners with a positive attitude toward the past determine higher prices to sell their products when the products are anthropomorphized. On the contrary, anthropomorphism has not shown the same effect for the sellers who have a relatively less favorable attitude toward the past.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **ENDOWMENT EFFECT**

#### **2.1. ENDOWMENT EFFECT**

People show a greater tendency to demand a higher price for an object that they own than their willingness to pay to possess the same object that they do not (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:194). Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1991:194) explained this with an explicit example. A wine-lover individual buys a bottle of wine at an affordable price. After some time, this bottle of wine increased in value and cost 200 dollars while the buying price was 10 dollars. The individual drinks the wine every so often but does not prefer to sell the wine at a higher price or purchase another bottle at a new price. This was named as “endowment effect” by Thaler (1980:44) which refers to the fact that people require more to give up on the item that they own than they would be willing to pay to buy it.

Thaler (1980:44) defined the endowment effect as undervaluation of opportunity cost and explained with similar examples. According to the examples, the endowment effect works in two different ways. First, giving up on the bottle of wine will create a loss, and buying the same bottle of wine will create a gain. However, this gain that an individual will experience will be less weighted compared to the first bottle. On the other hand, money that will be paid to buy a new bottle of wine will be considered as a loss while the money that can be received from the sale is considered as a gain (Thaler, 1980:44).

From another perspective, Thaler (1980:45) explained the endowment effect as referring to the distinction between opportunity cost and out-of-pocket cost. For instance, credit card companies charge additional prices for users in return of using the credit card. In this case, customers prefer to pay with cash instead of bearing the additional charges. This example gains meaning in the endowment effect context, if the customers would see the discount that they will receive from paying with cash as an opportunity cost of paying with the credit card, and additional charges as an out-of-pocket cost.

Thaler (1980) was the first researcher who defined the endowment effect in relation to the loss aversion concept of “prospect theory”. In the beginning, the endowment effect phenomenon has been explained together with loss aversion. Loss aversion refers to the fact that the loss in utility that originates from giving up the product is greater than the gain in utility that originates from purchasing the same product (Thaler, 1980:42). In other words, losses appear larger than gains.

Kőszegi and Rabin (2006:3) explained the loss-aversion framework with three different components; reference dependence, loss aversion, and consumption dimension. According to this study, total utility has two different components  $u(c|r) = m(c) + n(c|r)$ ,  $m(c)$  refers to “consumption utility which is emphasized in economics, and  $n(c|r)$  refers to “gain-loss utility” (Kőszegi and Rabin, 2006:8). Therefore, in reference dependence, results are assessed in relation to reference points, and people experience "gain-loss utility" accordingly in addition to consumption utility. According to loss aversion, a loss of  $X$  has a greater effect on gain-loss utility than a gain of  $X$  concerning the reference point. In regard to the last component, people should separate their consumption in the consumption dimension in order to notice the endowment effect of risk-free decisions. When gain-loss utility is accumulated into  $c$  (consumption index), there will be no loss for exchanging two items that have equal values. Furthermore, the endowment effect will not be accepted for the products that take place in the same conception dimension.

Associated with the previous explanation, Chapman (1998:56) demonstrated that the endowment effect is shown less within similar items. According to the findings of this study, losing the possessed item will cause less pain if people are endowed with a similar item that can be considered as a substitute of it, as compared to endowing with an entirely different item in return (Chapman, 1998:56). This exchange leads to a small amount of loss which also leads to less loss aversion and finally results in less reluctance to trade an item.

Prior to Kőszegi and Rabin (2006:2)’s explanation of the reference point in relation to expectations of people regarding future outcomes, Tversky and Kahneman (1991:1046) indicated that the reference point generally refers to people’s current position but reference point can also consist of people’s wishes, norms, and even social comparisons. In practice, the reference point has been considered as what people

already possess or status quo, which refers to prevailing legal rights (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988:46). Kahneman and Thaler (1991:197) explained the status quo as people's tendency to remain in their current position since disadvantages of giving up on the position seem to have a higher impact than advantages do.

In this aspect, Samuelson, and Zeckhauser (1988:8) indicated this effect as "status quo bias". In one of the experiments, a part of the participants was faced with a suppositional task, and the status quo was given as participants were reader of financial pages and recently a new investment opportunity came up since a large amount of money were inherited from their uncles. Presented portfolio choices for investment consisted of investing in a moderate-risk company, investing in a high-risk company, investing in treasury bills, and investing in municipal bonds (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988:52). The remaining part of participants was also faced with the same scenario but the status quo was given to them as one of the portfolio choices. The participants in second group were already received the inherited portfolio of cash from their uncles and invested a major amount of it in a moderate-risk company (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988:53). Therefore, the results of the different scenarios revealed that when the possible option was manipulated as reflecting the status quo becomes more favorable for the participants. Additionally, the benefits that the status quo presents increase when the number of alternatives increases (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988:47).

Prior to the studies mentioned above, the first laboratory proof of the endowment effect was presented by Knetsch and Sinden (1984:511). According to the study, lottery ticket or 2 dollars were given to participants, and later opportunity to sell the ticket or buy the ticket with the money was provided to each participant. A major part of the participants decided to keep the ticket instead of trading them with the money. The participants which were given the ticket recorded a higher impression of liking compared to participants who were endowed with money. Even though these examples are conspicuous, some researchers (Knez, Smith, and Williams, 1985:397) suggest that this behavior will not be seen if the customers were observed in the market environment. In this regard, Knez, Smith, and Williams (1985:397) demonstrated that there is a possibility for the creation of inconsistency between selling and buying prices which originates from the bargaining habits of customers, in other words,

overestimating one's willingness to accept (WTA) and underestimating one's willingness to pay (WTP). Studies that ask WTA and WTP responses of people for different kinds of products have revealed a prominent disparity between selling and buying prices based on individual value (Knetsch and Sinden, 1984:519). Even though WTA and WTP should not vary more than modest income effect, WTA responses of individuals in the manner are commonly higher than WTP values (Knetsch and Sinden, 1984:519).

Knetsch and Sinden (1984:516) explained the findings of the study based on "framing paradigm" of Kahneman and Tversky (1982:168). The framing effect occurs when different reference points are used in the evaluation of two different objects (Kahneman and Tversky, 1982:168). According to the example presented in the study, a part of the participants imagined that they will purchase a jacket for \$125 and a calculator for \$15 while the prices of the products were presented as \$15 for the jacket and \$125 for the calculator for another group. The first group was informed that there is a sale on the calculator for \$5 while the second group was informed about the \$5 sale on the jacket. Since the branch of the store where the sale takes place is 20 minutes away, participants who were presented \$5 discount for the jacket did not prefer to drive 20 minutes to the other store while participants who were presented the same amount of discount for the calculator said they will. Although the total amount of the discount is the same in both scenarios, participants evaluate the decrease from \$15 to \$10 more rather than the decrease from \$125 to \$120. The findings show that reference point has an impact on customers' decision-making (Kahneman and Tversky, 1982:168).

In the endowment effect, the gap between WTA and WTP is also seen as ascribable to prospect theory (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990:1343). Prospect theory indicates that individuals value losses more than they value gains. The theory allocates two different stages in the decision process; editing and evaluation (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979:274). The early stage of editing includes evaluation of presented prospects while the second stage includes a selection of an item with the highest value. The editing phase refers to an organization of possible options in order to ease the process of evaluation. The main operation of the editing phase is mentioned as coding in the paper which indicates that people evaluate outcomes in terms of gain and loss instead of wealth or comfort (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979:274). Therefore,

gains and losses are assessed according to reference points (Kahneman and Tversky, 1982). Normally, reference points refer to actual position of the item thus the value of gain and loss collide with the current amount that can be accepted or paid. Certainly, position of the reference point can change with regard to gains and losses also this can be influenced by the expectation of people (Kahneman and Tversky, 1982:274).

Losing something has a major impact than gaining the same thing relative to the status quo (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988: 47) and first reference point (Tversky and Kahneman, 1991:1039). These findings of prospect theory go against the utility theory which creates a base for the major part of economic models (Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988: 47). Since the standard theories of utility do not separate gains and losses (Rabin and Thaler, 2001: 219), prospect theory distinguishes from the utility theory in regard to customers' decision-making process and evaluation of implicit gains (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990:1343). The expected utility theory demonstrates that individuals should prefer alternatives that can provide high returns (Rabin and Thaler, 2001: 228). In this aspect, the expected utility theory values the gains and losses as equal while the prospect theory assumes that the individuals evaluate gains and losses as distinct from each other (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990:1343). The prospect theory suggests that marginal return decreases as the gain increases. As opposite, the negative impact of losses decreases as the losses increase (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990:1344). Therefore, experiencing an equal gain and loss does not stabilize each other instead creates a negative impact (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979:275). Hence, the prospect theory model is important with respect to gains and losses to create a better understanding of the endowment effect.

Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1990:1331) proved with various studies that individuals eventually change their reference point to express their ownership of an item when they acquire it. People demand a higher price to sell their goods since this selling act is considered as a loss and valued more heavily by them. Additionally, people prefer to set a higher price to sell their items to be able to resist the additional value of loss which are experienced as a result of this transaction. Conversely, people who do not have the good see it as a gain and value the item less as compared to the people who already have it.

The traditional endowment effect study ran by Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler

(1991:195) with participation of economic students. The students are separated into two groups, first group of students are given the mug and determined as “sellers” while the students in the other group are just given an opportunity to view the mug and determined as “buyers”. The findings of the experiment revealed that the students who are randomly assigned to the seller group displayed higher WTA compared to the WTP of the buyers (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:195).

Even though the endowment effect is proved and strengthened with different experiments, it is still not debatable according to some researchers (Plott and Zeiler, 2005). Hereof, Plott and Zeiler (2005:542) suggested that the gap observed in the endowment effect occurs as a result of people’s misunderstanding of the conditions instead of the outcome of the prospect theory. Therefore, researchers included different control variables such as market environment and practice rounds into valuation in order to decrease the effect of misunderstanding. As a result of the experiments, it has been indicated that the gap between WTA and WTP relies on the procedure of studies. Hence, the endowment effect can be activated and removed by manipulation via experimental procedure (Plott and Zeiler, 2005:542).

These findings proved that the prospect theory was not the single explanation for the endowment effect. Plott and Zeiler (2007:1462) proposed a possible explanation and pointed out that participants’ intention to not reject the item given by the experimenter, to value the item more or incidental changes in the process of the experiment can affect the findings and can lead to an inaccurate effect. In spite of the opposing reasoning of Plott and Zeiler (2005;2007), the endowment effect seems to be consistent in a variety of circumstances since different variables mediate and alter its effect. As Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1990:1335) attested that the endowment effect cannot be restricted to monetary values. People are capable of noticing differences that are equal in value with respect to a loss or decrease in a gain. For instance, a rise in the price of an item occurs as \$X is evaluated as fair when the price becomes equal to market value. As opposite, if the price stands above the market value after the rise, it is evaluated as unfair. These judgments occur even when the prices were equal at the beginning and at the end (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:203). This example indicates that the endowment effect goes beyond monetary value and becomes relevant in all kinds of gains and losses which are expressed by the

value that people ascribe to objects.

While the endowment effect is not limited to the monetary value, it can also be mediated by social factors (Dommer and Swaminathan, 2013:1035). For example, people in the seller position value a product that they possess more than the people in the buyer position when they experience a threat of rejection due to the link between the value of the product and their self-worth (Dommer and Swaminathan, 2013:1039). It has been shown that threatened seller shows a high degree of WTA as compared to any seller who takes place in the control group without any threat and rejection (Dommer and Swaminathan, 2013:1039). These findings reveal that the endowment effect occurs in the presence of social factors. Therefore, the endowment effect defines by the people's preferences which are directly related to daily social interactions. According to this aspect of the endowment effect, the way people evaluate the product and its value or the way they see themselves can be changed by ownership. Therefore, the endowment effect enables researchers to experience the different applications of this phenomenon outside the economy.

