

UDC 659.13:004.738.5]:366.1:519.233.5(497.7)

MEASURING ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR TOWARDS DIFFERENT FORMATS OF ONLINE BANNER ON MACEDONIAN MARKET

Ezeni Brzovska, Ph.D., Faculty of Economics - Skopje

Marija Trpkova-Nestorovska, Ph.D., Faculty of Economics - Skopje

Snezana Ristevska Jovanovska Ph.D., Faculty of Economics - Skopje

Abstract

Digital media started to dominate on the global media landscape. Companies are intensively employing new advertising formats in order to gain and maintain competitive edge in defined target market. The increasing time that people spend on the new media points out the necessity of implementing new media format as a part of the comprehensive media communication plan.

Choosing the appropriate format of the online banner will be crucial for implementing the integrated and effective approach in marketing communication activities. To date, there has been limited research for the effects of different formats of online banners. The objective of this paper was to evaluate consumers attitudes and self reported behavior toward different format of online banner. Factor analysis was conducted followed by single and multiple regression analysis for testing of the hypothesis for all types of banners.

The study examines the effect of the format of the banner on consumers' likability.

The results of the study provide useful managerial and theoretical implication.

Keywords: *format of the banner, rich media, attitudes, behaviour*

Introduction

The traditional channels are rapidly losing relevance. Today, the majority of consumers are spending most of their time on the Internet. With the meteoric rise of internet penetration, it's no surprise that internet is a way of life. Europe has impressively high levels of internet usage, with several countries registering penetration of more than 90% (InternetWorlStats, 2014).

The Internet proliferate the media channels and support a number of additional ad formats in the media landscape, among which is display advertising. Media fragmentation is occurring at lightspeed in today's multi

platform environment and this new paradigm offers consumers a seamless digital experience that can easily traverse platforms, locations so that content can be experienced anytime and anyplace (ComScore, 2013). Over the past several years, digital media has continued to develop as a branding medium, growing beyond its roots as a channel of interest solely to direct response and companies are increasing the usage of digital channels and new ad formats in order to achieve the business objectives of conversion and revenue. As consumers' media consumption continues to migrate toward digital channels, brand marketers (and their advertising currencies) will need to follow them there. A great percentage of marketers stated that they will increase their online brand advertising budgets. A recent Econsultancy survey found that marketers are spending 35% of their total marketing budget on digital channels (Econsultancy, 2013). Total Internet advertising is expected to get higher each year, and it is forecast to rise to 24.6% in 2015. Display advertising is the fastest-growing sub-category, with 20% annual growth (ZenithOptimedia, 2013). Display-related advertising includes display/banner ads (19% of revenues), rich media (3%) (IAB Report, 2013).

Banner ads offer great possibility for interactivity. In a cluttered and interactive digital environment it is and will be a great challenge for all the marketers to capture consumers' attention in a sidebar display ad, when they have only have 250 x 300 pixels (in most cases) worth of space on disposal. So using a proper format of online banner will be one of the determinants whether consumer will choose to click or be part of the banner they are seeing or interacting with. A recent comScore study shows that when it comes to launching an online campaign, creative execution drove more than half of the contribution to sales volume changes (Comscore brand sales).

Advertising formats of online banner evolve to provide richer experiences, trying to grab consumers attention for a moment. Faced with a wide array of options, the consumer is able to choose whether will perceive the online banner, making it more difficult for marketers to control their brand message. People go to websites for information, entertainment and engagement with other people, not to click on online banners.

Companies are trying to figure out how to maximize the visibility of the online banner and how to employ new formats of online banner that will have impact on consumer attitudes and behavior. The impact of the new formats on the consumers likeability to see and click must be analyze on order to chose the proper format of online banners. The main goal of this paper is to determine the effect different types of banner have on the perception, attitude and behavior of the customers.

Literature review

Display advertising is not only effective for advertising products, but is also crucial for creating positive attitude and making a positive impact on consumer behavior. There is current void in theory for analyzing the different formats of online banner and their effects on influencing consumer attitude and behavior.

