The Effects of Photo Decoration Cues on Online Consumers’ Affective Responses
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Abstract. This study refines three decoration cues from the photos in the online grocery store which enable consumer to experience grocery with affective responses. Three cues on consumers’ affective perception, attitudes as well as behavioral intention were examined in a laboratory experiment. The experiment results show that (1) both reflective surface and complementary goods layout lead to visual appeal and shopping enjoyment; (2) contrast color usage positively impacts on visual appeal while does not significantly affect shopping enjoyment; (3) consumers’ affective responses positively impact attitudes toward product and store which in turn lead to purchase intention and store loyalty. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
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1. Introduction

As shopping online is sweeping across the world, both online grocery stores and consumers have been care about how product is presented as well as processed by customers [1]. For example, research found that the detailed information of product presentation is significantly influence consumers' satisfaction [2]. For this reason, both researchers and practitioners strive to improve online grocery product presentations.

Various photo process technologies have been adopted currently to enrich product presentations in most grocery stores. It’s popular for most online stores to employ photos to present products’ information which benefit consumers to generate a clear comprehension of products [3] and decrease consumers’ uncertainty about the products [4]. Product photos are usually applied to describe visual appeal of products [5], which is generally difficult depicted by verbal cues alone. Many researchers investigated that the effects of photo details have played a role on the consumer reactions. For instance, [7] examined the impacts of photo size on buying tendency and found that larger photos enable customers to collect more information and hence elevate their purchase tendency.

Despite several those efforts studied the effects of product photo on consumers’ responses, the photo decoration cues underlying these presentation methods have not been explored in a comprehensive way in the marketing and information systems fields.

Based on the theories of media richness and visual rhetoric, three constructs for grocery photo decoration cues are conceptualized as well as how they might provoke affective responses are validated. The three photo decoration cues are: reflective surface, contrast color usage and complementary goods layout. The findings of this study will enrich online product presentation literature and have important implications for website interface design, online product promotion and online advertising, among others.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Visual Design Artifacts

Visual design artifacts as an e-commerce Website characteristic is typically graphic or image-based [8,9] which try to adopt lively visual effects to strengthen users’ insights of product performs. The core compositions of visual design include photographs, colors, shapes, silhouette, pattern or fonts [11] which plays a pivotal role to deliver some meaningful visual information to online
consumers. Inasmuch as photos are essential contents of visual design, therefore, online grocery photos’ visual design might have a significant effect on consumers’ perception, attitudes and purchase intention.

2.2 Arrangement

Arrangement accounts for the positioning of artifacts in a picture which can deliver some metaphors and suggestions for attracting consumers [12]. When groceries are placed in a photo based on some matched ingredients as their background, this kind of special layout can easily provoke consumer to value products as well as recall the way how consuming them. argues that the ability must be provided to direct the order of argumentation through the “arrangement” of the visual factors. Consequently, in our study, we replace “arrangement” with complementary goods layout which connotes the products’ location in the photo and its stimulated effects on consumers’ reaction. The artifacts’ layout can either accelerate or dampen users’ navigation.

2.3 Photo Decoration Cues

In an offline environment, product visual presentation is influenced not only by product design ,, but also store “decoration” and product “arrangements”. Similarly, in online environment, the store “decoration” (i.e., Web site design, , ) could effects on Web site quality, perceived visual appeal, perceived product quality and purchase tendency. Therefore, vendors could adopt some specific decorative information to facilitate consumer to understand and evaluate their products . Based on the above considerations, this study creates a new concept of “photo decoration cues” used for represent detailed design information. Photo Decoration Cues means that various photographic and editing techniques (i.e. camera control, focusing, lightning, exposure, rendering, and balancing) adopted to polish photo, and it intend to emphasize or hide a part or overall target contents for effective communication by changing the elements of brightness, color, graphics and layout.