Another factor that can affect the endowment effect is time pressure (Chuang, 2013:1320). Even though the majority of the laboratory experiments were not treated under time pressure, it bears a crucial role in the real words, especially with respect to selling and buying actions (Chuang, 2013:1320). When time pressure is added to the decision-making process, sellers may be willing to decrease their prices in order to create a higher demand or buyers may willing to pay more in order to use the opportunity of buying a product (Chuang, 2013:1321). This offers that time pressure has an impact on how people see their possessions and it has also an impact on the devaluation of an item while people evaluate their selling and buying decisions under the time pressure (Chuang, 2013:1321).

Although physical objects (such as mugs, pencils, lottery tickets, and sweatshirts) (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990; Knetsch and Sinden, 1984; Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer, 2012) have been used in the endowment effect studies, there are other findings that revealed the endowment effect is not valid only for physically available objects (Chuang, 2013:1319; Sousa and Munro, 2012:483). Instead, people tend to make their decisions based on imaginary interactions with products (such as during online shopping). For example, Chuang (2013:1319)

presented the visual of the mug to the participants in the endowment effect study instead of using a real mug. Sousa and Munro (2012:483) also trace the endowment effect in a totally imagined environment which is presented in online game staging. These studies indicated that the endowment effect does not occur only for specific objects and goes beyond the physical attachment.

### **2.1.1. Psychological Ownership**

Researchers from different areas have started to show an interest to examine the psychological mechanism underlying ownership (Carmon and Ariely, 2000; Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003). Etzioni (1992:466) mentioned that ownership is “dual creation, part attitude, part object, part in mind, part real”. Strahilevitz and Loewenstein (1998:285) revealed that the value of an item can be changed according to the continuum of ownership. In more detail, the valuation of the item can increase due to perceived psychological ownership. Strahilevitz and Loewenstein (1998:276) extended the prior findings on the endowment effect literature by indicating that the valuation of an item is associated with the status of an owner in the past and the present. Even though people physically lost any item, the feeling of ownership can still be maintained (Strahilevitz and Loewenstein, 1998:285).

Novemsky and Kahneman (2005:139) offered support for loss aversion theory, researchers also suggested that the endowment effect is valid for products which are possessed by the people for consumption purposes but not for the products that are possessed for exchange purposes. Carmon and Ariely (2000:368) demonstrated that buyers’ and sellers’ cognitive perspectives regarding exchange differ and the endowment effect can be described by this difference. Sellers and buyers pay attention to what they have to give up which stands as the result of an exchange. The above findings indicate that the endowment effect includes more than only actual ownership of an item.

Reb and Connolly (2007:107) examined the ownership concept in two different components; legal entitlement and subjective ownership. Researchers revealed that these two components are directly related to each other. People can experience the feeling of ownership against products that they do not actually own. For instance,

people can act like an actual owner of a borrowed bicycle. On the contrary, people can also feel relatively little ownership of an item which are newly purchased since it requires a specific amount of time to experience the sense of ownership. In this regard, it has been suggested that subjective ownership is more complicated compared to legal ownership (Reb and Connolly, 2007:108).

Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003:103) also offered a psychological model by relying on psychological and subjective ownership. In this model, ownership feeling is encouraged through actual possession (controlling endowed item), imagination (getting close with it), or identification (creating a connection with the self-identity). Researchers especially paid attention to the antecedents of psychological ownership and attested that this state occurs as a consequence of control, relationship, or attribution of the self through the item (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003:102). It has also been revealed in this study that psychological ownership has both positive and negative impacts. From a positive perspective, psychological ownership leads to embracing such feelings as responsibility, caring, or displaying sacrifices as well as measuring the risk in the name of the endowed item. From a negative perspective, this type of ownership can lead to stress and overwhelming (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003:102).

Prior to Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003), Belk (1988:160) demonstrated that people are defined by what they own and this refers to the strongest concept of consumer behavior. The findings of the study suggested that the possessions of people make a contribution to self-identities and people tend to describe themselves with their possessions. It has been suggested by Belk (1998:160) that identification of self in regards to possessions start at an early age. Beginning in early infancy, the concept of “mine” displays an important role in the creation of self-identity (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003:102). Even though the importance of possessions inclines to decrease as people age, it may stay high as people tend to define themselves with their possessions in order to keep experiences and accomplishments alive.

Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003:103) suggested three antecedents of psychological ownership; the ability to control the item, getting familiar with the item, and investing self into it. In the classical endowment procedure, subjects are not able to get to know the item intimately or invest their characteristics of the self in the

selected item (Kahneman, Knetsch, Thaler, 1990). Regarding the “instant endowment effect” people evaluate and value the item immediately after owning the item (Kahneman, Knetsch, Thaler, 1990:1329). Even though an intimate relationship or self-object congruence is not achieved in a short time, subjects can still have the capability of controlling the item which leads to an increase in psychological ownership (Furby, 1978:62). Furby (1978:62) demonstrated that ownership gives physical control to the people with respect to the use of an item.

In the same vein, Peck and Shu (2009:444) created support for the power of touch by revealing that physical control over an item and closeness leads to a higher level of attachment and a strong eventual sense of ownership. Therefore, a sense of ownership became powerful when a subject is able to touch the item. Researchers also noted that strong perceived ownership which originates from the feeling of touch also beat a path to a favorable valuation of an item (Peck and Shu, 2009:443). Strahilevitz and Loewenstein (1998:285) also presented support for the power of touch related to the endowment effect. Researchers demonstrated that when touch is available, perceived ownership of people increases and this leads to more favorable evaluations (Strahilevitz and Loewenstein, 1998:285). Being able to touch an object creates an instant endowment effect which refers to the basic action of owning the object for a short moment. This ownership feeling nudges the sense of loss once an individual decided to sell the object (Strahilevitz and Loewenstein, 1998:284). It has been concluded in the study that the feeling of loss becomes powerful when the ownership becomes stronger, therefore duration of the ownership determines the valuation of the object (Strahilevitz and Loewenstein, 1998:285).

Psychological ownership differs from legal ownership since it refers to the feeling of attributing something as “mine” (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003:102). The literature revealed that individuals can experience ownership feeling for their workplaces (Pierce, Kostova, Dirks, 2003:84), and children can name the song that they heard for the first time as theirs (Isaacs, 1993:21). This shows that children can claim ownership even in the absence of actual ownership. As a higher valuation of an item is driven by the actual ownership, it is possible to observe that psychological ownership also induces the same effect even in the absence of actual (physical) ownership (Peck and Shue, 2009:445).

Legal ownership and psychological ownership are related concepts, even though legal owners of any item can have a greater level of perceived ownership than non-owners, psychological ownership can be driven by different factors (such as imagination) rather than touch (Peck and Shue, 2009:445). In this regard, there are similar concepts in the literature that are named as “pseudo-endowment” or “anticipatory possession” (Ariely and Simonson, 2003; Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg, 2003). According to the standard explanation of the endowment effect, the value of a specific item increases when it is possessed by people (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:194). One of the reasons for this increase was defined as a perceived attachment to an object (Carmon and Ariely, 2000:368). For instance, if a customer replaces the highest bid at the beginning of the auction and does not enter the auction site for a couple of days, they start to increase attachment to the product since they consider this product as a part of their psychological endowment. Ariely and Simonson (2003:117) named this effect as pseudo endowment.

It is revealed that perceived ownership can be maintained through imagination. In the absence of touch, imagination is stronger enough to increase the ownership feeling and level of willingness to pay (Peck and Shue, 2009:445). Carmon and Ariely (2000:368) demonstrated that students who actually possess the tickets and who imagine that they have tended to evaluate the selling and buying prices of the tickets similarly. Even though a part of the students has the actual ownership and ability of physical touch there was no difference observed with the students just imagine they have the tickets.

In another study, Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan (2007:469) asked buyers to pay attention to the positive side of the exchange which leads to higher valuation, even actual ownership is not available. These results evoke an important question, would imagination increase the sense of perceived ownership in the absence of physical touch? Schlosser (2003:196) suggested that when the interaction concept is considered, imaginary objects create more convincing mental pictures in the individuals' minds rather than static visuals of an object. Therefore, it is claimed that imagination can substitute the actual touch of an object when it is not available and this will lead to an increase in the valuation of an object (Ariely and Simonson, 2003:117; Carmon and Ariely, 2000:368; Peck and Shue, 2009:445).

### **2.1.2. Alternative Theories of Endowment Effect**

#### **2.1.2.1. Attachment Theory**

The endowment effect theory utilizes attachment theories (Carmon and Ariely, 2003; Peck and Shue, 2009). Attachment theories make the assumption that obtaining an object even for a short time establishes a modest attachment to it and people show resistance to losing this connection (Burson, Faro, and Rottenstreich, 2013:553). In this context, Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg (2003:25) offered a theory of “option attachment” which explains why people who evaluate an item closely experience restlessness instead of relief after making their decisions. Researchers explain this feeling of people with the attachment theory. Since people feel attached to the item while making a selection and establish a feeling of prefactual ownership, they become more prone to experience discomfort as a result of their forfeit decision (Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg, 2003:25). This shows that actual possession is not necessary for the endowment effect to occur. Therefore, forgone options were rated more positively by the subjects who experience the option attachment as compared to subjects who did not (Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg, 2003:25).

In the respect of attachment theories, Ariely, Huber, and Wertenbroch (2005:135) paid attention to the relation of the endowment effect with two different psychological approaches; emotional attachment and cognitive perspective. Researchers defined emotional attachment as a reasonable mechanism to create the endowment effect. It has been revealed that individuals’ attachment to an object increases according to their resistance to giving up on the endowed object (Ariely, Huber, and Wertenbroch, 2005:135). As the literature indicated that people’s tendency to respond toward endowed items, even though they have not found a chance to use them, can contribute to the instant endowment effect (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990:1329). Researchers proposed that loss aversion can be explained by the differences in cognitive focus of individuals who possess the items and who do not (Ariely, Huber, and Wertenbroch, 2005:135). In detail, it has been suggested that possessing an object leads people to pay more attention to the good sides while considering the exchange of an object with money. As opposite not having a possession leads people to pay more attention to money instead of the object itself

(Carmon and Ariely, 2000:369).

Strahilevitz and Loewenstein (1998:276) also considered the endowment effect based on attachment theory and suggested that people gain a feeling of ownership with time. Researchers offered a three-stage adaptation process and indicated that people experience no ownership, partial ownership, and complete ownership throughout their psychological stages. Researchers proposed that initial ownership has an impact on the value of an object that is assigned by the people (Strahilevitz and Loewenstein, 1998:285). Therefore, both the value and attractiveness of the endowed item increase with time.

In the same aspect, the endowment concept as related to attachment has been studied in the field of online auctions. Ariely and Simonson (2003:120) suggested that in an auction, the individuals who offer the highest bid consider themselves as head of the auction, start to think of the possession as more tangible and attached to the item partially. This effect was named as “pseudoendowment effect” by Ariely and Simonson (2003:117). These findings found support from Heyman, Orhun, and Ariely (2004:9), researchers proposed that participants of an auction who have placed the highest bid and expect to win the auction develop a psychological attachment to the object. Therefore, if another person presents a higher offer, the participants who expect to win experience a feeling of loss and become tend to increase the price (as a result of the pseudoendowment effect) even if the new price takes place above the WTP of the individual (Heyman, Orhun, and Ariely, 2004:17).

#### **2.1.2.2. Query Theory**

The endowment effect occurs since sellers and buyers tend to focus on different aspects of the exchange (Carmon and Ariely, 2000:368). Buyers pay attention to the possible expense, whereas sellers pay attention to the object itself that they might quit (Carmon and Ariely, 2000:368). Associated with this, “query theory” has been proposed by Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan (2007:462). Researchers suggested that the endowment alters the hierarchy of the questions that people ask themselves during the decision-making process. Buyers might consider possible excuses not to pay the price on the object, whereas sellers could start by considering reasons why they should not sell (Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan, 2007:461). Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan (2007:461)

demonstrated that buyers tend to think less favorably about the object (such as a mug) and more favorably about the money. This also indicates that as subjects are instructed to use a query technique, the endowment effect vanishes since this query procedure shows a reverse effect of what endowment predicts (Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan, 2007:469).