Beside the fact that each day we are inundate with different types of online banner there is a lack of empirical data in examing the liability of different formats of banners. In order to cut through the noise, marketers must use appropriate formats of online banner. Several studies found that distinctive advertising elements, unique features and greater interactivity on online banner create a positive effect on consumer attention and generate immediate recall (Phillips and Lee 2005; Liu and Shrum's, 2002; Li and Bukovac 1999; Cho, Lee, and Tharp, 2001; Heo and Sundar 2000; Hong, Thong, and Tam 2004). These effects may lead to more positive attitudes toward ads and stronger purchase intentions (Choi, Miracle, and Biocca 2001).

The significant benefit of display advertising is using and developing different formats of online banners. By employing different formats of online banners companies can create a display ad campaign that consumers will notice and will make a lasting impact.

The Interactive Advertising Bureau divide online banner in two main groups: standart banner (display of a static or linked banner or logo) and rich media formats. Rich media formats integrate some component of streaming interactivity. Rich media ads often include flash or java script, but not content, and can allow users

to view and interact with products or services (e.g., scrolling or clicking within the ad opens a multimedia product description, expansion, animation, video or a “virtual test-drive” within the ad) (IAB internet advertising revenue report, 2014). Interactive rich media formats increase user involvement and emphasizes user engagement in the form of clicks and mouse rollovers. Rich media describes online content comprise of different multimedia elements, such as sound, video, audio, animation or content that moves when a user click on the page that features the content (Shaw, 2004; Chabrow, 2006). A static advertising that neither moves nor changes its content with every loading page includes only one gif or jpeg image file. Still standart banner is the most used format of online banner in the Republic of Macedonia (Ispos Strategic Puls, 2013).

An opposite of static banner, banner with interactive features attracts more attention and has a strong persuasive impact (Brown, 2002).

Interactivity in advertising is an important factor for creating favorable attitude and has a positive influence on consumers' perceptions of brands (Macias, 2003). Cho and Leckenby (1999) define interactivity as a “degree to which a person actively engages in advertising processing by interacting with advertising messages”. Interactivity is the extent to which user can participate in modifying the format and content of a mediated environment in real time (Steuer, 1992).

A number of researches confirmed that interactivity has a direct and positive effect on persuasive outcomes and lead to more positive attitudes (Briggs and Holis, 1997; Maddox et al., 1997).

New media and new ad formats revolutionize the whole process of communication between companies and customers, changing the way companies communicate with their customers and providing an interactive multimedia communication, greater flexibility for the companies and greater control for the consumer (Hoffman and Novak, 1996). In consideration of the fact that consumers are not simply reacting to Internet ads, they are using these ads to accomplish their goals, if the advertising is not adopted according consumers need there is no adequate base for dealing with complex behavior such as responding to persuasive communication (Rodgers and Thorson, 2000).

Macias (2003) found that interactivity is the main factor in consumer persuasive outcomes among which is attitude toward the ad. Cho and Leckenby (1999) also found that a higher degree of interactivity yields favorable attitude toward the ad and higher purchase intention.

Rodgers and Thorson in their Interactive advertising model explain how individuals process advertisements in an interactive environment by analyzing the aspects of the Internet that are consumer-controlled and those that are advertiser-controlled. Beside the fact that advertisers have controlled which ads consumers see, when and how, consumers always have the alternative of not paying attention to, becoming involved with or ignoring the ad. Knowing what motivates individuals to use the internet also provides insights into the types of ads and ad appeals that will attract attention and prompt click-throughs (2009). Interactive formats of ads initiate difference in terms of how people perceive and process it (e.g., Cho, 1998; Li & Bukovac, 1999). It was found that different advertising formats result in different consumers behavior (Rodgers and Thorson, 2000).

All the findings show that the format of the online banner has an impact on consumers attitude and behavior. Therefore, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 1: The format of online banner influence the attitude of the respondents

Hypothesis 2: The format of online banner influence the behavior of the respondents

Methodology

In order to gather data about attitude and self reported behavior toward different formats of online banners in Macedonia, a questionnaire based on a previous research (Burns and Lutz, 2006) was developed. This study represents the first attempt to compare different formats of online banners in the Republic of

Macedonia.

A convenience sample of 350 citizens participated in the experiment. Data were collected in the second half of 2012. From the initial sample 93 were rejected due to uncompleted data. They were removed from the data set, leaving a total of 257 participants. Fifty seven percentage were female (n=178) and forty three (n=135) were male. Respondents were recruited from each region (eight) in the Republic of Macedonia.

