Improving Customer Experience through Advocacy and Morphing:
A Web Application for Suruga Bank

by

Yoshio Tokoro

Submitted to the MIT Sloan School of Management on May 9, 2008
in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Business Administration

ABSTRACT

After the rise of the internet, the relationship between customer and company has changed so that customer power increased. Companies have had to change their marketing activity from mass media based to internet based. At the same time, if the company successfully established web-based communication with the customer, it would be able to expand its business without being constrained by the existing order of market standing. In other words, effective customer-based web solution is critical for companies at present day.

Professor Glen Urban propounded two ideas to improve customer experience through web site- one is the “Customer advocacy”, which leads to build a trust-based relationship with the customer, and the other is the “Morphing web site” which enable customers to have an optimal web site which fit to their own cognitive or cultural style automatically without customizing the page.

The research created a practical web site based on those two ideas, and conducted a market research in order to make clear the effectiveness of advocacy and morphing.

Data shows that both advocacy and morphing are effective to improve customer experience, and that the web site based on those ideas has a potential power to change the position of the company in that industry. This research will be a useful reference for companies who need effective web communication with customers.
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Title: David Austin Professor of Marketing, Dean Emeritus
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1. Introduction

1.1 Interactive communication with customer

Traditionally, companies used to sell their products or service by push-pull marketing. They had sent one-sided messages though mass media such as TV commercials, telephone sales, and direct mail. The situation changed dramatically around 2000, when the Internet became common among the people. Consumers became so powerful that they could get and choose their information and whatever they needed directly by using the Internet. The company, which still relied on push-pull marketing, lost their power.

Many companies changed their marketing style from push-pull marketing to relationship marketing. They try to understand the customer's needs, and improve their quality of products or service to meet the customer's needs by the quality control method such as TQM, and offer personalized service by the CRM system. However, those efforts often don't make much sense to enlightened customers, if companies still stick to sell by push-pull marketing simply more efficiently.

Professor Glen Urban proposed "Advocacy marketing" to solve this problem in 2005 (Don't Just Relate- Advocate!). The company, which implements Advocacy marketing, communicates with customer interactively and provides full information to advocate customers so that the customers' profit will be maximized. Companies can make long-term profits based on the long-term trust and loyalty between customers. This marketing method can be a best solution for this era where customers have more power than companies.
1.2 Importance of web marketing

Because environmental change happened through the spread of the Internet, web marketing has been a key issue from the beginning, but the importance of it has been increased throughout those years. Recently, many consumers can easily transmit information and communicate with each other by explosive diffusion of blog, SNS (Social Networking Service) and BBS (Bulletin Board Service). Different from the early era, the Internet is not just an information-gathering tool any more, but an interactive communication tool. Even if the companies send out self-serving information, consumers can share the negative information with each other, and the companies lose the trust from consumers.

Also, the companies, which provide poor products or service, will face hardship, because consumers can easily compare the products and service. Consumers can know the true value of the products or service sooner or later by using the Internet, even if the companies don’t offer enough information honestly. There is no room for companies to control information for their self-interest.

On the other hand, web marketing can be the most effective tool for the company. Web marketing has the best products or service and sense of advocacy, even if the company doesn’t have enough physical resource such as worldwide sales network, long term history or enough brand recognition. Even start up companies can have an advantage over established competitors. The good use of web marketing is so important that it can determine the success and failure of the company.
1.3 Suruga Bank

Suruga Bank is a Japanese commercial bank, which is physically based on the Shizuoka prefecture and greater Tokyo area. Quite different from another commercial bank in Japan, it has focused on retail banking such as mortgage, personal lending, and credit card business for more than 20 years. It had built the CRM system throughout the 1990s, and has reorganized its business into a more and more customer-oriented business in the early 2000s.

It also expanded its business from regional to nation-wide by using the Internet. In 1999, Suruga Bank started a virtual bank, a first for a Japanese bank, and has been offering banking service for customers who live in the area where the Suruga Bank doesn’t have any physical bases. Suruga Bank has expanded the virtual networks, and has 10 virtual branches and 8 virtual banking service alliances so far.

To accomplish the next level of service, Suruga Bank is interested in Advocacy marketing and web morphing -the next stage of interactive communication with customers, which sponsored this research project.