Fundamentally, query theory imitates to explain why people do experience loss aversion (Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan, 2007:461). Three propositions form the basis of query theory (Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan, 2007:462). First of all, people create choices through self-produced queries. As an example, people may evaluate the reasons in order to decide to sell or not to sell an item before setting a selling price. Secondly, the first queries are inclined to look for reasons to be able to retain the status quo. For instance, an owner of a specific item may tend to initiate the evaluation process by searching for reasons not to sell. Lastly, initial claims ease similar claims while inhibiting the distinct ones. Therefore, supplemental reasons may be required if an individual starts with determining reasons for not selling an endowed item (Johnson, Haubl, and Keinan, 2007:462).

Burson, Faro, and Rottenstreich (2013:553) also used the query theory to support the findings which revealed that exchanging multiple goods (such as seven chocolate bars and five pens) instead of a single unit diminishes the endowment effect. Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer (2012:49) offered an alternative model that is highly similar to query theory. According to the model, people evaluate the value of an endowed item based on the idea of not having them which later leads people to focus on the worthwhile features of the endowed item. While assessing the advantages of an exchange, the prominent increase in features of an item leads to a higher valuation of the endowed item since the comparison between exchange options focuses on the notional advantages (Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer, 2012:51).

## **2.2. ENDOWMENT EFFECT FOR HEDONIC PRODUCTS**

People demand greater prices for a product that they already possess than their willingness to pay to purchase the same item (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:194; Köszegi and Rabin, 2006:2). According to the literature, loss aversion arises

as an expected statement (Tversky and Kahneman,1991). Sellers who forgone an object experience loss aversion and become more prone to increase the price that they can accept. Hence, disparity occurs between the WTA of sellers and the WTB of buyers for the exact item (Chan, 2015:3). Ariely, Huber, and Wertenbroch (2005:135) suggested that the pricing disparity between WTA and WTP in addition to the loss aversion that sellers experience can explain with the emotional attachment theory.

While the findings proposed that the emotional attachment of sellers triggers the perceived loss and leads to an increase in the price they can accept, this seems more relevant for hedonic products than utilitarian products (Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000:68). Therefore, the emotional attachment of sellers to possessed objects directs the endowment effect and this becomes prevalent specifically for hedonic products (Chan, 2015:3). Dhar and Wertenbroch (2000:68) depicted a resistance of subjects to forfeit hedonic products than utilitarian products. Participants in the study express a higher preference for hedonic products in forgone rather than acquirement conditions. Additionally, the researcher supported their finding with the field study in the marketplace. In the study, products were defined according to consumption purposes; hedonic products were defined by sensory experiences and fun while utilitarian products were defined by goal-motivated and instrumental features (Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000:61). According to the findings of the experiment, people who own hedonic cars assign more value to their automobiles as compared to owners of utilitarian cars (Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000:68).

Choosing between hedonic and utilitarian options can change based on a presentation of a product in process of decision-making (Okada, 2005:51). Okada (2005:51) indicated that customers are more likely to value the hedonic option than the utilitarian option if these two comparable options are displayed as single. On the contrary, customers tend to value the utilitarian option more as compared to the hedonic option when both alternatives are displayed side by side. Additionally, customers tend to show positive responses to the one-time opportunity of consuming hedonic products since they are more thrilled against the probability of enjoyment rather than practicality (Okada, 2005:52).

### **2.3. ENDOWMENT EFFECT AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM**

Marketers adapt anthropomorphism (i.e., attributing human-like features, intentions, and motivations) to use it as a strategy (Epley, 2007; Aggarwal and McGill, 2007). The literature suggested that anthropomorphism as a marketing strategy has been found influential in improving product evaluations (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007), and favorable customer responses toward products (Delbaere, McQuarrie, and Phillips, 2011). Prior studies on anthropomorphism revealed that researchers have focused on the effect of anthropomorphism on consumer evaluation (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Aggarwal and McGill, 2012; Han et al., 2019; Maeng and Aggarwal, 2017; Puzakova, Kwak, and Rocerto, 2013), consumer-brand relationship (Chandler and Shwarz, 2010; Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014), and recently impact of anthropomorphism on selling and buying prices (Kim and Swaminathan, 2021; Yuan and Dennis, 2019).

The literature on the endowment effect offers an important understanding of consumer evaluation of products. Prior studies proposed that customers are more likely to value their own possessions instead of products that they do not possess (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:94). The crucial impact of emotional attachment to an endowed item on the willingness to accept of sellers has also been mentioned in this regard (Ariely, Huber, and Wertenbroch, 2005; Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg, 2003). For instance, Genesove and Mayer (2001:1238) indicated that house owners attempt to sell their houses at higher prices compared to real estate brokers since they establish a higher emotional attachment to their houses than brokers. Related to this, Lastovicka and Fernandez (2005:821) suggested that once consumers sold their endowments, they felt a disconnection from some portions of their extended selves since these endowments had become a part of who they actually are. Therefore, a variety of studies have revealed that customers can create special connections with their possessions and they can experience loss while they consider selling them (Genesove and Mayer, 2001; Lastovicka and Fernandez, 2005). The literature suggested that the relationship between customer and product can affect the selling and buying price of the endowed item and this effect can be strengthened when the product is anthropomorphized (Kim and Swaminathan, 2021:79).

There are several studies in the literature that creates support for this strengthened connection between customers and anthropomorphized products. First of all, Aggarwal and McGill (2007) showed that customers imply human schemas easily to anthropomorphized entities. Thus, this makes it more possible to establish a humanlike relationship with anthropomorphized products rather than non-anthropomorphized ones (Fournier, 1998:345). Being included in a relationship with an anthropomorphized item also increases the emotional quality that customers perceive (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010:138). In the same vein, Kim and Swaminathan (2021:85) showed that anthropomorphism enhances the emotional connection between anthropomorphized products and the seller. Further, researchers demonstrated that when customers decide to sell their products, they feel reluctance to be away from their possessions since they value their relationship with the anthropomorphized item more than non-anthropomorphized items (Kim and Swaminathan, 2021:85). Hence, when a relationship has been established once, customers become more likely to experience reluctance and put more effort to maintain it.

Anthropomorphism leads people to evaluate inanimate objects as if they were alive (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010:138). This outcome of anthropomorphism becomes effective while customers are making product replacement decisions. Normally objects are rated according to their functionalities however this is considered improper while evaluating an actual person (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010:138). Therefore, it has been revealed that the same mentality is valid for anthropomorphized products (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010:138). Chandler and Schwarz (2010:138) demonstrated that utilitarian thinking (e.g., the functionality of product) becomes less important while evaluating the anthropomorphized product. Instead, customers become more reactive to personal information (e.g., considering the product as warm or cold). Related to this anthropomorphic reasoning, customers displayed lower intention to change their cars when they evaluated them in anthropomorphic terms. In more detail, considering their cars in anthropomorphic terms lead people to value the functionality of the product less. These findings indicate that anthropomorphism diminishes the value of functionality therefore hedonic products become more attractive to the customers and valued more by them (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010:138).

Yuan and Dennis (2019:469) indicated that customers were willing to pay more when a product was presented with anthropomorphic features rather than they were willing to pay for the same item that was presented in actual form. Particularly, researchers demonstrated that anthropomorphism increases customers' willingness to pay through an increase in their attachment not through emotional route or perceived quality (Yuan and Dennis, 2019:469). From another perspective, Yuan and Dennis showed that customers' increased willingness to pay is also related to the decrease in their self-control. Hur, Koo, and Hofmann (2015:20) revealed that anthropomorphism reduces self-control which later leads people to consume more from the anthropomorphized item (such as cookie with a smile on it).

Finally, it can be claimed based on the literature that the endowment effect and anthropomorphism intersect at the same point in different aspects (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010; Kim and Swaminathan, 2021; Yuan and Dennis, 2019).

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

#### **3.1. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

Previous studies have demonstrated that anthropomorphism varies based on the complexity of the products (Hart, Jones, and Royne, 2013:115). Customers tend to anthropomorphize complex products (such as mobile phones, laptops, and cars) (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Chandler and Schwarz, 2010; Landwehr, McGill, and Herrman, 2011) more as compared to simple products (such as toothbrushes, juice bottles, and coffee mugs) (De Bondt, Van Kerckhove, and Geuens, 2018; Han et al., 2019; Hart, Jones, and Royne, 2013) since complex products can be considered as human-like naturally (Hart, Jones, and Royne, 2013:115).

The complexity of the product is determined based on the functionality of an item which also includes a quantity of different materials and parts (Hart, Jones, and Royne, 2013:110). As an example, when customers anthropomorphize complex products such as cars or computers, they make inferences about the functionality of products by referring that they have memory, a mind of their own, or intelligence. Instead, for anthropomorphizing simple products such as a toothbrush or coffee mug, customers' effort to make human-like inferences about the product occurs comparatively less.

Therefore, it is claimed that anthropomorphic primes are more proper for complex products rather than simple products (Hart, Jones, and Royne, 2013:116). Adding a smile or face on a complex product can trigger favorable customer evaluations regarding that item (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Landwehr, McGill, and Hermann, 2011) while the same application may not be strong for simple products. Hart, Jones, and Royne (2013:117) showed that anthropomorphism is a strong predictor of the personal values of each product.

Anthropomorphism changes the direction of how people perceive brands and products (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Aggarwal and McGill, 2012; Awad and Youn, 2018; Puzakova, Kwak and Rocereto, 2013; Wang et al., 2007). Customers apply social schemas to products and prefer the ones which show congruence with this

schema. For instance, customers tend to name product lines as product “family” or evaluate the cars with a smile instead of a frown more favorably (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:479). Therefore, anthropomorphism turns ownership into relationship. If this phenomenon has the power of changing the way of how people perceive brands and products and eventually affect their decisions, can the same assumptions be valid when willingness to accept and willingness to pay decisions are considered?

Past research showed that anthropomorphizing a product increases customers’ willingness to pay for that item (Kim and Kramer, 2015:290; Kim and Swaminathan, 2021:469; Yuan and Dennis, 2019:85). However, there is no study that examines the impact of anthropomorphism on the gap between willingness to accept and willingness to pay. The endowment effect literature revealed that customers are willing to accept more for an item than they are willing to pay to acquire it (Knetsch and Sinden, 1984:519). Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1991:195) demonstrated that sellers set a higher price as their willingness to accept compared to the price that buyers are willing to pay. In substance, customers show a greater tendency to demand a higher price for the product that they own as compared to their willingness to pay for the same product (Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1991:194). Therefore, in this study, how willingness to accept and willingness to pay decisions of customers differ between anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized products will be explained. Also, it is aimed to examine how the impact of anthropomorphism on WTA and WTP will differ between product types (complex vs. simple).

H<sub>1</sub>: Endowment effect will be higher for anthropomorphic-complex products compared to non-anthropomorphic complex products.

H<sub>2</sub>: Endowment effect will not differ significantly between anthropomorphic-simple and non-anthropomorphic-simple products.

Normally, products are considered according to how effective they function but functionality loses its importance when making inferences about people (Chandler and Waytz, 2010: 138). This difference can be seen between hedonic and utilitarian products. Dhar and Wertenbroch (2000:68) revealed that people who own hedonic cars assign more value to their automobiles as compared to owners of utilitarian cars. Chan (2015:1) also indicated that pricing disparity between willingness to accept and willingness to pay are seen as valid specifically for hedonic products. Therefore, it can

be expected that customers will be willing to pay more for hedonic products when they are anthropomorphized as compared to utilitarian products which were also presented with anthropomorphic features. Since anthropomorphism is stronger for complex products, this effect is expected to be observed specifically in this product category.