Respondents were asked to respond individually to the online questionnaire in order to measure the level of likeability, attitude and self reported behavior toward five different formats of online banners. Each online questionnaire contained links to an example of each banner format (takeover, floater, synchronized units, stretching and standard banner). Consumer perception for different formats of online banners were measured with fourteen items: innovative, different, entertaining, creative, irritating, attractive, annoying, boring, eye-catching, sophisticated, attractive, interactive, intrusive and usual. A five item semantic differential scale was used to measure consumers' attitude. The semantic differential scale from Burns and Lutz was modified and final version was comprise of three items: liked by me/disliked by me, one of the best formats/ one of the worst formats and an excellent ad format/ a poor ad format (2006). The self reported behavior was measured with 8 items ranging on five point Likert statement ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

Analyses and results

A principal component analysis with orthogonal rotation (varimax) and reliability analysis was conducted for all five different types of banner formats on:

- A 14 items in order to develop factor(s) that would describe the format characteristics (FORMAT);
- B 3 items in order to develop factor(s) that would describe the attitudes of questionnaire responders (ATTITUDE);
- C 8 items in order to develop factor(s) that would describe the behavior of questionnaire responders (BEHAVIOUR).

A) Format

Principal component analysis suggested possible two – factor solution for four types of banners, and only one factor solution for one type of banner. Two – factor solution recognized two factors, where the first one can be described as pleasant, while the second factor as unpleasant. The last type of banner, standard banner, had only one factor, pleasant, since the factor items irritating, disruptive, boring, intrusive and usual were eliminated since they didn't correlate fairly well with other items (Field, 2009). Factor loadings were not generated for the last format, standard banner, since only one component was extracted and the solution could not be rotated. For all types of banners, except for the standard banners, factor loadings after rotation are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Factor loadings for the rotated factor solution (for format constructs)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------------|------------------|-------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZED UNITS | STRETCHING BANER | |
| FACTOR 1 PLEASANT | Innovative | 0,764 | 0,782 | 0,777 | 0,772 |
| | Different | 0,757 | 0,797 | 0,825 | 0,786 |
| | Entertaining | 0,715 | 0,851 | 0,793 | 0,829 |
| | Creative | 0,671 | 0,832 | 0,833 | 0,774 |
| | Attractive | 0,722 | 0,806 | 0,752 | 0,782 |
| | Likeable | 0,680 | 0,806 | 0,727 | 0,758 |
| | Interesting | 0,808 | 0,829 | 0,803 | 0,802 |
| | Exciting | 0,783 | 0,804 | 0,747 | 0,759 |
| FACTOR 2 UNPLEASANT | Interactive | 0,687 | 0,774 | 0,736 | 0,653 |
| | Irritating | 0,776 | 0,767 | 0,776 | 0,810 |
| | Disruptive | 0,799 | 0,769 | 0,720 | 0,789 |
| | Boring | 0,809 | 0,710 | 0,661 | 0,799 |
| | Intrusive | 0,759 | 0,751 | 0,775 | 0,742 |
| | Usual | 0,651 | 0,534 | 0,625 | 0,721 |

Statistics for principal component analysis are presented in the Table 2. The Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin measures (KMO) verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis (according to Field, 2009, 'superb' for standard banner and synchronized units, and 'great' for the other types of banners). All KMO values for individual items are well above the acceptable limit of 0,5 (Field, 2009). Bartlett's test of sphericity with $p < 0,001$ for all types of banners indicates that correlations between items were sufficiently large for principal component analysis.

The first factor accounted from 35,613% to 43,031% of the total variance, while the second factor accounted from 19,559% to 22,491%. For the last standard banner, only the first factor accounted 70,024%.

Table 2. Statistics for principal component analysis with varimax rotation (for format constructs)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE D UNITS | STRETCHING BANER | STANDARD BANNER |
| KMO | 0,895 | 0,891 | 0,907 | 0,895 | 0,931 |
| KMO individual | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 |
| BTS χ^2 | 1691,588 | 2212,641 | 2101,801 | 1981,026 | 1988,528 |
| BTS (df) | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 36 |
| p value | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| 1 component | 35,613% | 43,031% | 40,850% | 38,977% | 70,024% |
| 2 component | 22,332% | 19,559% | 20,644% | 22,491% | - |
| Total | 57,945% | 62,590% | 61,495% | 61,469% | 70,024% |

A summary of means, variances and reliability coefficients for each type of banner are presented in table 3. The factors for all banner types have provided acceptable internal consistency according to Nunnally's (1978) suggested minimum of 0,70.