1.4 Purpose of the research

The ultimate purpose of this research project is to find the most effective way to communicate with customers by making good use of a web site. We assume that the morphing web site developed from the advocacy advisor could be a good solution. Therefore, we created a test morphing web site, to test the effectiveness of it.
2. Literature and Framework

2.1 Customer Advocacy

The basic idea of Customer Advocacy can be explained with "The Advocacy Pyramid" (See figure 1). To realize Customer Advocacy, there are two bases- Customer satisfactions, and TQM (Total Quality Management). Customer Advocacy marketing makes clear which company creates the most valuable products or service. If the company doesn’t offer the value for the customer, the company will be pushed into a corner because of the Customer Advocacy marketing. It is a necessary condition to boost up the value of the company’s products or service by TQM and pursuing Customer Satisfaction. The next step is relationship marketing. It offers tools not for the company’s efficient promotion, but for building trust with customers in order to maximize the customer’s profits, which is necessary for Customer Advocacy.

Given those fundamental conditions, Professor Glen Urban pointed out that the web-based virtual advisor should be a good tool to realize Customer Advocacy. Well
trained advisors are necessary to build trust, but there are three problems—difficulty to find, high-cost, and the high turnover rate for skilled advisors (Urban 2005). Well-designed virtual advisors solve these problems at once. We put this idea in practice and test the effectiveness of the Advocacy advisor in previous research. The website for the research this time is based on the result of the previous research in Advocacy advisor, and it's expansion of advocacy advisor into a morphing web site.

2.2 Morphing

An advocacy adviser is one of the effective ways to communicate with customers and can increase the probability of sales for a company. However, everybody isn’t satisfied with a single well-designed web site. Some people may prefer to get as much information as possible or a long list of alternatives to make purchase decisions, but others may feel bothersome with it. Some people may prefer an authority’s advice, and others may prefer a friend’s advice. Every customer has his or her own style and preference to recognize information, and there is no single best web site for everyone. To serve the best web-experience for all customers, it is necessary to serve a personalized web page. Customizable web sites can be one solution for this problem, but is not a perfect answer because few people go through the trouble to sign up for their own page and customize it.

A morphing web page, which serves as an optimal site for each customer automatically, is the answer for this matter. Professor Glen Urban’s morphing research team defined 3 cognitive styles and 3 cultural styles as follows.
Cognitive Styles

- Reading vs. Listening
- Analytic vs. Holistic
- Deliberative vs. Impulsive

Cultural Styles

- Hierarchical vs. Egalitarian
- Individual vs. Collectivistic
- Neutral vs. Emotional

In accordance with this definition of cognitive and cultural style, we can create web sites in advance, which fit to each style. The moment the customer visits the site, we estimate the customers’ cognitive and cultural style by their clicking activity, and serve optimal site for their style. We frame a hypothesis that, if we can serve optimal morph for each customer, the customer experience will be improved. The aim of this research is to validate this hypothesis by market research with test morphing the web site.
3. Previous research

3.1 Advocacy mortgage site for Suruga bank

In 2006, we created an advocacy mortgage site for Suruga bank. There are two reasons why we focused on mortgage. First, mortgage is one of the best-fit categories which advocacy benefits a lot. The industry that has the following attributes has the greatest benefit with advocacy (Urban 2005).

1. Complex product
2. High customer involvement with products
3. High risk of loss if the customer selects the wrong product
4. Wide range of available products
5. Large volumes of available information.

Mortgage has all the five attributes above. The second reason is that mortgage offered by Suruga Bank is not recognized so much though it offers a wide range of mortgage which has many competitive advantages over other banks. If people understand well about the mortgage offered by Suruga Bank with an advocacy advisor, they would consider Suruga for their mortgage provider.

The advocacy site has many characteristics. First, it has an advisor, which provides the most suitable and beneficial mortgage for each visitor. Secondly, the advisor provides fair and enough information for the visitor to make a decision for mortgage. Third, it provides the competitor’s information as well as Suruga Bank’s, even if the competitor’s mortgage is better than that of Suruga’s for the particular case.
The web site was written in Japanese, and then conducted market research in Japan. Some responders were shown Suruga’s existing web site as well as the control, and others were shown this test advocacy site. We asked a considerable bank as a mortgage provider before and after the site visit.

3.2 Result of the previous research and improvement

The result of the survey was not satisfactory. Although the percentage of responders who considered Suruga Bank had increased significantly after the site visit (Pre site visit 3.48%, Post site visit 33.4%), there was no difference of significant level between test advocacy site and the existing Suruga’s site. This only meant that people who learnt Suruga Bank’s mortgage came to consider Suruga Bank.