H<sub>3</sub>: Endowment effect will be higher for hedonic-anthropomorphic products than utilitarian anthropomorphic products in the complex product category.

H<sub>4</sub>: Endowment effect will not differ significantly for hedonic-anthropomorphic products than utilitarian anthropomorphic products in the simple product category.

### **3.2. MANIPULATION CHECK**

In order to select the appropriate products to be used in the main study, a manipulation check has been conducted for five different types of products (robot cleaner, personal assistant, watch, car, and thermos) (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Chandler and Schwarz, 2010; Maeng and Aggarwal, 2017; Landwehr, McGill and Herrman, 2011). In addition to cars, watches can also be perceived as having a human face since the round frame of watches make the anthropomorphizing process easier for the customers (Maeng and Aggarwal, 2017; Landwehr, McGill and Herrman, 2011).

Besides these products, technological devices such as cell phones (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007; Landwehr, McGill and Herrman, 2011), slot machines (Kim and McGill, 2011) and personal assistants (i.e., Alexa or Siri) (Herrman, 2022) were used by many researchers in anthropomorphism studies. Technological devices with many parts and functionalities are considered as complex products and it has been proved that complex products are anthropomorphized more by the customers (Hart, Jones and Royne, 2013: 115). However, there are still other studies which have revealed the same effect for simple products like coffee mug (Han et al., 2019). Therefore, in accordance with the literature, different products from all categories have been selected for the manipulation check.

An online survey for manipulation check of watch, robot cleaner and personal assistant has been conducted with 71 participants who were assigned to one of the two different conditions randomly (35 anthropomorphic, 36 non-anthropomorphic).

Firstly, the participants read the definition of anthropomorphism which was created by combining the definition of Epley (2007:864) and the scale items of Kim and McGill (2011:97) in each condition. First the anthropomorphism definition was given, then hedonic and utilitarian versions of three different products have been presented to the participants in both conditions. Products in anthropomorphic conditions were humanized by adding hands (Toure-Tillery and McGill, 2015:20), eyes (Hur, Koo and Hofmann, 2015:6; Landwehr et al., 2011:133), and smile (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:473). Products “spoke” in the first person (Toure-Tillery and McGill, 2015:4) with the speech bubbles (Kim, Chen and Zhang, 2016:23).

The text in the hedonic condition mentioned for the watch as “Hey I am Blue! Now I am more fun”, for the personal assistant as “Hey I am Arvo! I am your new personal assistant, and I was designed to entertain you. Let’s get started!”, lastly for robot cleaner, text in speech bubble was designed as “Hey I am Villy! New member of your family. I am making the cleaning more fun”. The utilitarian condition of the products, on the other hand, was defined as “Hey I am Black! I am classy and suitable for all periods of time” for the watch, “Hey I am Lato! I am your new personal assistant, and I was designed to help you. Let’s get started!”, lastly for robot cleaner “Hey I am Molly! New member of your family. The cleaning is easier and faster with me.” As opposite, products in non-anthropomorphic condition were seen as the original version of the products without any characteristics or features of actual human beings.

**Figure 1:** Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Watches



Anthropomorphic-Hedonic

Anthropomorphic-Utilitarian

Source: Created by the author

**Figure 2:** Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Robot Cleaners



Anthropomorphic-Hedonic

Anthropomorphic-Utilitarian

Source: Created by the author

**Figure 3:** Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Personal Assistants



Source: Created by the author

To measure anthropomorphism, three items were adapted from Kim and McGill (2015:287): “the product looks like a person”; “the product seems almost as if it has free will”; “the product seems almost as if it has its own intentions” and combined with the anthropomorphism definition of Epley (2007:864) to be able to create clear definition as “Anthropomorphism describes the tendency of non-human beings to have real or imagined human behavior. These can be human-like traits, motivations, intentions, or emotions. An object may appear to you to have human characteristics (face, body, emotion, thought, etc.), or can be perceived as having thoughts or intentions of its own”. To assess whether the products were anthropomorphized sufficiently one item of anthropomorphism (“To what extent do you perceive this product as anthropomorphic? 1=not anthropomorphic at all, 7=very anthropomorphic) has been included to the measurement scale.

After participants answered the anthropomorphism question in two different conditions (anthropomorphized vs non-anthropomorphized), to reveal whether products were perceived as hedonic or utilitarian, another manipulation check (adapted from Okada (2005:46), Dhar and Wertenbroch (2000:63) has been performed. In order to assess that, definitions of hedonic and utilitarian products were given to the participants. After, participants were exposed to a control (non-anthropomorphized)

version of the products, with the definition of their characteristics (three characteristics of each product) they were asked to evaluate in regard to being utilitarian or hedonic (1=very utilitarian, 7=very hedonic).

Cross-tab analysis has been performed on anthropomorphism and hedonism-utilitarianism checks. Results of the anthropomorphism check revealed that there was no significant difference between the anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic versions of the three products.

**Table 1:** Chi-Square Test Results of Anthropomorphism Check for Watch, Personal Assistant, and Robot

|                                                                                      | Asymp.<br>Sig. (2-<br>sided) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (Hedonic anthropomorphic watch) *(Hedonic non-anthropomorphic watch)                 | ,667                         |
| (Utilitarian anthropomorphic watch) *(Utilitarian non-anthropomorphic watch)         | ,785                         |
| (Hedonic anthropomorphic assistant) *(Hedonic non-anthropomorphic assistant)         | ,456                         |
| (Utilitarian anthropomorphic assistant) *(Utilitarian non-anthropomorphic assistant) | ,119                         |
| (Hedonic anthropomorphic cleaner) *(Hedonic non-anthropomorphic cleaner)             | ,070                         |
| (Utilitarian anthropomorphic cleaner) *(Utilitarian non-anthropomorphic cleaner)     | ,496                         |

Source: Created by the author

**Table 2:** Anthropomorphism Manipulation Results for Watch, Personal Assistant, and Robot Cleaner

| MEAN      | Hedonic         |                     | Utilitarian     |                     |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
|           | Anthropomorphic | Non-anthropomorphic | Anthropomorphic | Non-anthropomorphic |
| Watch     | 5,25            | 4,08                | 3,62            | 2,31                |
| Assistant | 5,91            | 6,17                | 4,34            | 3,77                |
| Cleaner   | 4,37            | 4,62                | 3,94            | 2,74                |

Source: Created by the author

Hedonism-Utilitarianism check results revealed that manipulations of watch  $p=.000$  ( $M_{\text{hedonic watch}}=5,26$  and  $M_{\text{utilitarian watch}}=3,21$ ), personal assistant

$p=.053$  (Mhedonic assistant=5,12 and Mutilitarian asistant=3,4) and robot cleaner  $p=.002$  (Mhedonic cleaner=5,29 and Mutilitarian cleaner=3,01) were sufficient. However, the difference between anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized versions of the products was not significant. Therefore, these three items were not included in the main study.

Another online survey for manipulation check of car and thermos has been conducted with 23 participants for the thermos and 27 participants for the car. In both surveys, participants were asked to evaluate two different versions of products (hedonic and utilitarian) in both anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic conditions. The same process which was used for the manipulation check study of the watch, personal assistant, and robot cleaner has been used. Products were endowed with human-like features; hands (Toure-Tillery and McGill, 2015:20), eyes (Hur, Koo and Hofmann, 2015:6; Landwehr et al., 2011:133), and smile (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:473) and spoke balloon has been included to manipulate visuals as hedonic and utilitarian. The thermos in the hedonic version was introduced as “Hey I am Mug! I was designed to offer you coffees that you will enjoy” while the thermos in the utilitarian version was introduced as “Hey I am Cup! I was designed to keep your coffee warm”. For cars manipulation of hedonic features has been maintained with the text of “Hey I am Red! I am faster now. Are you ready to meet me?” and for the utilitarian car with “Hey I am Grey! I am stronger now. Are you ready to meet me?”.

**Figure 4:** Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Thermoses



Anthropomorphic-Hedonic



Anthropomorphic-Utilitarian

Source: Created by the author

**Figure 5:** Anthropomorphic-Hedonic and Utilitarian Versions of Cars



Anthropomorphic-Hedonic



Anthropomorphic-Utilitarian

Source: Created by the author

The results of thermos and car manipulation studies revealed a significant difference between anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic conditions of products both for hedonic and utilitarian versions. Only the result for the hedonic car was not

significant and another manipulation study has been conducted by increasing the sample size to 70 participants. This study was concluded with significant results which are given in the table below.

**Table 3:** Chi-Square Test Results of Anthropomorphism Check for Car and Thermos

|                                                                                  | Asymp. Sig.<br>(2-sided) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (Hedonic anthropomorphic thermos) *(Hedonic non-anthropomorphic thermos)         | ,022                     |
| (Utilitarian anthropomorphic thermos) *(Utilitarian non-anthropomorphic thermos) | ,039                     |
| (Hedonic anthropomorphic car) *(Hedonic non-anthropomorphic car)                 | ,003                     |
| (Utilitarian anthropomorphic car) *(Utilitarian non-anthropomorphic car)         | ,025                     |

Source: Created by the author

**Table 4:** Anthropomorphism Manipulation Results for Car and Thermos

| MEAN    | Hedonic         |                     | Utilitarian     |                     |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
|         | Anthropomorphic | Non-anthropomorphic | Anthropomorphic | Non-anthropomorphic |
| Thermos | 4,22            | 2,95                | 4,59            | 3,36                |
| Car     | 5               | 2,9                 | 5,10            | 4,00                |

Source: Created by the author

Hedonism-Utilitarianism check results revealed that manipulations of thermos  $p=.000$  ( $M_{\text{hedonic thermos}}=5,68$  and  $M_{\text{utilitarian thermos}}=2,68$ ), and car  $p=.000$  ( $M_{\text{hedonic car}}=5,88$  and  $M_{\text{utilitarian car}}=2,85$ ) were significant.

As a result of the manipulation check, thermos and cars were chosen to be used in the main study.

Previous studies explored that seeing a car as having a face of human is a common form of anthropomorphism (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007: 472; Chandler and Schwarz, 2010:139; Landwehr, McGill and Herrmann, 2011:135; Welsh, 2006:7). It is also related to the complexity of the product. Epley et al. (2007:834) and Hart, Jones and Roynes, (2013:105) demonstrated that anthropomorphism is stronger in complex products. Along with the cars, the majority of other studies have also focused on

complex products such as cell phones (Aggarwal and McGill, 2007:472; Landwehr et al., 2011:135) and slot machines (Kim and McGill, 2011:97).

Including only complex products in the anthropomorphism studies remains the relationship between this concept and product type questionable. Therefore, using a simple product such as a thermos will lead to finding differences between the complex and simple products in terms of relationship with anthropomorphism. In another aspect, products were also proper for the main study since the choices are also consistent with the endowment effect literature. (Chandler and Schwarz, 2010; Chuang, 2013; Dhar and Wertenbroch, 2000; Johnson, Haubl and Keinan, 2007; Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler, 1991).

### **3.3. STUDY 1: IMPACT OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM ON WTA AND WTP OF CUSTOMERS FOR COMPLEX PRODUCTS**

Study 1 aims to test  $H_1$ , in other words, examine how the endowment effect differs for anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic complex products (car). It is expected to conclude that the endowment effect will be higher for anthropomorphic complex products. Therefore, in Study 1, the focus is on revealing the difference between the selling and buying prices of complex anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic products.

#### **3.3.1. Procedure and Design**

Eight different surveys have been designed to prevent the effect of any possible bias which can originate from anthropomorphic-non-anthropomorphic and hedonic-utilitarian conditions. 2 (anthropomorphic vs non-anthropomorphic) x 2 (sellers vs buyers) x 2 (hedonic vs utilitarian) between-subjects factorial design was used.