3. Development and Research Model

Empirical researches suggest that well-presented products provide a positive affective reaction and judgment which further leads to purchasing behavior in physical store. Similarly, in online store context, effective and efficient product presentation not only draws consumers to a Web site, but also accelerates the purchase decision-making in the short of direct product experiences. Online grocery vendors usually try to employ some lively visual effects to provoke consumers to understand a grocery performance and visual design artifacts can afford sufficient information to the photo as well as influence consumers’ affective reactions [24].

Visual appeal is defined as “the tangible aspect of the online environment which reflected the ‘look and feel’ or perceived attractiveness of a Web site”. Visual appeal connotes the attractiveness of the Web site, consisting of photos, colors, and fonts [26,27]which inspired by the design, beauty inherent and physical attractive appearance in the retail setting. Visual search research theory also suggests that the salience of visual objects can effortless evoke users’ attention. Salience can be endowed by local contrast among the visual characteristics such as color or layout. The salient features draw human attention and shorten the search time can be found in various studies.

As mentioned above, the reflective surface possesses the higher salient property as it reflects the local appearance of grocery surface by presenting product with brightness and lights, which can easily draw consumers’ attention to the target product immediately. In line with [29], reflective surface represents the symbol of fresh and it can easily attract consumer to feel that the grocery could be fresh. Hence, we expect that the reflective surface can provoke consumers’ visual appeal towards the grocery. Therefore,

H1: Reflective surface positively affects online consumers’ visual appeal.

Visual design has the potential to elicit affective appeal for consumers [19] and may be conveyed via photos or colors . Color as one design elements has a particularly strong impact on visual appeal
and is known to be a strong predictor of a website’s overall appeal [32,33], argue that the adoption of color and image quality band together influence visual appeal. also suggest that certain fundamental aesthetic properties, such as color has been found to reliably predict overall visual appeal ratings across users. Color contrast on Webpage is usually conductive to decrease users’ information processing load and to highlight the products’ presentation [36], thus shorten and simplify the road from stimulus to visual appeal.

In this study, contrast color usage between the target product and background could easily attract customer to the target product. Therefore, 

H2: Contrast color usage positively affects online consumers’ visual appeal.

Goods layout refers to the design of space, allocation of items and grouping of products. In the grocery photo, complementary goods layout conveyed the information more imaginative and accessible by their holistic coordination effect than separating them does. The grocery and matched ingredients that are laid out vivid and aesthetic will fosters consumers’ concern, enjoyment and comfortable when consumer experience product [38].

In line with the theory of visual rhetoric, the arrangement accounts for the positioning of artifacts which can convey some metaphors and suggestions for attracting consumers toward visual design. When groceries are surrounded by some complementary goods in the photo, this layout could easily stimulate consumers’ reaction and imagine. [40] argue that layout can create a deeper impression on consumer. Therefore, in our study, we hypothesize that,

H3: Complementary goods layout positively affect online consumers’ visual appeal.

Research found that visual design aesthetics in Website have important impact on consumers’ enjoyment. Multimedia presents product information through multiple cues and channels, which jointly form a rich and attractive information presentation, thereby attracting consumers’ attention. The empirical evidence indicated that the usage of appropriate colors could enhance consumers’ pleasant feelings in e-store. Using contrast color on webpage is usually conductive to reduce consumers’ information processing load as well as to highlight the products’ presentation[26], thus potential to shorten and simplify the road from stimulus to pleasantness. found that Webpage’s color contrast positively impacts consumers’ enjoyable experience.

The vivid product presentations with more information cues can portray more concretely product attributes and thus provide consumers with sufficient attentions. When enhanced consumers’ attention is combined with vivid multimedia product presentations, the feeling of enjoyment is enhanced.

Shopping enjoyment, as an affective assessment criterion of the shopping experience, refers to the shopping experience is full of enjoyment in its own right, exclude the received product’s value [47]. In our research context, when examine the grocery products with reflective surface, it provokes consumer to think that the target grocery must be fresh; contrast color usage can draw consumers’ concentration on the target product; and complementary goods layout can stimulate consumer to imagining as well as to recall the way how consuming them. During the whole examine process, all those activities can help consumer to narrow their attention on the tasks (examine the target grocery) and consequently make them involved in information process. According to [48], as the user concentration on a specific activity, he or she loses self-consciousness and involved in the task which induces a higher flow state.