We analyzed the reason why advocacy didn’t effect a lot. Open-ended comments suggested that the appearance of the web site affected the sense of trust. Many people pointed out that the web site was not trustworthy because it looked amateur, or it had some bug. Actually, it was a natural reaction because Suruga Bank’s existing site was neatly designed and created by a professional designer, and the difference of appearance was obvious. It was a necessary point to improve for next research.

Also, we found a possibility of bias that many responders answered to consider Suruga Bank because they knew Suruga Bank conducted this survey. There were many people who didn’t browse the test site enough who were removed from the survey data as a noise. However, if we analyzed the data of those removed people by way of experiment, many of those people answered to consider Suruga Bank, despite the lack of the site experience.
That means some portion of people who answered to prefer the survey provider's products regardless of contents. Removing this bias remained an issue for next research.
4. Research methodology

4.1 Building a practical card loan site for general

This time, we created a card loan site. Card Loan is a kind of personal loan, which is usually a small amount and not for business purposes. In Japan, people prefer to borrow money with this kind of loan rather than to carry the balance of a credit card. Therefore, there are many kinds of card loans in the Japan market. Some of them are very easy to apply and borrow, but require higher interest rate. Many seem to offer low interest rate, but the total cost of it including all fees are not always low and depends on the condition. Although card loans are confusing and difficult to understand for most people, the risk of loss in the long run would be very high if the customers choose the wrong product. In other words, card loan is one of the beneficial categories for advocacy as well as mortgage.

This time, based on the characteristic of advocacy advisors, we built a morphing web site for card loan not specifically for Suruga Bank, but for the general. Last time, the mortgage advisor recommended Suruga Bank’s mortgage at first, and showed competitors’ mortgage later as an alternative, but this site showed best products from all competitors without distinction. The visitor has no way to know who provides the site, because there is no difference in order to display between product of provider and competitors.

Also, this site has expanded from a simple advisor to a total information site including data, advisors, fast-solution, learn and info, and forum. Visitors can get basic or educational information, other people’s comments, and in-depth data as well as recommendations for their own situations.
4.2 Morphing methodology

This site was created as a morphing web page, which serves optimal site for each customer automatically. To realize this concept, we chose 4 dimensions (2 cognitive styles and 2 cultural styles) as follow from 6 dimensions, which Professor Glen Urban’s team defined.

Cognitive Styles

- Analytic vs. Holistic
- Deliberative vs. Impulsive

Cultural Styles

- Hierarchical vs. Egalitarian
- Individual vs. Collectivistic

Each web page has 4 dimensions and each dimension has 2 opposite characteristics, so there should be at most 16 morphing patterns for each page. For example, some pages may be a “Analytic- Deliberative- Hierarchical- Individual” page. Other pages may be a “Holistic- Impulsive- Hierarchical- Collectivistic” page.

Also, for example, analytic pages have in-depth data, and holistic pages have some charts, which describe a whole picture of all card loans. Individual pages have some contents, which are specially provided for the visitors, and collectivistic pages have some trend information, which describe popularity. The actual morphing patterns and how to morph are described in Appendix 1 “Morphing patterns”.

When a customer visits the site, the morphing engine, which was developed by Professor Glen Urban’s team, it calculates the first few clicks of the visitor, and decides the cognitive
and cultural style of the visitor. This calculation is based on the analysis of the link characteristics. For example, the visitor who clicks “Fast solution” at first is probably an impulsive person, and the visitor who clicks “Data” at first is probably an analytic person. We analyze those characteristics of each link of the first few pages, by conducting C’s Panel research. Those characteristic data have been built into morphing engine so that the morphing engine can recognize the cognitive and cultural style of the visitor after he/she makes a few clicks. After that, the morphing engine can serve the site of optimal morph pattern, which fits to the visitor. The visitor does nothing special such as to “customize” or “log in”, but the most comfortable web site for him/her will be served automatically.

4.3 Market research methodology

The web site was created in Japanese and the market research was conducted in Japan in the form of a web survey. The research is divided into two stages. The first stage, which is a scope of this article, was conducted with a fixed morph, and the second stage, which will be the future research, will be done with a dynamic morph. At the first stage, every responder browses a particular morphing site, which is randomly provided. The morph engine doesn’t estimate the visitor’s cognitive and cultural style for this stage, so the morphing site is not always matched to the visitor’s cognitive style and cultural style.