Surveys have been assigned to participants randomly and participants are shown one of the four products (hedonic anthropomorphic car, hedonic non-anthropomorphic car, utilitarian anthropomorphic car, and utilitarian non-anthropomorphic car) while they were informed to consider themselves as buyer or seller. Participants in the seller position were first asked to imagine that they were

using this car for one year and they had an amazing time with it. Now they can continue to use their cars or they can sell them. In the case of deciding to sell their cars, what will be the price, they will be willing to accept. As opposed, participants in the buyer position were first asked to determine the price they will be willing to pay for the car without including their current income into consideration. By doing this, it was aimed to remove any effect of income on participants' decision-making.

Next, participants answered questions that were included in the survey to measure psychological ownership. Previous studies on the endowment effect have shown that legal ownership of the item in question is not always required to see the effect. Instead, even though the consumer does not have the product, anticipatory possession or pseudo endowment can create similar psychological effects to legal ownership (Ariely and Simonson, 2003:117). It shows that psychological ownership and legal ownership are related. However, psychological ownership can exist through creative design, imagination, or touch (Fuchs, Parandelli and Schreier, 2010:67; Peck and Shu, 2009:435; Reb and Connolly, 2007:108). Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2003:86) define psychological ownership as "the state in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership or a piece of that target is 'theirs'". Therefore, psychological ownership questions have been included to be able to name the effect as an endowment. Lastly, participants responded to the demographics-related questions.

### **3.3.2. Measures**

The price that participants are willing to accept and pay was measured in a "name-your-own-price" format (Yuan and Dennis, 2019:462). Products were presented to participants first then they were asked to mention the price they will be willing to pay (for participants in the buyer position) or accept (for participants in the seller position). There were no restrictions on how much participants could pay for a product. Psychological ownership was measured by using a three-question scale derived from another psychological ownership scale used by Pierce, Kostova and Dirks (2003:103). Questions included in the scale are "I feel very high degree of personal ownership of this car", "I feel like I own this car" and I feel like this is my

car”, each on a seven-point scale anchored from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” ( $\alpha=.97$ ).

### **3.3.3. Results**

#### **3.3.3.1 Demographics of Participants**

568 participants attended to online survey study. 273 participants were male and the remaining 295 participants were female. In figure 5 below, the gender percentages of participants have been given.

According to age distribution, a major proportion of the participants were young and middle-aged consumers. Among 568 participants; 82 participants were in the age range of 18-24, 221 participants were in the age range of 25-34, 123 participants were in the age range of 35-44, 92 participants were in the age range of 45-54 and finally remaining 50 participants were over 55 years old.

Observation of the education status of participants showed that a large proportion of participants has bachelor's degrees. After participants who have bachelor's degrees, high school graduates participants have the second-highest rate. Percentages of education status are shown in Figure 7 below.

In order to receive the income level of participants, five different income level has been provided. Participants have been asked to determine which income level they can put themselves in. According to the results, 30 participants described themselves as in lower-income level, 146 participants were in low-middle income level, 249 participants with higher rate were in middle-income level, 139 participants were in upper-middle-income level and lastly, the remaining 4 participants were in upper-income level.

#### **3.3.3.2. Hypotheses Testing**

Before testing the hypotheses, whether price differed across income levels was tested through Chi-Square test.

**Table 5:** Chi-Square Analysis of Complex Product vs Income Level

|                                                                                          | Value                | df  | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                                                                       | 435,860 <sup>a</sup> | 408 | ,164                  |
| Likelihood Ratio                                                                         | 363,766              | 408 | ,943                  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                                                             | 11,757               | 1   | ,001                  |
| N of Valid Cases                                                                         | 567                  |     |                       |
| a. 485 cells (94,2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,01. |                      |     |                       |

Source: Created by the author

According to the results, it can be seen that price did not differ across income levels.

Then, psychological ownership was measured according to buyer and seller position. ANOVA has been used for the analysis method.

**Table 6:** ANOVA Results of Psychological Ownership for Seller-Buyer Position for Complex Products

|        |     |        |           |            | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             |       |      |
|--------|-----|--------|-----------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------|------|
|        | N   | Mean   | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound | F     | Sig. |
| Seller | 280 | 4.5667 | 2.06821   | .12360     | 4.3234                           | 4.8100      | 5.510 | .019 |
| Buyer  | 288 | 4.1539 | 2.12096   | .12498     | 3.9079                           | 4.3999      |       |      |
| Total  | 568 | 4.3574 | 2.10344   | .08826     | 4.1840                           | 4.5307      |       |      |

Source: Created by the author

Results revealed that the mean of sellers' psychological ownership is 4,56 while the mean of buyers' psychological ownership is 4.15. It shows that even though the mean is higher for sellers, buyers can also imagine themselves as having the product. Therefore, as related to the literature endowment effect can be claimed

(Ariely and Simonson, 2003; Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg, 2003; Red and Connolly, 2007; Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003).

**Table 7:** GLM Results of Endowment Effect and Anthropomorphism for Complex Product

| Anthropomorphism    | Seller/Buyer | Mean   | Std. Dev. | N   | p    | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|-----|------|-------------|-------------|
| Anthropomorphic     | Seller       | 5.6773 | .36725    | 142 | .000 | .143        | .329        |
|                     | Buyer        | 5.4413 | .52109    | 152 |      | -.329       | -.143       |
| Non-anthropomorphic | Seller       | 5.5145 | .32147    | 138 | .027 | -.206       | -.012       |
|                     | Buyer        | 5.4056 | .37870    | 136 |      | .143        | .329        |

Source: Created by the author

GLM (General Linear Model) has been used to test the H<sub>1</sub>. This model has been selected in order to determine whether the means of sellers' and buyers' responses in both anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic conditions.

According to the results, the endowment effect differs between buyers and sellers in both anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized cars (anthropomorphized  $p=.000$ , non-anthropomorphized  $p=.027$ ). The mean of anthropomorphized products for seller position was 5,67 and for buyer position was 5,44. As expected, sellers were assigned a higher price to sell the product that they own, compared to buying the same product. The mean of non-anthropomorphized cars for seller position was 5,51 and for buyer position was 5,40. As in the line with the hypotheses, even though sellers in non-anthropomorphic condition were assigned higher prices than the buyers, the difference between these two positions was less significant as compared to anthropomorphic condition.

It can be concluded from the results that the endowment effect is higher for anthropomorphic products. Therefore, H<sub>1</sub> is supported.

### **3.4. STUDY 2: IMPACT OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM ON WTA AND WTP OF CUSTOMERS FOR SIMPLE PRODUCTS**

Study 2 aims to test H<sub>2</sub>, in other words examine how the endowment effect differs for anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic simple products (thermos). It is expected to conclude that there will not be a significant difference between anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic simple products in terms of buyer and seller positions. In other words, there will not be a significant difference between the selling and buying prices of simple anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic products.

#### **3.4.1. Procedure and Design**

The same procedure and designs as Study 1 were used. Eight different surveys have been designed including anthropomorphic, and non-anthropomorphic versions of hedonic-utilitarian products for both seller and buyer positions. 2 (anthropomorphic vs non-anthropomorphic) x 2 (sellers vs buyers) x 2 (hedonic vs utilitarian) between-subjects factorial design was used.

Surveys have been assigned to participants randomly and participants have been shown one of the four products (hedonic anthropomorphic thermos, hedonic non-anthropomorphic thermos, utilitarian anthropomorphic thermos, and utilitarian non-anthropomorphic thermos) while they considered themselves as buyer or sellers. Participants in the seller positions were first asked to imagine that they were using this thermos for one year and they had the item for all the long nights they had to work. Now they can continue to use their thermoses, or they can decide to sell them. In case of deciding to sell their thermoses, what will be the price, they will be willing to accept. As opposed, participants in the buyer position were first asked to determine the price they will be willing to pay for the thermos without including their current income into consideration. Next, participants answered questions that were included in a survey to measure psychological ownership. Lastly, demographic information of the participants was collected.

### **3.4.2. Measures**

The price that participants are willing to accept and pay was measured in a “name-your-own-price” format (Yuan and Dennis, 2019:462) as same in Study 1. Psychological ownership was measured by using a three-question scale derived from another psychological ownership scale used by Pierce et al. (2003:103). Questions included in the scale are “I feel very high degree of personal ownership of this thermos”, “I feel like I own this thermos” and “I feel like this is my thermos”, each on a seven-point scale anchored from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” ( $\alpha=.93$ ).

### **3.4.3. Results**

#### **3.4.3.1. Demographics of Participants**

585 participants have attended to online survey study. 273 participants were male and the remaining 312 participants were female. In figure 11 below, the gender percentages of participants have been given.

According to age distribution, a major proportion of the participants were middle-aged consumers. Among 585 participants; 86 participants were in the age range of 18-24, 224 participants were in the age range of 25-34, 122 participants were in the age range of 35-44, 99 participants were in the age range of 45-54 and finally the remaining 54 participants were over 55 years old.

Observation of the education status of participants showed that a large proportion of participants has bachelor's degrees. After participants with bachelor's degrees, high school graduates have the second-highest rate. Percentages of education status are shown in Figure 13 below.

In order to receive the income level of participants, five different income levels have been provided. Participants have been asked to determine which income level they can put themselves at. Results showed that, 32 participants described themselves as in lower-income level, 147 participants were in low-middle income level, 261 participants were in middle-income level, 139 participants were in upper-middle-income level and lastly, 6 participants were in upper-income level.

### 3.4.3.2. Hypotheses Testing

Before testing the hypotheses, whether price differed across income levels was tested through Chi-Square test.

**Table 8:** Chi-Square Analysis of Simple Product vs Income Level

|                                                                                          | Value                | df  | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                                                                       | 211,170 <sup>a</sup> | 188 | ,118                  |
| Likelihood Ratio                                                                         | 182,295              | 188 | ,604                  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                                                             | 13,286               | 1   | ,000                  |
| N of Valid Cases                                                                         | 585                  |     |                       |
| a. 205 cells (85,4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,01. |                      |     |                       |

Source: Created by the author

According to the results, it can be seen that price did not differ across income levels.

Then, psychological ownership was measured according to buyer and seller position. ANOVA has been used for the analysis method.

**Table 9:** ANOVA Results of Psychological Ownership for Seller-Buyer Position for Simple Products

|        | N   | Mean   | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | F      | Sig. |
|--------|-----|--------|-----------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------|------|
|        |     |        |           |            | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |        |      |
| Seller | 290 | 4.6172 | 2.06587   | .12131     | 4.3785                           | 4.8560      | 19.867 | .000 |
| Buyer  | 295 | 3.8542 | 2.07426   | .12077     | 3.6166                           | 4.0919      |        |      |
| Total  | 585 | 4.2325 | 2.10328   | .08696     | 4.0617                           | 4.4033      |        |      |

Source: Created by the author

Results showed that the mean of sellers' psychological ownership is 4,61 while the mean of buyers' psychological ownership is 3.85. Therefore, it is seen that participants in both positions can imagine themselves as having the item.

**Table 10:** GLM Results of Endowment Effect and Anthropomorphism for Simple Products

| Anthropomorphism    | Seller/Buyer | Mean   | Std. Dev. | N   | Sig. <sup>b</sup> | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|-----|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Anthropomorphic     | Seller       | 1.9308 | .33385    | 145 | .107              | -.013       | .129        |
|                     | Buyer        | 1.8725 | .38470    | 149 |                   | -.129       | .013        |
| Non-anthropomorphic | Seller       | 1.9740 | .25912    | 145 | .000              | .134        | .276        |
|                     | Buyer        | 1.7690 | .23269    | 146 |                   | -.276       | -.134       |

Source: Created by the author

GLM has been used to test H<sub>2</sub>. According to the results, the endowment effect does not differ between buyers and sellers in anthropomorphized thermoses ( $p=.107$ ). Oppositely, it differs in non-anthropomorphic thermoses ( $p=.000$ ). The mean of anthropomorphized products for seller position was 1.93 and for buyer position was 1.87. Even though sellers were assigned higher prices for the anthropomorphized thermoses, there was no significant difference. The mean of non-anthropomorphized products for seller position was 1.97 and for buyer position was 1.76. It is shown that the endowment effect does not differ for simple products when they are anthropomorphized. Therefore, H<sub>2</sub> is supported.