Table 3. Mean scores, variances and reliability coefficients for factors and banner types (for format constructs)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE | STRETCHING | STANDARD |
| | (n = 257) | (n = 257) | D UNITS (n = 257) | BANNER (n = 257) | BANNER (n = 257) |
| Factor 1 Pleasant | | | | | |
| Mean | 3,786 | 2,933 | 3,743 | 3,955 | 2,830 |
| Variance | 0,044 | 0,037 | 0,032 | 0,049 | 0,022 |
| Cronbach's α | 0,899 | 0,940 | 0,930 | 0,917 | 0,946 |
| Factor 2 Unpleasant | | | | | |
| Mean | 3,374 | 2,622 | 3,407 | 3,511 | - |
| Variance | 0,044 | 0,032 | 0,020 | 0,030 | - |
| Cronbach's α | 0,831 | 0,768 | 0,792 | 0,840 | - |

B) Attitude

For the second construct attitude, all three items converged to one factor – solution for all types of banners in the principal component analysis. The factor can be described as attitude. Factor loadings were not generated since only one component was extracted and the solution could not be rotated.

Statistics for principal component analysis are presented in the Table 4. The Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin measures (KMO) verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis (according to Field, 2009, 'good' for all types of banners). All KMO values for individual items are well above the acceptable limit of 0,5 (Field, 2009). Bartlett's test of sphericity with $p < 0,001$ for all types of banners indicates that correlations between items were sufficiently large for principal component analysis. The construct attitude accounted from 78,357% of the total variance for takeover banner to 84,563% of the total variance for standard banner.

Table 4. Statistics for principal component analysis with varimax rotation (for attitude construct)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE | STRETCHING | STANDARD |
| | | | D UNITS | BANNER | BANNER |
| KMO | 0,736 | 0,745 | 0,739 | 0,722 | 0,755 |
| KMO individual | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 |
| BTS χ^2 | 355,281 | 426,353 | 435,041 | 369,077 | 509,298 |
| BTS (df) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| p value | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| 1 component | | | | | |
| | 78,357% | 81,486% | 81,599% | 78,404% | 84,563% |
| Total | 78,357% | 81,486% | 81,599% | 78,404% | 84,563% |

A summary of means, variances and reliability coefficients for 'attitude' construct for each type of banner are presented in table 5. The factors for all banner types have provided acceptable internal consistency according to Nunnally's (1978) suggested minimum of 0,70.

Table 5. Mean scores, variances and reliability coefficients for factors and banner types (for attitude construct)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE | STRETCHING | STANDARD |
| | (n = 257) | (n = 257) | D UNITS | BANNER | BANNER |
| | | | (n = 257) | (n = 257) | (n = 257) |
| Factor 1 Attitude | | | | | |
| Mean | 3,636 | 2,838 | 3,709 | 3,825 | 2,868 |
| Variance | 0,022 | 0,011 | 0,012 | 0,016 | 0,002 |
| Cronbach's α | 0,858 | 0,883 | 0,885 | 0,860 | 0,908 |

C) Behaviour

Principal component analysis with varimax rotation converged to one factor solution for all types of banners. The new construct (factor) is named behavior. Correlation matrix for 8 items suggested some of the items should be removed since they did not correlate well with other items. For all banner types the items: 'I would notice this banner format' and 'I would ignore this banner format' were deleted. For banner format floater only the first item 'I would notice this banner format' was deleted. Factor loadings were not generated since only one component was extracted and the solution could not be rotated.

Statistics for principal component analysis that generate the construct behavior are presented in the Table 6. The Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin measures (KMO) verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis (according to Field, 2009, 'superb' for floater and standard banner, and 'great' for the other types of banners). All KMO values for individual items are well above the acceptable limit of 0,5 (Field, 2009). Bartlett's test of sphericity with $p < 0,001$ for all types of banners indicates that correlations between items were sufficiently large for principal component analysis. The construct behavior accounted from 60,261% of the total variance for stretching banner to 71,728% of the total variance for standard banner.