The panelists are screened at the first page of the research. The panelists who are less than 20 years old, or who have no interest in card loan, are rejected at this point. After the screening questions, we ask possible providers for a card loan, preference for that provider, and the probability of purchase, which we call a “Pre-site visit” survey. Then, the panelists
go to the morphing site, and browse it. To ensure the site experience of a panelist, we made some screening for this part. If the panelist tries to quit the site and go back to the survey within 60 seconds, we reject those panelists, and never allow them to go back again. If the panelist spends more than 60 seconds, but less than 150 seconds or 10 clicks, and tries to quit the site and go back to the survey, we ask him/her to browse more carefully, otherwise he/she is not eligible for the survey. Only the panelists who browse the site more than 150 seconds, and more than 10 clicks, can go to the next step.

At the next step, we ask them to evaluate the site, and ask the same “Post site visit” questions three times. First, we ask the panelists about possible providers for a card loan, preference for Company-O, and probability of purchase of Company-O’s card loan, assuming that Company-O provided the site. Then, we ask the panelists about possible providers for a card loan, preference for Suruga bank, and probability of purchase of Suruga bank’s card loan, assuming that Suruga bank provided the site. Finally, we ask the panelists about possible providers for a card loan, preference for Company-A, and probability of purchase of Company-A’s card loan, assuming that Company-A provided the site. The purpose of asking the same questions three times is to eliminate the bias that the panelists would have towards the survey provider regardless of the contents. The panelists have no way to know who conducts this survey, so there are no biases.

After that, we ask the panelists characteristic questions to measure the panelists’ cognitive and cultural style, which is necessary to calculate the number of morph matched. The questionnaires are attached as an appendix 2.

For reference, I referred to the characteristics of the three companies above;
Company-O, Suruga bank, and Company-A, which may affect to the survey analysis.

One point, Company-O and Company-A are the famous companies as card loan providers in Japan. Company-O focuses on the web banner advertisement, and Company-A focuses on TV commercials. On the other hand, Suruga bank is not so famous compared to the other two companies, because it doesn’t spend as much money on advertisement (see figure 2). Secondly, Suruga bank and Company-O offer a low rate high limit card loan, which need moderate screening process. On the other hand, Company-A offers quick and easy screening process in exchange of higher rate and lower limit (see figure 3).

**Figure 2: Advertisement expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>2005.4 - 2006.3</th>
<th>2006.4 - 2007.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company-O</td>
<td>12,465</td>
<td>13,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suruga</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>1,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company-A</td>
<td>16,087</td>
<td>10,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Corporate annual security report

**Figure 3: Characteristics of main products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interest rate</th>
<th>Borrowing limit</th>
<th>Screening process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company-O</td>
<td>6.9% - 17.6%</td>
<td>(restriction for more than ¥2M)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the lowest</td>
<td>One of the highest in the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suruga</td>
<td>7.0% - 18.0%</td>
<td>(restriction for more than ¥3M)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the lowest</td>
<td>One of the highest in the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company-A</td>
<td>12.0% - 18.0%</td>
<td>(restriction for more than ¥0.5M)</td>
<td>Quick &amp; easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the highest</td>
<td>One of the lowest in the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Corporate web site
5. Research Analysis

5.1 Effectiveness of advocacy (Consideration analysis)

First, I analyzed the panelist’s consideration change as a loan provider to make clear the effectiveness of advocacy. Although advocacy is already a confirmed idea in other researches, I didn’t have the significant result for Suruga bank’s case in previous research, so I started with the vilification of advocacy idea for Suruga case.

Figure 4 is a result of consideration change in table form, and figure 5 has the same results in graph form with the analysis for the difference.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre site visit</th>
<th>Post Site visit</th>
<th>Kai Square</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>Not Consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company-O</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumig that Company-O brought you to this site</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>196.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumig that NOT Company-O brought you to this site</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suruga</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumig that Suruga brought you to this site</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>491.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumig that NOT Suruga brought you to this site</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>49.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company-A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumig that Company-A brought you to this site</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>140.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumig that NOT Company-A brought you to this site</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Figure 5: Consideration change (Graph)

Company-O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-visit</th>
<th>Post-visit</th>
<th>Pre-visit (as a site builder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product recognition</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company-A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-visit</th>
<th>Post-visit</th>
<th>Pre-visit (as a site builder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product recognition</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suruga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-visit</th>
<th>Post-visit</th>
<th>Pre-visit (as a site builder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product recognition</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Site visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company-O</th>
<th>Suruga</th>
<th>Company-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior perception of products</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Site visit (Assuming that NOT the company brought you to this site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company-O</th>
<th>Suruga</th>
<th>Company-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post perception of products</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Site visit (as a site builder)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company-O</th>
<th>Suruga</th>
<th>Company-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post perception of products w) advocacy</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre site visit, the people who considered Suruga bank was 9.6%, but it increased dramatically. If we assumed that Suruga bank had provided the site, the people who considered Suruga bank was 38.7%, and if we assumed that others provided the site, the rates were 16.8% and 15.4%, which shows significant increase from the original.