### 3.5. ENDOWMENT EFFECT FOR HEDONIC VS UTILITARIAN PRODUCTS

After revealing the difference between the endowment effect and anthropomorphized, non-anthropomorphized products. Other analyses have been run to see how the endowment effect differs when the product has hedonic or utilitarian features.

**Table 11:** GLM Results of Selling and Buying Prices for Hedonic and Utilitarian Products

| Anthropomorphism    | Seller/Buyer | Hedonic/Utilitarian | Mean   | Std. Deviation | N   |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------|----------------|-----|
| Anthropomorphic     | Seller       | Hedonic             | 5.7076 | .26335         | 70  |
|                     |              | Utilitarian         | 5.6479 | .44571         | 72  |
|                     |              | Total               | 5.6773 | .36725         | 142 |
|                     | Buyer        | Hedonic             | 5.2771 | .64102         | 77  |
|                     |              | Utilitarian         | 5.6099 | .27428         | 75  |
|                     |              | Total               | 5.4413 | .52109         | 152 |
|                     | Total        | Hedonic             | 5.4821 | .54149         | 147 |
|                     |              | Utilitarian         | 5.6285 | .36756         | 147 |
|                     |              | Total               | 5.5553 | .46776         | 294 |
| Non-anthropomorphic | Seller       | Hedonic             | 5.4630 | .41562         | 70  |
|                     |              | Utilitarian         | 5.5674 | .16675         | 68  |
|                     |              | Total               | 5.5145 | .32147         | 138 |
|                     | Buyer        | Hedonic             | 5.5009 | .25441         | 72  |
|                     |              | Utilitarian         | 5.2983 | .46075         | 64  |
|                     |              | Total               | 5.4056 | .37870         | 136 |
|                     | Total        | Hedonic             | 5.4823 | .34276         | 142 |
|                     |              | Utilitarian         | 5.4369 | .36680         | 132 |
|                     |              | Total               | 5.4604 | .35462         | 274 |

Source: Created by the author

According to the result of the first analysis, when the complex products are anthropomorphized the endowment effect is stronger for the one which has hedonic features as compared to one which has utilitarian features. Results showed that for anthropomorphic products, sellers were willing to assign higher prices for a product both have hedonic (*M*hedonic car selling price=5,70, *M*hedonic car buying price=5,27) and utilitarian (*M*utilitarian car selling price=5,64, *M*utilitarian car buying price=5,60) features.

For non-anthropomorphic products, sellers were not willing to accept the higher price to sell the product which has hedonic features (*M*hedonic car selling price=5,46) as compared to the price that buyers were willing to pay (*M*hedonic car buying price=5,50). The opposite result has been observed for a non-

anthropomorphized product with utilitarian features (*Mutilitarian* car selling price=5,56, *Mutilitarian* car buying price=5,29).

**Table 12:** Tests Results of Between Subject Effects for Complex Products

Dependent Variable: Selling/Buying Price

| Source                      | Type III Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F          | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-------------|------------|------|
| Corrected Model             | 12.278 <sup>a</sup>     | 7   | 1.754       | 11.234     | .000 |
| Intercept                   | 17188.945               | 1   | 17188.945   | 110087.797 | .000 |
| Anthro                      | 1.508                   | 1   | 1.508       | 9.659      | .002 |
| Position                    | 4.333                   | 1   | 4.333       | 27.750     | .000 |
| HedUtil                     | .270                    | 1   | .270        | 1.731      | .189 |
| Anthro * Position           | .498                    | 1   | .498        | 3.192      | .075 |
| Anthro * HedUtil            | 1.220                   | 1   | 1.220       | 7.813      | .005 |
| Position * HedUtil          | .064                    | 1   | .064        | .413       | .521 |
| Anthro * Position * HedUtil | 4.329                   | 1   | 4.329       | 27.728     | .000 |
| Error                       | 87.438                  | 560 | .156        |            |      |
| Total                       | 17341.342               | 568 |             |            |      |
| Corrected Total             | 99.716                  | 567 |             |            |      |

a. R Squared = .123 (Adjusted R Squared = .112)

Source: Created by the author

Finally, when all variables have been included in the model and three-way interactions were founded for complex products ( $p=.000$ ).

The same analysis was run for simple products (thermoses). Results showed that for anthropomorphic products, sellers were willing to assign higher prices for a product both have hedonic (*Mhedonic* thermos selling price=1,97, *Mhedonic* thermos buying price=1,89) and utilitarian (*Mutilitarian* thermos selling price=1,88 *Mutilitarian* thermos buying price=1,84) features. For non-anthropomorphic products, sellers were also willing to accept the higher price to sell the product (*Mhedonic* thermos selling price=2,01, *Mutilitarian* thermos selling price=1,92) as compared to the price that buyers were willing to pay (*Mhedonic* thermos buying price=1,86,

Mutilitarian thermos buying price=1,67) without differing significantly for hedonic and utilitarian features.

**Table 13:** Tests Results of Between Subject Effects for Simple Products

| Source                      | Type III Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F         | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-------------|-----------|------|
| Corrected Model             | 5.490 <sup>a</sup>      | 7   | .784        | 8.470     | .000 |
| Intercept                   | 2079.310                | 1   | 2079.310    | 22457.616 | .000 |
| Position                    | 2.613                   | 1   | 2.613       | 28.218    | .000 |
| Anthro                      | .141                    | 1   | .141        | 1.527     | .217 |
| HedUtil                     | 1.649                   | 1   | 1.649       | 17.807    | .000 |
| Position * Anthro           | .806                    | 1   | .806        | 8.710     | .003 |
| Position * HedUtil          | .031                    | 1   | .031        | .330      | .566 |
| Anthro * HedUtil            | .174                    | 1   | .174        | 1.878     | .171 |
| Position * Anthro * HedUtil | .202                    | 1   | .202        | 2.176     | .141 |
| Error                       | 53.423                  | 577 | .093        |           |      |
| Total                       | 2140.401                | 585 |             |           |      |
| Corrected Total             | 58.913                  | 584 |             |           |      |

a. R Squared = .093 (Adjusted R Squared = .082)

Source: Created by the author

It can be seen in the table above that even though there were differences between means, three-way interaction has not been found for simple products ( $p=.141$ ).

When the results of the analysis were compared it can be said that the endowment effect is higher for hedonic-anthropomorphic complex products than for utilitarian-anthropomorphic complex products. As suggested by hypotheses, this difference was not observed for simple products. Therefore, H3 and H4 are supported.

## CONCLUSION

The current research provides a considerable contribution to prior anthropomorphism and the endowment effect studies by indicating how the price gap between willingness to accept of sellers and willingness to pay of buyers differs for anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized products. In particular, this study demonstrates the novel impact of product anthropomorphism on consumers' selling and buying prices for products that were endowed with human-like features. Across two studies conducted with different types (cars as complex products vs thermoses as simple products) and versions (hedonic vs utilitarian) of products, impact of anthropomorphism on the endowment effect has been revealed.

Study 1 demonstrated that anthropomorphism leads customers to set a higher selling price for a complex product that they own compared to the buying price determined by buyers for the same product. Furthermore, Study 2 revealed that the endowment effect does not differ between anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized simple products. Even though sellers set higher prices to sell the products, the difference between the prices that were indicated by the buyers was not significant. According to additional analysis done in Study 2, which was conducted to reveal how the endowment effect differs between anthropomorphized and non-anthropomorphized products when hedonic or utilitarian features were attributed the products, results showed that when the complex products are anthropomorphized the endowment effect is stronger for the one which has hedonic features as compared to one which has utilitarian features. In particular, three-way interaction has been found between anthropomorphism, the endowment effect and hedonism-utilitarianism for complex products. The same outcome was not valid for simple products since the findings demonstrated that the endowment effect does not differ according to hedonic or utilitarian features.

As much as theoretical contributions, there are also managerial implications. First, anthropomorphic features change how people usually evaluate non-human objects. When a non-human entity is endowed with human-like features, people show a higher tendency to consider them as if they were actual humans. Therefore, marketers should pay attention to anthropomorphic features that the brand or product in question may have in order to receive a more favorable attitude from customers. The findings

of this thesis showed that customers tend to set higher prices for the anthropomorphized products. Thus, beyond making products more appealing for the customers, marketers can use anthropomorphism while determining their pricing strategies. It can be claimed that anthropomorphism creates a different experience than any product in object form can offer. In today's global world, while customers can reach any information in a short time, creating experience becomes more crucial for the companies. Anthropomorphism occurs as a one way of achieving this goal. Secondly, as the findings suggest that anthropomorphism shows significant impact on the selling and buying prices of products for specific categories. Therefore, applying anthropomorphic characteristics can be more proper for complex products rather than simple ones. Also, it should be noted that the effect that anthropomorphism creates on the price-based decisions of the customers will be stronger if the product has hedonic features compared to utilitarian features. Therefore, in order to prevent any negative impact that can be caused by misuse of anthropomorphism, marketers should be selective for the target object that they are planning to attribute to human-like features.

## **LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCHES**

This study suffers from the limitations of using questionnaires as a measurement method. All data were collected by online surveys. The risk of bias was decreased by preparing eight different surveys for each combination and assigning these surveys to participants randomly. Another limitation is that participants did not actually possess the product. Most of the studies in the endowment effect literature were done in a laboratory setting. However, the literature has suggested that even in the absence of the actual ownership, the endowment effect still can be claimed (Ariely and Simonson, 2003:117; Carmon and Ariely, 2000:368; Peck and Shue, 2009:445). Participants were informed in the surveys about ignoring their current income when making their decisions. To be able to remove the effect of income, chi-square test was performed and revealed that the income has no impact on the price.

Future research could pursue a few additional ways in this line of work. First, in this study participants in the seller position have been informed that they spent amazing time with their products (since the literature suggests that positive attitudes

toward the past affect consumer evaluation of anthropomorphized products favorably), however the results can change when customers have a negative relationship with their products. Therefore, future works can examine the impact of anthropomorphism on selling and buying prices of products when customers have a negative relationship with their products. Additionally, even though findings of the study prove that the endowment effect can occur in the absence of actual ownership, future studies can replicate this research in a field experiment with an actual ownership of products.



## REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 34(3): 347–356.
- Aaker, J. (1999). The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-expression in Persuasion. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 36(1): 45–57.
- Aggarwal, P. (2004). The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 31 (1): 87-101.
- Aggarwal, P. and McGill, A. (2007). Is That Car Smiling at Me? Schema Congruity as a Basis for Evaluating Anthropomorphized Products. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 34 (4): 468-479.
- Aggarwal, P. and McGill, A. (2012). When Brands Seem Human, Do Humans Act Like Brands? Automatic Behavioral Priming Effects of Brand Anthropomorphism. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 39 (2): 307-323.
- Ariely, D., Huber, J., and Wertenbroch, K. (2005). When Do Losses Loom Larger Than Gains? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(2): 134–138.
- Ariely, D. and Simonson, I. (2003). Buying, Bidding, Playing, or Competing? Value Assessment and Decision Dynamics in Online Auctions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 13(1-2):113–123.
- Asquith, P. J. (1997). Why Anthropomorphism Is Not Metaphor. *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals* (pp. 22–34). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Awad, N. and Youn, N. (2018). You Reflect Me: Narcissistic Consumers Prefer Anthropomorphized Arrogant Brands. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*. 3 (4): 540–554.

Bordalo, P., Gennaioli, N., and Shleifer, A. (2012). Salience in Experimental Tests of the Endowment Effect. *American Economic Review*. 102(3): 47–52.

Burson, K., Faro, D., and Rottenstreich, Y. (2013). Multiple-Unit Holdings Yield Attenuated Endowment Effects. *Management Science*. 59(3): 545–555.

Baumeister, R. F. and Leary, M. R. (1995). The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*. 117(3): 497–529.