Table 6. Statistics for principal component analysis with varimax rotation (for behavior construct)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------|-------------|------------|----------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE | STRETCHING | STANDARD |
| | | | D UNITS | BANNER | BANNER |
| KMO | 0,842 | 0,917 | 0,887 | 0,847 | 0,906 |
| KMO individual | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 | > 0,5 |
| BTS χ^2 | 732,109 | 1165,887 | 846,486 | 696,523 | 1040,730 |
| BTS (df) | 15 | 21 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| p value | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| 1 component | 60,766% | 66,474% | 65,813% | 60,261% | 71,728% |
| Total | 60,766% | 66,474% | 65,813% | 60,261% | 71,728% |

A summary of means, variances and reliability coefficients for each type of banner are presented in table 3. The factors for all banner types have provided acceptable internal consistency according to Nunnally's (1978) suggested minimum of 0,70.

Table 7. Mean scores, variances and reliability coefficients for factors and banner types (for behavior construct)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE | STRETCHING | STANDARD |
| | | | D UNITS | BANNER | BANNER |
| | (n = 257) | (n = 257) | (n = 257) | (n = 257) | (n = 257) |
| Factor 1 Behavior | | | | | |
| Mean | 3,018 | 2,492 | 3,200 | 3,182 | 2,673 |
| Variance | 0,141 | 0,027 | 0,152 | 0,119 | 0,031 |
| Cronbach's α | 0,869 | 0,912 | 0,895 | 0,866 | 0,921 |

Multiple regression analysis was used for testing of the hypothesis for all types of banners. For each type of banner, two regressions were conducted. Constructs or factors 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant' were used as explanatory variables, construct 'attitude' was used as respondent variable for the first hypothesis, while the construct 'behavior' was used as respondent variable for the second hypothesis. Simple regression analysis was used for the last banner format, standard banner, since the factor analysis converged to only one factor 'pleasant'.

The results from the regression analyses for the first hypothesis are presented in table 8.

General conclusion valid for all types of banners is that the attitude of the respondents is influenced by the banner formats, both 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant'. Unstandardized coefficients B are statistically significant in all regressions for both factors. Since for the last banner type – standard banner, only one factor 'pleasant' was available, the influence on the attitude of 'unpleasant' banner types cannot be examined.

The adjusted R^2 explains the percentage of variation in 'attitude' explained by the variation in 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant'. It varies from 48,8% to 63,9%.

To draw conclusions about a population based on a regression analysis done on a sample, several assumptions must be true (Field, 2009).

Variable types: All predictor variables are continuous and unbounded, since they were derived from factor analysis as factor scores.

Table 8. Regression results for Hypothesis 1 (Response variable: Attitude)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------|-------------|------------|----------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE | STRETCHING | STANDARD |
| | | | D UNITS | BANNER | BANNER |
| Explanatory variables Unstandardized coefficients B | | | | | |
| 'Pleasant' | 0,677** | 0,759** | 0,739** | 0,706** | 0,795** |
| 'Unpleasant' | 0,183** | 0,172** | 0,308** | 0,322** | - |
| Adjusted R^2 | 0,488 | 0,602 | 0,639 | 0,598 | 0,630 |
| Durbin-Watson | 1,593 | 1,644 | 1,721 | 1,689 | 1,717 |

Multicollinearity: For all models the variance inflation factor values are all well below 10 and the tolerance statistics all well above 0,2, so we can safely conclude that there is no collinearity within our data.

Homoscedasticity and linearity: For all regression models, standardized predicted values and standardized residuals were plotted. The points were randomly and relatively evenly dispersed throughout the plot, which is indicative of a situation in which the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity are met.

Independent errors: Durbin–Watson test varies from 1,593 to 1,721 meaning that the residuals are uncorrelated.

Normally distributed errors: Histograms of the residuals and normal probability plots are used to test this assumption. After examining the charts for all regression models, the conclusion is that most of the residuals are relatively normally distributed.

It is important to conclude that rather good or bad, the banner definitely influences the attitude of the respondents.

Table 9. Regression results for Hypothesis 2 (Response variable: Behavior)

| | TYPE OF BANNER | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | TAKEOVER | FLOATER | SYNCHRONIZE D UNITS | STRETCHING BANNER | STANDARD BANNER |
| Explanatory variables | Unstandardized coefficients B | | | | |
| 'Pleasant' | 0,568** | 0,702** | 0,583** | 0,495** | 0,699** |
| 'Unpleasant' | -0,018 | 0,189** | 0,066 | 0,044 | - |
| Adjusted R^2 | 0,317 | 0,524 | 0,339 | 0,241 | 0,487 |
| Durbin-Watson | 1,486 | 1,805 | 1,845 | 1,804 | 1,663 |

The results from the regression analyses for the second hypothesis are presented in table 9.