When we analyze the difference, it is obvious that the difference between “pre site visit” and “post site visit (assuming that others provide the site)” was caused by the recognition of attractiveness of the product. People, who knew the attributes of the products for the first time with this site, began to consider Suruga bank as a loan provider for them. On the other hand, we can say that the difference between “post site visit (assuming that others provide the site)” and “post site visit (assuming that Suruga bank provide the site)” was caused by the effect of advocacy idea. If the responders knew who had conducted this survey, it would be a flatter bias. However, in this case, the responders didn’t know it, and thus the difference was caused by a trust to the site provider, which we call “advocacy”.

We can see other interesting facts with this data comparing Company-O and Suruga bank. There was a big difference in “pre sit visit”, but the results of “post site visit” of each were very similar. The difference of “pre site visit” was probably caused by the perception of products of each company, which was probably created by advertisements. On the other hand, there was no clear difference in “post site visit” data, because the products of each provider had very similar attributes to each other. It means that the advocacy site could fill a perception gap created by an expensive advertisement at a lower cost.
The other interesting fact is the difference between Company-A and the others. At “pre site visit”, Company-A got less people to consider it in spite of its brand recognition, and at “post site visit”, it got significantly worse. This was because the loan provided by Company-A had a higher interest rate and some people recognized the fact before the site visit. The people, who didn’t know the fact, browsed the site and stopped considering because he/she found its interest rate. As shown in Figure 6, Company-A got lower points in “Overall trust” and “Better rate” even among the people who chose Company-A as a No1 provider. In this figure, we can also find that Company-O got a higher score than Suruga bank, although consideration for each provider was almost equal. This means that
there is another factor which decides the consideration of consumers. To find other factors that may affect consideration, deserves further research.

5.2 Effectiveness of morphing (Site evaluation analysis)

The second analysis is about effectiveness of morphing and I started with the data of site evaluation. Responders evaluated the site right after the site visit, and I analyzed the correlation between “Site evaluation” and “number of morph matched”. We served the site to responders randomly, so some people browsed a suitable site for him/her, while others didn’t. If the morphing was effective, the more suitable site the responders browsed, the better points they gave to the site evaluation.

![Figure 7: Correlation between # of morph matched and site evaluation](image)
Figure 7 shows the correlation between “numbers of morph matched” and “site evaluation”. The correlation for each questions were at most 13%, and the given population of this survey was n=501, there were some significant values in some questions. Out of 13 questions, 7 questions had a significant correlation at the 95% confidence level, and 2 of them had a significant correlation even at the 99% confidence level.

Especially, the evaluation for the site itself such as “trustworthy” and “easiness”, related to the decision making such as “sufficient info to make a decision” and “helpful in reaching decision” marked a higher correlation with “number of morph matched”. The total average points of site evaluation correlated to the “number of morph matched” at the 95% confidence level as well.

Next, Figure 8 shows the scatter chart and function for the correlation between “number
of morph matched” and “average point of site evaluation”. It shows that if an additional one more morph matched from the original, the evaluation for the site could increase 0.088 points, but is not significant because the R Square is low.

Beside the number of the morph matched, there were some other factors, which had correlation with the site evaluation. From the research data, age of responder, and number of loans, the responder had a positive correlation with the average point of site evaluation, which meant that the older the responder was, or the more loans the responder had, the higher point the site evaluation is. The correlation of each factor was a good approximation number. It can be said that the number of morph matched effected the site evaluation in a high level as much as the other important factors. Figure 9 shows this correlation and regression for site evaluation.