Indeed, research found that responses to stimulation in shopping environment are positively related to enjoyment.[50] also put forward that product with more information cues in presentation contribute to enhance consumers’ shopping enjoyment. Therefore, it would be proper to expect that consumer evaluating grocery photo with three cues will have a more pleasant experience which can increased their enjoyment, concentration, pleasant feelings and deeply attraction toward grocery photo. Therefore, we hypothesize that,

H4: Reflective surface positively affects online consumers’ shopping enjoyment.
H5: Contrast color usage positively affects online consumers’ shopping enjoyment.
H6: Complementary goods layout positively affects online consumers’ shopping enjoyment.
The attitude toward product refers to consumers’ holistic assessments about product and the likelihood intention to complete purchases on a particular Website [15]. Even small variation in a photo can cause an impact on consumers’ attitude toward product assessments. For example, by slightly change the angle of camera to an advertised product, viewers attitudes were influenced [51]. When consumers were inspired by the beauty inherent and physical attractive appearance in the grocery photo, higher perceived visual appeal may enable consumers to insight into the positive product information more clearly and truly, thus increasing consumers’ evaluation of products which further result in more positive attitudes toward the grocery. Therefore, we hypothesize that, 

H7: Visual appeal positively affects consumers’ attitude toward products.

validated that visual gravitation is positively associated with perceived Website’s quality. The visual design of online grocery store is important lie in its abilities to increase Website aesthetics and emotional appeal [19, 50, 51] which may in turn leads to more favorable attitudes toward online store.

Higher visual appeal can easily make consumers better recognize products and make safer purchase decisions, consequently, facilitate them their shopping goals which will further enhance their attitudes toward shopping at that grocery store. Therefore, 

H8: Visual appeal positively affects consumers’ attitude toward online grocery store.

Previous study verified that consumers’ shopping behavior has been significantly influenced by their perceived shopping enjoyment in physical shopping experiences [54]. Similarly, research in online context has also confirmed that consumers’ shopping enjoyment is a critical aspect of their online shopping experiences. With greater enjoyment consumers are more likely to examine products and more actively process the information provided [56], resulting in a greater likelihood to accelerate consumers’ product understanding, which will affects their attitude toward product and improve their acceptance intention of grocery. Therefore, 

H9: Shopping enjoyment positively affects consumers’ attitude toward products.

Most prior studies have established that perceived enjoyment could positively influence consumers’ attitudes toward Websites [57]. Evidences show that the enjoyable experience from e-commerce environments has a direct effect on the consequent responses when online shopping [37]. found that consumers who experienced higher levels of pleasure from the website displayed higher levels of approach responses towards the Website, including revisit tendency.

have suggested that entertainment features that helpful in promoting consumers’ shopping enjoyment improve their attitudes toward purchasing at a Website, and thus increase their revisit intention of the Website. Subsequently, researches have proved that enjoyment can obviously impacts consumers’ attitudes toward online vendors and their Websites . [15] also proposed that shopping enjoyment positively effects on consumer attitudes toward a Website. Specific to our study context, we hypothesize that,

H10: Shopping enjoyment positively affects consumers’ attitude toward online grocery store.

Most research works associated with consumers’ purchase behavior have supposed that purchase intention is decided by consumers’ attitude toward product. We assumed that consumers’ purchase intentions are determined by two essential elements: consumers’ attitude toward product and attitude toward store. Usually, positive attitudes toward a product result in higher intention to purchase just because consumers can feel the benefits of consuming the product , suggest that attitude toward product positively impact consumers’ intention to purchase from a Website. A vivid grocery product presentation with decoration cues potentially evoke consumers’ interest and intense impulse which may be changed into increased purchase intention. Such that, in our research context, we hypothesize that,

H11: Consumers’ attitude toward product positively affects their purchase intention from a grocery store.