For all format types, a conclusion can be made that the 'pleasant' banners influence the behavior of the respondents. All unstandardized coefficients B are statistically significant. On the other hand, the 'unpleasant' banners seem not to influence the behavior except for the floater banner. For the last banner type – standard banner, only one explanatory variable 'pleasant' was available, so only this influence on the behavior was measured.

The adjusted R^2 explains the percentage of variation in 'behavior' explained by the variation in 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant'. It varies from 24,1% to 52,4%.

Regarding the assumptions, the conclusions are:

Variable types: All predictor variables are continuous and unbounded, since they were derived from factor analysis as factor scores.

Multicollinearity: For all regression models the variance inflation factor values are all well below 10 and the tolerance statistics all well above 0,2, so the conclusion is that there is no collinearity within the data.

Homoscedasticity and linearity: For all regression models, standardized predicted values and standardized residuals were plotted. The points were randomly and relatively evenly dispersed throughout the plot, which is indicative of a situation in which the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity are met.

Independent errors: Durbin–Watson test varies from 1,486 to 1,845 meaning that the residuals are uncorrelated.

Normally distributed errors: After examining the histograms of the residuals and normal probability plots for all regression models, the conclusion is that most of the residuals are relatively normally distributed.

Final conclusion is that the good or pleasant banner influences the behavior of the respondents, while the negative or unpleasant banners don't seem to have any effect on the behavior of the respondents (except for the floater banner).

The results indicate that different format of banners impact on/how different formats of online banners affects brand attitude in the interactive environment.

Conclusion

As the internet has increasingly become an integrated tool for marketing, the effectiveness of the format of online banners remains a crucial issue. The ad format could generate a huge impact in the campaign results.

Two hypothesis which were set in the primary research were fully confirmed. The conducted research confirmed the correlation among the format and attitude and self reported behavior in a positive direction. The findings make explicit connection between the favorable consumer attitudes and behavior toward more interactive online banners. Attitude toward the format was found to be significant predictor which is a well established influence on brand attitude. According Burns and Lutz, "understanding the underlying determinants of format attitudes can help advertisers realize when they need to overcome unfavorable attitude toward the format – through a compelling creative approach" (2006).

The findings emphasize the importance of comparing the different format of the online banner so that marketers could implement the most effective. Marketers can then reduce risk of running unsuccessful formats of online ads and take more innovative approach to online advertising. Online advertisers should select their formats carefully as format attitudes influence ad likability which in turn influences brand attitude and behavior (Haley, 1990)

If company do not realize the impact of the formats of online banner, they will avoid the great opportunity to perform communication activity with enormous possibilities. The research was a pioner attempt to highlight the impact and effects of the formats of the online banner on the attitude and behavior. Overall, this paper provides significant theoretical contribution to the growing literature for online advertising and also offers valuable conclusions for the effects of different formats of online banners.

The results of this study could be used by marketers as a basis for developing interactive formats of online banners. Marketing agencies should be focus on creating a web banner that incorporate interactive elements. This paper will be beneficial both for the scientifically research in defining the most appropriate format of online banner in their marketing communications campaigns.

The sample was comprised only from Macedonian citizens limits the generalizability of the results. To increase the generalizability of the results, it is important to use a larger, more diverse sample. Another issue which is important to consider in the future researches is examining consumer behavior in a more natural setting. The fields experiment also meets the ongoing need for additional research outside laboratory settings (Carison et al,2005). The field experiment will contribute for extended understanding of different formats of banners and more accurate facts for banner effectiveness.

Taking in to consideration the fact that results for the standart banner did not correlate well and were deleted resulting with only one factor as explanatory variable 'pleasant', a further issue which should be considered is designing the random ordering of the formats or design where respondent assesses only one format.