Carmon, Z. and Ariely, D. (2000). Focusing on the Forgone: How Value Can Appear So Different to Buyers and Sellers. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 27(3): 360–370.

Carmon, Z., Wertenbroch, K. and Zeelenberg, M. (2003). Option Attachment: When Deliberating Makes Choosing Feel Like Losing. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 30(1): 15–29.

Chandler, J. and Schwarz, N. (2010). Use Does Not Wear Ragged the Fabric of Friendship: Thinking of Objects as Alive Makes People Less Willing to Replace Them. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 20(2): 138–145.

Chapman, GB. (1998). Similarity and Reluctance to Trade. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. 11(1): 47–58.

Chaung, S. S. (2013). Time Pressure and the Endowment Effect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 43(6): 1313-1323.

Chen, R. P., Wan, E. W. and Levy, E. (2017). The Effect of Social Exclusion on Consumer Preference for Anthropomorphized Brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 27(1): 23–34.

Dalton, R. (2003). Nature News. *Lion Man Takes Pride of Place as Oldest Statue*. <http://www.nature.com/news/2003/030904/full/news030901-6.html>, (23.10.2021)

Davis, H. (1997). Animal Cognition versus Animal Thinking: The Anthropomorphic Error. *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*. (pp. 335–347). Albany: State University of New York Press.

De Bondt, C., Van Kerckhove, A. and Geuens, M. (2018). Look at That body! How Anthropomorphic Package Shapes Systematically Appeal to Consumers. *International Journal of Advertising*. 37(5): 698-717.

Delbaere, M., McQuarrie, E. and Phillips, B. (2011). Personification in Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*. 40 (1): 121-130.

Delgado-Ballester, E., Palazón, M. and Peláez, J. (2019). Anthropomorphized vs Objectified Brands: Which Brand Version Is More Loved? *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*. 29(2): 150–165.

Dhar, R. and Wertenbroch, K. (2000). Consumer Choice Between Hedonic and Utilitarian Goods. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 37(1): 60–71.

Dommer, SL. and Swaminathan V. (2012). Explaining the Endowment Effect Through Ownership: The Role of Identity, Gender, and Self-Threat. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 39(5): 1034-50.

Epley, N., Waytz, A. and Cacioppo, J. (2007). On Seeing Human: A Three-factor Theory of Anthropomorphism. *Psychological Review*. 114 (4): 864-886.

Epley, N., Akalis, S., Waytz, A. and Cacioppo, J. (2008). Creating social connection through inferential reproduction loneliness and perceived agency in gadgets, gods, and greyhounds. *Psychological Science*. 19 (2): 114-120.

Epley, N., Waytz, A., Akalis, S. and Cacioppo, J. (2008). When We Need A Human: Motivational Determinants of Anthropomorphism. *Social Cognition*. 26 (2): 143-155.

Etzioni, A. (1991). The Socio-economics of Property. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*. 6 (6): 465–468.

Fisher, J. A. (1991). Disambiguating Anthropomorphism: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Perspectives in Ethology*. 9: 49–85.

Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 24 (3): 343–73.

Fournier, S. and Alvarez, C. (2012). Brands as Relationship Partners: Warmth, Competence, and In-Between. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 22(2): 177–185.

Fuchs, C., Prandelli, E. and Schreier, M. (2010). The psychological effects of empowerment strategies on consumers' product demand. *Journal of Marketing*. 74(1): 65–79.

Furby, L. (1978). Possessions in Humans: An Exploratory Study of Its Meaning and Motivation, *Social Behavior and Personality*. 6(1): 49-65.

Genesove, D. and Mayer, C. (2001). Loss Aversion and Seller Behavior: Evidence from the Housing Market. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 116(4): 1233–1260.

Gray, H. M., Gray, K. and Wegner, D. M. (2007). Dimensions of Mind Perception. *Science*. 315(5812): 619–619.

Guido, G. and Peluso, A. M. (2015). Brand Anthropomorphism: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Impact on Brand Personality and Loyalty. *Journal of Brand Management*. 22(1): 1–19.

Guthrie, S. (1993). *Faces in the Clouds. 1st ed. New York: Oxford University Press.*

Han, N. R., Baek, T. H., Yoon, S. and Kim, Y. (2019). Is That Coffee Mug Smiling at Me? How Anthropomorphism Impacts the Effectiveness of Desirability vs. Feasibility Appeals in Sustainability Advertising. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services.* 51: 352–361.

Hart, P. M., Jones, S. R. and Royne, M. B. (2013). The human lens: How anthropomorphic reasoning varies by product complexity and enhances personal value. *Journal of Marketing Management.* 29 (1-2): 105–121.

Hermann, E. (2022). Anthropomorphized Artificial Intelligence, Attachment, and Consumer Behavior. *Mark Letter*, 33: 157–162.

Heyman J., Orhun Y. and Ariely D. (2004). Auction Fever: The Effect of Opponents and Quasi-Endowment on Product Valuations. *Journal of Interactive Marketing.* 18(4): 4–21.

Huang, R., Zhou, X., Ye, W. and Guo, S. (2020). Think versus Feel: Two Dimensions of Brand Anthropomorphism. *Journal of Product and Brand Management.* 29(7): 955–969.

Hur, J. D., Koo, M. and Hofmann, W. (2015). When Temptations Come Alive: How Anthropomorphism Undermines Self-Control. *Journal of Consumer Research.* 42(2): 340–358.

Isaacs S., (1933). Social Development in Young Children. *The International Library of Psychology*, 28: 1-23.

Johnson, E. J., Häubl, G. and Keinan, A. (2007). Aspects of Endowment: A Query Theory of Value Construction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition.* 33(3): 461–474.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decisions Under Risk. *Econometrica*. 42(2): 263-291.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1982). The Psychology of Preferences. *Scientific American*. 246(1): 160–173.

Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L. and Thaler, R. H. (1991). Anomalies: The endowment Effect, Loss Aversion, and Status Quo Bias. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 5(1): 193–206.

Karpinska-Krakowiak, M. and Eisend, M. (2021). The Effects of Animistic Thinking, Animistic Cues, and Superstitions on Brand Responses on Social-Media. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. 55: 104–117.

Kim, H. Y. and McGill, A. L. (2018). Minions for the Rich? Financial Status Changes How Consumers See Products with Anthropomorphic Features. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 45(2): 429–450.

Kim, J. and Swaminathan, S. (2021). Time to Say Goodbye: The Impact of Anthropomorphism on Selling Prices of Used Products. *Journal of Business Research*. 126: 78–87.

Kim, S. and McGill, A. L. (2011). Gaming with Mr. Slot or Gaming the Slot Machine? Power, Anthropomorphism, and Risk Perception. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 38(1): 94–107.

Knetsch, J. L. and Sinden J. A. (1984). Willingness to Pay and Compensation Demanded: Experimental Evidence of an Unexpected Disparity in Measures of Value. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 99(3): 507–521.

Knez, P., Smith, V. and Williams, AW. (1985). Individual Rationality, Market Rationality, and Value Estimation. *American Economic Review*. 75(2): 397–402.

Kőszegi, B. and Rabin, M. (2006). A Model of Reference- Dependent Preferences. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 121(4): 1133–1165.

Kwak, H., Puzakova, M. and Rocereto, J. F. (2017). When Brand Anthropomorphism Alters Perceptions of Justice: The Moderating Role of Self-Construal. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 34(4): 851–871.

Novemsky, N. and Kahneman, D. (2005b). How Do Intentions Affect Loss Aversion? *Journal of Marketing Research*. 42(2): 139–140.

Landwehr, J. R., McGill, A. L. and Herrmann, A. (2011). It's Got the Look: The Effect of Friendly and Aggressive "Facial" Expressions on Product Liking and Sales. *Journal of Marketing*. 75(3): 132–146.

Maeng, A. and Aggarwal, P. (2017). Facing Dominance: Anthropomorphism and the Effect of Product Face Ratio on Consumer Preference. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 44(5): 1104–1122.

Maloney, J. and Blackstone, B. (2017). Fox Business. *Big Brands Feel Pain as Consumers Pull Back*. <https://www.foxbusiness.com/features/big-brands-feel-pain-as-consumers-pull-back-wsj>, (07.05.2022).

Morewedge, C. K., Preston, J. and Wegner, D. M. (2007). Timescale Bias in the Attribution of Mind. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 93(1): 1–11.

Peck, J. and Shu, S. B. (2009). The Effect of Mere Touch on Perceived Ownership. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 36(3): 434–447.

Piaget, J. (1926-1929). *The Child's Conception of the World*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T. and Dirks, K. T. (2003). The State of Psychological

Ownership: Integrating and Extending A Century of Research. *Review of General Psychology*. 7(1): 84–107.

Plott, C. R. and Zeiler, K. (2005). The Willingness to Pay- Willingness to Accept Gap, the “Endowment Effect,” Subject Misconceptions, and Experimental Procedures for Eliciting Valuations. *American Economic Review*. 95(3): 530–545.

Plott, C. R. and Zeiler, K. (2007). Exchange Asymmetries Incorrectly Interpreted as Evidence of Endowment Effect Theory and Prospect Theory? *American Economic Review*. 97(4):1449–1466.

Portal, S., Abratt, R. and Bendixen, M. (2018). Building A Human Brand: Brand Anthropomorphism Unravelling. *Business Horizons*. 61(3): 367–374.

Puzakova, M., Kwak, H. and Rocereto, J. (2009). Pushing the Envelope of Brand and Personality: Antecedents and Moderators of Anthropomorphized Brands. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 36: 413-420.

Puzakova, M., Kwak, H. and Rocereto, J. (2013). When Humanizing Brands Goes Wrong: The Detrimental Effect of Brand Anthropomorphization Amid Product Wrongdoings. *Journal of Marketing*. 77 (3): 81-100.

Rabin, M. and Thaler, R. H. (2001). Anomalies: Risk Aversion. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 15(1): 219–232.

Rauschnabel, P. A. and Ahuvia, A. C. (2014). You’re So Lovable: Anthropomorphism and Brand Love. *Journal of Brand Management*. 21(5): 372–395.

Reb J. and Connolly T. (2007). Possession, Feelings of Ownership and the Endowment Effect. *Judgment and Decision Making*. 2(2): 107–114.

Samuelson W. and Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status Quo Bias in Decision Making. *Journal of Risk & Uncertainty*. 1(1): 7–59.

Schlosser, A. E. (2003). Experiencing Products in a Virtual World: The Role of Goals and Imagery in Influencing Attitudes versus Intentions. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 30 (9): 377–83.

Soanes, C. and Stevenson, A. (Eds.). (2005). *Oxford Dictionary of English*. (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sousa, Y. F. D. and Munro, A. (2012). Truck, Barter and Exchange versus the Endowment Effect: Virtual Field Experiments in An Online Game Environment. *Journal of Economic Psychology*. 33(3): 482–493.

Strahilevitz, M. A. and Loewenstein, G. (1998). The Effect of Ownership History on the Valuation of Objects. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 25(3): 276–289.

Schultz, S. E., Kleine, R. E. and Kernan, J. (1989). Quot; These Are a Few of My Favorite Things & Quot; Toward an Explication of Attachment as a Consumer Behavior Construct, in NA. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 16: 359-366.

Thaler, R. (1980). Toward a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. 1(1): 39–60.

Thomson, M., MacInnis, D. J. and Park, C. W. (2005). The Ties That Bind: Measuring the Strength of Consumers' Emotional Attachment to Brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 15(1): 77–91.

Touré-Tillery, M. and McGill, A. L. (2015). Who or What to Believe: Trust and the Differential Persuasiveness of Human and Anthropomorphized Messengers. *Journal of Marketing*. 79(4): 94–110.

Tremoulet, P. D. and Feldman J. (2000). Perception of Animacy from the Motion of a

Single Object. *Perception*. 29(8): 943–5.

Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1991). Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference- Dependent Model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 106(4): 1039–1061.