Similarly, [15] announce the concept of consumers’ attitude toward Website, which refers to consumers’ general evaluations of a shopping experience toward a specific Website. Positive attitude toward shopping in a Website cloud be potential to elicit consumers to perform shopping behavior, which enhances the possibility for purchase . [15] verified that consumers’ attitude toward shopping
at a Website significantly affect their intention to purchase product. Therefore, in our research context, we hypothesize that,

H12: Consumers’ attitude toward grocery store positively influences their purchase intention.

Consumers’ online loyalty has been regarded as a “consumer’s intention to purchase” from a given Website and consumers will dislike switch to another Website, depict consumers’ online loyalty as the tendency to revisit a Web site, or to intend to buy from it again in the future time. validated consumers’ loyalty in a B2B service environment, and the finding shows that loyalty is the repeating visit an online Website as well as more willing to recommend shop owner to other consumers. Consistent with the preceding, in this study, consumer’s loyalty toward grocery store is defined as the intentions to revisit or use a grocery store to plan purchasing from it in the future.

In line with the theory of reasoned action, human’s attitudes are among the direct determinants of their behavior intentions. [15] confirmed that consumers’ attitude towards shopping at a Website positively influence their revisit intention. Therefore,

H13: Consumers’ attitude towards grocery store positively affects their store loyalty.

Based on the literature review, we proposed a research model demonstrated in Figure 1.
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**Figure 1.** Research Model

To account for other influences on the core dependent and mediating variables, three control variables, such as information deception detection, issue involvement, and issue expertise must be controlled. Besides, we decided the measure the privacy concern as the marker variables to access the common method bias.

4. **Data Analysis and Results**

Because we could not directly measure the photo decoration cues of the independent variables, therefore, we assigned the binary data type to each independent variable. Consequently, we perform 2-steps approach to analyze the results. First, we challenge to perform ANOVA to validate H1-H6. Next, we try to perform the structural equation model analysis using PLS to validate the left hypotheses. Data analysis was conducted with SPSS 21.0 software and the structural equation modeling was tested with smartPLS 2.0 software.

4.1 A. Control and Manipulation Checks

Subjects who failed to complete the experiment task were removed from the following statistical analyses and 331 valid data sets retained. Among the 331 subjects, 52.6% were females and 47.4% were males. The independent t-test was examined to show that there is no significant difference in gender toward visual appeal (t=-0.387, MD=-0.06395, p=0.699) and shopping enjoyment (t=1.794, MD=0.28745, p=0.074). ANOVA revealed there is no significant differences between the groups in terms of subjects’ age (F=1.661, p=0.175; F=0.894, p=0.445) and the frequency of shopping grocery (F=0.371, p=0.774; F=0.385, p=0.764) toward visual appeal and shopping enjoyment. The experimental results demonstrated that the eight different treatment conditions significantly affect photo’s reflective surface (p<0.01), contrast color usage (p<0.01) and complementary goods layout
(p<0.01). Hence, manipulation check verified that the randomly assign of respondents to the experimental groups was successful.

4.2 Examination of Variation of Three Photo Decoration Cues

The ANOVA was conducted to verify the impacts of three photo decoration cues on two dependents variables and the results shown in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table 1. Statistical Analysis on Visual Appeal and Shopping Enjoyment

|          | Visual Appeal | Shopping Enjoyment |
|----------|---------------|--------------------|
|          | Group         | Mean    | Std. Deviation | Mean    | Std. Deviation |
| No       | No            | 2.7667  | .77007         | 2.6964  | .79353         |
| Yes      | Yes           | 4.3619  | 1.12899        | 3.4286  | .91613         |
|          | Yes           | 3.8865  | 1.25215        | 2.7365  | .71187         |
|          | Yes           | 4.8098  | .97258         | 3.6646  | .63396         |
| Yes      | No            | 2.9864  | .90209         | 4.8693  | .65700         |
|          | Yes           | 5.8150  | .89028         | 6.0688  | .64794         |
|          | Yes           | 5.0810  | 1.04910        | 4.6845  | .63931         |
|          | Yes           | 6.1628  | .55421         | 6.1570  | .63626         |

For visual appeal, the ANOVA analysis results shown in Table 2. These three independent variables’ p-values are confirmed significantly (p=0.000) across the total eight groups of participants. Therefore, H1, H2 and H3 are supported.