Literature:

- Briggs, R., & Hollis, N., (1997), Advertising on the web: is there response before click-through?, *Journal of Advertising research*, 37, 33-46.
- Brown, M., (2002), The use of banner advertisements with pull-down menus: A copy testing approach, *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 2(2), 57-65.
- Burns, K. S., & Lutz, R. J. (2006). The function of format: Consumer responses to six on-line advertising formats. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(1), 53-63.
- Carlson, L., Grove, S. J., & Stafford, M. R., (2005), Perspectives on advertising research: Views from Winners of the American Academy of Advertising Outstanding Contribution to Research Award, *Journal of Advertising*, 34(2), 117-149.
- Chabrow, E. (2006), US grants patent for broad range of internet rich applications, *Information Week*.
- Cho, C. H. (1999), How advertising works on the www: Modified elaboration likelihood model, *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 21(1), 34-50.
- Cho, C. H., & Leckenby, J. D. (2000), Banner clicking and attitude changes on the www, In *proceedings of the conference-american academy of advertising*, pp. 230-230, Pullman, WA; American Academy of Advertising
- Cho, C. H., & Leckenby, J. D., (1999), Interactivity as a measure of advertising effectiveness, In *Proceedings of the American Academy of Advertising*, pp. 162-179, Gainesville: University of Florida.
- Cho, C., Jung-Gyo, L., and Marye, T., (2001), The Effects of Different Forced Exposure Levels to Banner Advertisements on the WWW, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 41 Issue 4, pp. 45-56
- Choi, Y. K., Miracle, G. E., & Biocca, F. (2001), The effects of anthropomorphic agents on advertising effectiveness and the mediating role of presence, *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 2(1), 19-32.
- ComScore (2013), Brave new digital world - A Manifesto for the Future of Digital Media Measurement & Analytics
- Econsultancy, (2013), Digital marketing experience - Marketing Budgets Report
- Field, A. P., (2009), *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, England: SAGE.
- Haley, R. I., & Baldinger, A. L., (1991), The ARF Copy Research Validity Project, *Journal of advertising research*.
- Heo, N., & Sundar, S. S. (2000), Emotional responses to Web advertising: The effects of animation, position, and product involvement on physiological arousal, In *Annual Conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication*, Phoenix, AZ.
- Hoffman, D. L., & Novak, T. P. (1996), Marketing in hypermedia computer-mediated environments: conceptual foundations, *The Journal of Marketing*, 60 (3), pp. 50-68.
- Hong, W., Thong, J. Y., & Tam, K. Y. (2004), Does animation attract online users' attention? The effects of flash on information search performance and perceptions, *Information Systems Research*, 15(1), 60-86.
- <http://www.comscore.com/Insights/Press-Releases/2010/10/comScore-ARS-Research-Highlights-Importance-of-Advertising-Creative-in-Building-Brand-Sales>
- http://www.ipsos.com/Country_Profile_Macedonia
- <http://www.zenithoptimedia.com/zenithoptimedia-forecasts-stable-ad-growth-in-2013-will-pave-way-for-recovery-in-2014-and-2015/>
- Internet worldstat, (2014), <http://www.internetworldstats.com/list2.htm>
- Li, H., & Bukovac, J. L. (1999), Cognitive impact of banner ad characteristics: An experimental study. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76 (2), pp. 341-353
- Li, H., & Bukovac, J. L., (1999), Cognitive impact of banner ad characteristics: An experimental study, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 341-353.
- Liu, Y. and Shrum, L.J. (2002), What Is Interactivity and Is It Always Such a Good Thing? Implications of Definition, Person, and Situation for the Influence of Interactivity on Advertising Effectiveness, *Journal of Advertising*, (31) 4,

pp. 53-66.

Macias, W., (2003), A preliminary structural equation model of comprehension and persuasion of interactive advertising brand web sites, *Journal of interactive advertising*, 3(2), 36-48.

Maddox, L. M., Mehta, D., & Daubek, H. G., (1997), The role and effect of web addresses in advertising, *Journal of Advertising Research*, 37, 47-60.

Nunnally, J. C., (1978), *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Phillips, B. and Wei-Nei.L., (2005), Interactive Animation: Exploring Spokes-Characters on the Internet, *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, Vol. 27, Issue 1, pp.1-17

PWC, (2014), IAB internet advertising revenue report - 2013 full year results

Rodgers, S., & Thorson, E., (2000), The interactive advertising model: How users perceive and process online ads, *Journal of interactive advertising*, 1(1), 41-60.

Shaw, R. (2004), Evolution of rich media, *Imedia Connection*.

Steuer, J., (1992), Defining virtual reality: dimensions determining telepresence, *Journal of communication*, 42 (4), pp. 73-93