Wan, J. and Aggarwal, P. (2014). Spending Time with Mr. Lexus and Paying Money to Doughboy: The Effect of Time and Money on Preference for Anthropomorphized Products. *Working Paper*

Wan, J. (2018). Paying the Doughboy: The Effect of Time and Money Mind-sets on Preference for Anthropomorphized Products. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*. 3(4): 466-476.

Wan, J. and Aggarwal, P. (2015). Befriending Mr. Clean: The Role of Anthropomorphism in Consumer-Brand Relationships. In S. Fournier, M. Breazeale, and J. Avery (Eds.), *Strong Brands, Strong Relationships* Routledge.

Wang, L. C., Baker, J., Wagner, J. A. and Wakefield, K. (2007). Can a Retail Web Site Be Social? *Journal of Marketing*. 71(3): 143–157.

Waytz, A., Cacioppo, J. and Epley, N. (2010). Who Sees Human? The Stability and Importance of Individual Differences in Anthropomorphism. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 5 (3): 219-232.

Yuan, L. I. and Dennis, A. R. (2019). Acting Like Humans? Anthropomorphism and Consumer's Willingness to Pay in Electronic Commerce. *Journal of Management Information Systems*. 36(2): 450–477.

Yuan, S. (2018). China Daily. “P&G Plans New Strategy to Attract Younger Consumers”.

<https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/201806/21/WS5b2b02b5a3103349141dd747.html>,  
(07.05.2022)



## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix 1: Survey 1- WTA for Anthropomorphic-Hedonic Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

**KISIM 1:** Lütfen aşağıda yer alan soruları cevaplamadan önce verilen tanımları okuyarak görselleri dikkatli şekilde inceleyiniz.

**ANTROPOMORFİZM** (insan biçimcilik) insan olmayan varlıkların gerçek veya hayali insani davranışları taşıma eğilimini tanımlar. Bunlar insan benzeri özellikler, motivasyonlar, niyetler veya duygular olabilir. Bir nesne size insani özellikler (yüz, beden, duygu, düşünce vb.) taşıyor gibi görünebilir, kendi düşünceleri ya da niyetleri varmış gibi algılanabilir.



1)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik



2)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik

**KISIM 2:**



Yukarıda gördüğünüz arabanın size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu arabayla harika bir yıl geçirdiniz. Şimdi bu arabayı gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu arabayı satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 3:**

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabamış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 4:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.



Yukarıda gördüğünüz özel tasarım bu termosun size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu termos ile harika zamanlar geçirdiniz, tüm o zor uyanılan sabahlarda, çalışılması gereken gecelerde size eşlik etti. Şimdi bu termosu gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu termosu satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 5:**

1) Bu termosu kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2) Bu termosu sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuř gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

## **KISIM 6: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54
- ☐ 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- ☐ İlkokul
- ☐ Ortaokul
- ☐ Lise
- ☐ Üniversite
- ☐ Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- ☐ Alt gelir grubu
- ☐ Alt orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.

## Appendix 2: Survey 2- WTP for Anthropomorphic-Hedonic Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

**KISIM 1:** Lütfen aşağıda yer alan soruları cevaplamadan önce verilen tanımları okuyarak görselleri dikkatli şekilde inceleyiniz.

**ANTROPOMORFİZM** (insan biçimcilik) insan olmayan varlıkların gerçek veya hayali insani davranışları taşıma eğilimini tanımlar. Bunlar insan benzeri özellikler, motivasyonlar, niyetler veya duygular olabilir. Bir nesne size insani özellikler (yüz, beden, duygu, düşünce vb.) taşıyor gibi görünebilir, kendi düşünceleri ya da niyetleri varmış gibi algılanabilir.



1)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik



2)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik

## KISIM 2:



Yukarıda gördüğünüz araba sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu araba için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu arabayı satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 3:**

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabammış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 4:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.



Yukarıda gördüğünüz termos sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu termos için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu termosu satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 5:**

1) Bu termosu kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2) Bu termosu sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

## **KISIM 6: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54
- ☐ 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- ☐ İlkokul
- ☐ Ortaokul
- ☐ Lise
- ☐ Üniversite
- ☐ Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- ☐ Alt gelir grubu
- ☐ Alt orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.

### Appendix 3: Survey 3- WTA for Non-Anthropomorphic Hedonic Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

**KISIM 1:** Lütfen aşağıda yer alan soruları cevaplamadan önce verilen tanımları okuyarak görselleri dikkatli şekilde inceleyiniz.

**ANTROPOMORFİZM** (insan biçimcilik) insan olmayan varlıkların gerçek veya hayali insani davranışları taşıma eğilimini tanımlar. Bunlar insan benzeri özellikler, motivasyonlar, niyetler veya duygular olabilir. Bir nesne size insani özellikler (yüz, beden, duygu, düşünce vb.) taşıyor gibi görünebilir, kendi düşünceleri ya da niyetleri varmış gibi algılanabilir.



1)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik



2)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik

**KISIM 2:**



Yukarıda gördüğünüz arabanın size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu arabayla harika bir yıl geçirdiniz. Şimdi bu arabayı gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu arabayı satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 3:**

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabamış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 4:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.



Yukarıda gördüğünüz özel tasarım bu termosun size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu termos ile harika zamanlar geçirdiniz, tüm o zor uyanılan sabahlarda, çalışılması gereken gecelerde size eşlik etti. Şimdi bu termosu gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu termosu satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 5:**

1)Bu termosa kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu termosa sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

#### **KISIM 6: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54
- ☐ 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- ☐ İlkokul
- ☐ Ortaokul
- ☐ Lise
- ☐ Üniversite
- ☐ Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- ☐ Alt gelir grubu
- ☐ Alt orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.

#### Appendix 4: Survey 4- WTP for Non-Anthropomorphic Hedonic Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

**KISIM 1:** Lütfen aşağıda yer alan soruları cevaplamadan önce verilen tanımları okuyarak görselleri dikkatli şekilde inceleyiniz.

**ANTROPOMORFİZM** (insan biçimcilik) insan olmayan varlıkların gerçek veya hayali insani davranışları taşıma eğilimini tanımlar. Bunlar insan benzeri özellikler, motivasyonlar, niyetler veya duygular olabilir. Bir nesne size insani özellikler (yüz, beden, duygu, düşünce vb.) taşıyor gibi görünebilir, kendi düşünceleri ya da niyetleri varmış gibi algılanabilir.



1)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik



2)Bu arabayı nasıl algılıyorsunuz?

1

7

Hiç Antropomorfik değil

Oldukça Antropomorfik

**KISIM 2:**



Yukarıda gördüğünüz araba sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu araba için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu arabayı satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 3:**

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabamış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 4:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.



Yukarıda gördüğünüz termos sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu termos için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu termosu satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

**KISIM 5:**

1)Bu termosu kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu termosu sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

## **KISIM 6: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54
- ☐ 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- ☐ İlkokul
- ☐ Ortaokul
- ☐ Lise
- ☐ Üniversite
- ☐ Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- ☐ Alt gelir grubu
- ☐ Alt orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.

## Appendix 5: Survey 5- WTA for Anthropomorphic Utilitarian Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

### KISIM 1:



Yukarıda gördüğünüz arabanın size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu arabayla harika bir yıl geçirdiniz. Şimdi bu arabayı gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu arabayı satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

## KISIM 2:

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabamış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 3:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.



Yukarıda gördüğünüz özel tasarım bu termosun size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu termos ile harika zamanlar geçirdiniz, tüm o zor uyanılan sabahlarda, çalışılması gereken gecelerde size eşlik etti. Şimdi bu termosu gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu termosu satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

#### **KISIM 4:**

1)Bu termosa kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu termosa sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

#### **KISIM 5: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54

- 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- İlkokul
- Ortaokul
- Lise
- Üniversite
- Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- Alt gelir grubu
- Alt orta gelir grubu
- Orta gelir grubu
- Üst orta gelir grubu
- Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.

## Appendix 6: Survey 6- WTP for Anthropomorphic Utilitarian Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

### KISIM 1:



Yukarıda gördüğünüz araba sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu araba için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu arabayı satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

### KISIM 2:

1) Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

7

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabammış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 3:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.



Yukarıda gördüğünüz termos sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu termos için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu termosu satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

#### **KISIM 4:**

1)Bu termosu kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu termosu sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

#### **KISIM 5: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54
- ☐ 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- ☐ İlkokul
- ☐ Ortaokul

- Lise
- Üniversite
- Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- Alt gelir grubu
- Alt orta gelir grubu
- Orta gelir grubu
- Üst orta gelir grubu
- Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.



## Appendix 7: Survey 7- WTA for Non-Anthropomorphic Utilitarian Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

### KISIM 1:



Yukarıda gördüğünüz arabanın size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu arabayla harika bir yıl geçirdiniz. Şimdi bu arabayı gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu arabayı satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

## KISIM 2:

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabammış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 3:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.

**Kahvenizi sıcak  
tutmak için  
tasarlandı.**



Yukarıda gördüğünüz özel tasarım bu termosun size ait olduğunu ve 1 yıldır kullandığınızı düşünün. Bu termos ile harika zamanlar geçirdiniz, tüm o zor uyanılan sabahlarda, çalışılması gereken gecelerde size eşlik etti. Şimdi bu termosu gelecek yıllar için kullanmaya devam edebilir ya da satabilirsiniz. Bu termosu satmak için kabul edeceğiniz tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağıya yazınız.

..... TL

#### **KISIM 4:**

1)Bu termosa kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu termosa sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

#### **KISIM 5: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54

- 55 ve üstü

3)Eğitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduğunuz seviye)

- İlkokul
- Ortaokul
- Lise
- Üniversite
- Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- Alt gelir grubu
- Alt orta gelir grubu
- Orta gelir grubu
- Üst orta gelir grubu
- Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.

## Appendix 8: Survey 8- WTP for Non-Anthropomorphic Utilitarian Products

Bu çalışma kapsamında belirli soruları verilen ürün görsellerini dikkate alarak cevaplandırmanız beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle görselleri dikkatle incelemeniz önem arz etmektedir. Anketimiz tamamen gönüllük esasına dayalı olup, yöneltilen soruların hiçbirisi kişisel bilgi toplamaya yönelik değildir. Vermiş olduğunuz tüm bilgiler akademik araştırma amaçlı kullanılmak üzere gizli tutulacaktır.

Gizem Yağmur Sönmez

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İngilizce İşletme Yönetimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

### KISIM 1:



Yukarıda gördüğünüz araba sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu araba için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu arabayı satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

## KISIM 2:

1)Bu arabaya kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu arabaya sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu araba benim arabammış gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

**KISIM 3:** Bu kısımda az önce cevaplamış olduğunuz soruları başka bir ürün için yeniden değerlendirmeniz beklenmektedir.

**Kahvenizi sıcak  
tutmak için  
tasarlandı.**



Yukarıda gördüğünüz termos sizin olabilir! Mevcut gelirinizden bağımsız olarak bu termos için dilediğiniz fiyatı ödeyebileceğinizi hayal edin. Bu termosu satın almak için ödemeye gönüllü olacağınız tutar ne olurdu lütfen TL cinsinden aşağı yazınız.

..... TL

#### **KISIM 4:**

1)Bu termosa kişisel olarak sahip olduğumu hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2)Bu termosa sahipmişim gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3)Bu termos benim termosummuş gibi hissedebiliyorum.

1

7

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

#### **KISIM 5: DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLER**

1)Cinsiyetiniz

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek

2)Yaşınız

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45—54
- ☐ 55 ve üstü

3)Eđitim Durumunuzu (En son mezun olduđunuz seviye)

- ☐ İlkokul
- ☐ Ortaokul
- ☐ Lise
- ☐ Üniversite
- ☐ Yüksek Lisans +

4)Kendinizi gelir grubu olarak nerede tanımlarsınız?

- ☐ Alt gelir grubu
- ☐ Alt orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst orta gelir grubu
- ☐ Üst gelir grubu

Anketimiz sona ermiştir, katılımınız için teşekkürler.