Table 2. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects on Visual Appeal

|                  | Type III Sum of Squares | df | F   | Sig.  |
|------------------|-------------------------|----|-----|-------|
| RS               | 91.890                  | 1  | 100.687 | .000***|
| CCU              | 82.962                  | 1  | 90.905 | .000***|
| CGL              | 213.239                 | 1  | 233.653 | .000***|
| RS * CCU         | 3.947                   | 1  | 4.325  | .038*  |
| RS * CGL         | 9.996                   | 1  | 10.953 | .001** |
| CCU * CGL        | 30.183                  | 1  | 33.073 | .000***|
| RS * CCU * CGL   | 5.960                   | 1  | 6.531  | .011*  |
| Error            | 294.780                 | 323| 0.061  | .567   |
| Total            | 7385.120                | 331|      |       |
| Corrected Total  | 742.534                 | 330|      |       |

*p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

In terms of shopping enjoyment, the ANOVA results showed that the p-values of reflective surface and complementary goods layout are significant (p=0.000) across the eight groups of respondents. Therefore, H4 and H6 are supported, but the effect between contrast color usage and shopping enjoyment was not significant (p>0.10). Therefore, H5 was not supported. See Table 3.

Table 3. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects on Shopping Enjoyment

|                  | Type III Sum of Squares | df | F    | Sig.  |
|------------------|-------------------------|----|------|-------|
| RS               | 441.762                 | 1  | 874.096 | .000***|
| CCU              | .166                    | 1  | .329 | .567   |
| CGL              | 96.826                  | 1  | 191.586 | .000***|
| RS * CCU         | .717                    | 1  | 1.418  | .235   |
| RS * CGL         | 5.280                   | 1  | 10.446 | .001** |
| CCU * CGL        | 1.135                   | 1  | 2.246  | .135   |
| RS * CCU * CGL   | .031                    | 1  | .061  | .806   |
| Error            | 163.242                 | 323|      |       |
| Total            | 6858.188                | 331|      |       |
| Corrected Total  | 703.980                 | 330|      |       |
4.3 Measurement Model

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed and results displayed that the measurement items loaded heavily on their respective construct and slightly on other factors, each item with the loadings above 0.7, the value of KMO is 0.866 (the standard level > 0.7). The result indicates adequate convergent and discriminant validity (see Table 4).

Table 4. Loadings and Cross-Loadings of Measures

| Construct | Item | Component |
|-----------|------|-----------|
| LY        |      |           |
| LY5       | .884 | .093      |
| LY6       | .885 | .096      |
| LY1       | .835 | .084      |
| LY2       | .830 | .098      |
| LY3       | .874 | .048      |
| PIN       |      |           |
| PIN1      | .090 | .807      |
| PIN2      | .090 | .798      |
| PIN3      | .134 | .789      |
| PIN4      | .105 | .784      |
| VA        |      |           |
| VA5       | .130 | .103      |
| VA2       | .111 | .112      |
| VA3       | .111 | .127      |
| VA1       | .134 | .129      |
| VA4       | .100 | .123      |
| PC        |      |           |
| SE2       | .072 | .128      |
| SE1       | .170 | .114      |
| SE4       | .085 | .112      |
| SE3       | .121 | .178      |
| SE         |      |           |
| PC2       | .011 | .034      |
| PC1       | .062 | .011      |
| PC4       | .040 | .002      |
| SE3       | .017 | .039      |
| ATS       |      |           |
| ATS1      | .328 | .130      |
| ATS3      | .333 | .139      |
| ATS4      | .389 | .221      |
| ATS2      | .404 | .180      |
| IDD       |      |           |
| IDD3      | .014 | .065      |
| IDD2      | .002 | .045      |
| IDD1      | .012 | .004      |
| ATP       |      |           |
| ATP1      | .055 | .290      |
| ATP2      | .070 | .331      |
| ATP3      | .077 | .077      |
| IV        |      |           |
| IV1       | .044 | .029      |
| IV2       | .077 | .031      |
| EP        |      |           |
| EP1       | .008 | .030      |
| EP2       | .037 | .039      |

KMO = 0.890
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = 7533.175, df = 703, Sig. = 0.000
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Notes. ‘VA’ stands for visual appeal. ‘SE’ stands for shopping enjoyment. ‘ATP’ stands for attitude toward product. ‘ATS’ stands for attitude toward store. ‘PIN’ stands for purchase intention. ‘LY’ stands for loyalty. ‘PC’ stands for privacy concern. ‘IV’ stands for involvement. ‘EP’ stands for expertise. ‘IDD’ stands for information deception detection.
Composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha values are presented in Table 5. As all items’ reliability are larger than 0.7, thus the internal consistency standard are satisfied.

**Table 5. Internal Consistency of Constructs**

| Item | Construct | Std. path loading | AVE | CR | Cronbach's alpha |
|------|-----------|-------------------|-----|----|------------------|
| ATP1 | ATP       | 0.862             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| ATP2 | ATP       | 0.896             | 0.774| 0.911| 0.854          |
| ATP3 | ATP       | 0.881             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| ATS1 | ATS       | 0.842             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| ATS2 | ATS       | 0.849             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| ATS3 | ATS       | 0.831             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| ATS4 | ATS       | 0.854             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| EP1  | EP        | 0.882             | 0.841| 0.913| 0.818          |
| EP2  | EP        | 0.950             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| IDD1 | IDD       | 0.875             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| IDD2 | IDD       | 0.878             | 0.744| 0.897| 0.831          |
| IDD3 | IDD       | 0.834             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| IV1  | IV        | 0.923             | 0.884| 0.939| 0.872          |
| IV2  | IV        | 0.957             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| LY1  | LY        | 0.879             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| LY2  | LY        | 0.825             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| LY3  | LY        | 0.815             | 0.741| 0.945| 0.930          |
| LY4  | LY        | 0.857             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| LY5  | LY        | 0.913             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| LY6  | LY        | 0.872             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PC1  | PC        | 0.854             | 0.500| 0.789| 0.881          |
| PC2  | PC        | 0.516             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PC3  | PC        | 0.486             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PC4  | PC        | 0.875             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PIN1 | PIN       | 0.855             | 0.706| 0.923| 0.896          |
| PIN2 | PIN       | 0.813             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PIN3 | PIN       | 0.850             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PIN4 | PIN       | 0.844             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| PIN5 | PIN       | 0.836             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| SE1  | SE        | 0.8330            | 0.721| 0.912| 0.871          |
| SE2  | SE        | 0.884             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| SE3  | SE        | 0.835             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| SE4  | SE        | 0.847             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| VA1  | VA        | 0.825             | 0.700| 0.921| 0.893          |
| VA2  | VA        | 0.837             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| VA3  | VA        | 0.838             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| VA4  | VA        | 0.842             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |
| VA5  | VA        | 0.841             |     |    | 0.911 0.854      |

Usually, to evaluate the measurement model it requires checking its discriminant validity. As listed in Table 6, off-diagonal elements reveal all the latent variables’ correlations, while the diagonal elements are the square roots of the average variances extracted (AVE) of the latent variables. In line with, for the adequate discriminant validity, any latent variable’s average variances extracted (AVE) should be larger than the variance which shared between the latent variable and other latent variables. In another words, the diagonal elements should be larger than corresponding off-diagonal elements. Therefore, the data presented in Table 6 satisfy this requirement.

To further eliminate the common method variance (CMV), following the previous studies (e.g.,), we created a marker variable, the privacy concern, and then we add it as the indicator of attitudes toward product and store. For each endogenous variable, pseudo-test was conducted to check whether the improved R2 was significant or not [58]. The previous study argues that if the coefficient is under
0.10 at α=.05 level, the common method variance (CMV) is not significant and CMV is not a potential threat. In table 6, the results suggest that the original correlations among attitude toward product, attitude toward store and other variables are not differ significantly (Δr= -0.018). The results of Table 6 also suggest that there is no significant correlation ship between dependent variables and the control variables. Therefore, none of the control variables had a significant impact on the dependent variables in this study.

Hence, we conclude that the path coefficients evaluation in our research model is not influenced by common method variance.

4.4 Structural Model

The right-hand part of our research model was estimated employing the partial least squares (PLS) algorithm [61] and the PLS outcome model is shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. PLS Analysis Results](image)

The structural model’s explanatory power was explained by the value of R2 of the dependent variables. To verify the hypotheses, we calculated the t-statistics for gather the standardized path coefficient, and then we examined p-values based on the two-tailed test and significant level at 0.05 respectively. From Figure 3, we can see all hypotheses (H7---H13) were approved by statistically significant. Such R2 values of the dependent variables were calculated as visual appeal (0.537), shopping enjoyment (0.759), attitude toward product (0.335), attitude toward store (0.315), loyalty (0394), and purchase intention (0.354). Based on the bootstrap resampling analysis, the path significant levels was performed on the structural model.

As regard to their relative influence power, through the comparison of their path coefficients, the results shows that reflective surface plays a higher influence than other decoration cues on shopping enjoyment (path coefficients: 0.793 versus 0.014 and 0.370), complementary goods layout performed a strongest influence on visual appeal than the other two independent variables (path coefficients: 0.536 versus 0.347, 0.339).

5. Conclusion and Discussion

The goal of this study was to seek to answer two research questions: what photo decoration cues in online grocery could be identified? Could photo decoration cues significantly effect on the affective perception and behavioral intention of consumers? Using the media richness theory, visual rhetoric theory and visual design literature as the theoretical foundation, the study provides a solid foundation to comprehend the impacts of photo decoration cues on consumers’ affective responses.

Our suggested research model examined the relationships among the different variables and the findings provide strong support for the proposed model, as expected, photo decoration cues are associated with consumers’ affective actions, attitudes toward product and store which in turn, is positively affect consumers’ loyalty and purchase intention.

All expected relationships are supported in the research model, except Hypothesis 5. The findings show that contrast color usage does not significantly affect consumer shopping enjoyment. This different from our initial expectations based on the literature. There are two plausible explanations for this finding. First, the respondents may have gathered the sufficient and critical information they
are needed which elicits shopping enjoyment from other decorations cues, such as reflective surface and complementary goods layout, leading them to perceive few benefits and little relevance toward contrast color usage. Maybe the second reason come from the experiment stimulus, in other words, the white or red plate chosen in the experiment is relatively simple, which means that the plate’s color has fewer characteristics, as a result, respondents cannot be stimulated enough to make their shopping enjoyment.

Our findings indicate that the photo decoration cues are the important constructs and serve as the antecedents of consumers’ affective responses. Therefore, an understanding of how to design photo artifacts which can influence consumers’ affective responses will be great important.

In addition, this study has demonstrated that the visual appeal and shopping enjoyment evoked by photo decoration cues have indeed a positive impact on the attitudes toward product and store. This implies that the more decoration cues used in designing online grocery photo, the more likely they will foster a positive attitude towards continue using them.

The findings of this study will increase the ever-increasing body of literature about online product presentation as well as serve as a reference for vendors to improve their grocery Websites design. Thus, by providing photo visual decoration cues, Website vendors can effectively stimulate consumers’ learning about products.
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