![Figure 9: Multiple linear regression for site evaluation](image)

\[
Y = 0.085 X_m + 0.007 X_a + 0.058 X_l + 2.837
\]

\(R\text{ Square}=0.034, n=501\)
5.3 Effectiveness of morphing (Probability of purchase analysis)

The third analysis is in probability of purchase. In this research, we asked responders what providers they considered as their loan providers. If they answered more than five providers, we asked them to reduce it to less than five. Then, we asked them to rank the considering providers, and to allocate their chips in order of their preference which had been given in total of 100 to each responders. I estimated the probability of purchase of a particular company by using this data. The way to calculate it is shown in Figure 10.

![Figure 10: Definition of “Probability of purchase”](image)

If the morphing site is effective, the probability of purchase should be increased in proportion to the accession of number of morph matched. This indicator is important, because it is directly related to the sales of the company that is one of the most interesting issues for the company, who is considering the implement of web morphing.

Figure 11 shows that the probabilities of purchase of each provider increases dramatically after the site visit, but the correlation between “probability of purchase” and
"number of morph matched" is not clear with this data. The correlation of Suruga bank and that of Company-A are relatively high, but a high p-value shows that they are not significant level of correlations.

The regressions of "probability of purchase" and "number of morph matched" are shown in Figure 12. The regression also indicates that there is no significant correlation, although there are signs of positive correlation.
Figure 12: Equation expressing the relationship between "probability of purchase" and "# of morph matched"

**Equation for Company-O**

\[ Y = 0.012X + 0.153 \]

\( R^2 = 0.001, \ n=501 \)

\( F=0.807, \ \text{Significance } F=0.369 \)

(Not significant)

**Equation for Suruga**

\[ Y = 0.002X + 0.183 \]

\( R^2 = 5\times 10^{-5}, \ n=501 \)

\( F=0.027, \ \text{Significance } F=0.869 \)

(Not significant)

**Equation for Company-A**

\[ Y = 0.011X + 0.056 \]

\( R^2 = 0.002, \ n=501 \)

\( F=1.036, \ \text{Significance } F=0.309 \)

(Not significant)

X: # of morph matched
Y: Probability of purchase
5.4 Factors that affect to the probability of purchase

We found that the number of morph matched didn’t affect the probability of purchase significantly. There may have been some other factors that affected to the probability of purchase. Clarence Lee conducted ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and a stepwise regression in order to find these factors. I quoted the result of the analysis for reference.

Figure 13 is the result of the ANOVA, which implies that Hierarchical-Egalitarian dimension affected the probability of purchase of Suruga. It also implies that serving Individual or Collectivistic site dimension to the Hierarchical or Egalitarian people affect to the probability of purchase of Suruga.

Therefore, he picked up those factors, and conducted a stepwise regression as shown in Figure 14. The result shows that Hierarchical people tend to purchase Suruga products, because the B coefficient is minus which means the dimension had the opposite effects. Also, the group of hierarchical people who browsed collectivistic site had a high probability of purchase.

The reasons of those effects are not clear so far, but the effect can depend on the contents of the site or probable cultural differences between countries. It could be the theme of future research.
Figure 13: Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependant Variable: LSurugaPrmQ6Q8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>29.166**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>176.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.759</td>
<td>183.276</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A0H1_morph</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D011_morph</td>
<td>2.278</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.278</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0E1_morph</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0C1_morph</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsive_new</td>
<td>2.592</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.592</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holistic_new</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collectivistic_verbal_new</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egalitarian_new</td>
<td>8.764</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.764</td>
<td>9.087</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH_DI</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH_HE</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH_IC</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI_AH</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI_DI</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI_HE</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI_IC</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE_AH</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE_DI</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE_HE</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE_IC</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC_AH</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC_DI</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC_HE</td>
<td>5.389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.389</td>
<td>5.588</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC_IC</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>98.373</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358.705</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>127.539</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. R Squared=.229 (Adjusted R squared=.047)
(Analyzed by Clarence Lee)
Figure 14: Stepwise regression

Variables Entered/Removed**a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>egalitarian_new</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IC to HE (IF(AND(Morph=Style),1,0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: LSurugaPrmQ6Q8

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.229**a</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.98333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.301**b</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.96716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), egalitarian_new
*b. Predictors: (Constant), egalitarian_new, IC to HE (IF(AND(Morph=Style),1,0)

Coefficients**a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 egalitarian_new</td>
<td>-1.083</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-8.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 egalitarian_new</td>
<td>-1.964</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-2.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 IC to HE (IF(AND(Morph=Style),1,0)</td>
<td>-1.942</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>-3.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* a. Dependent Variable: LSurugaPrmQ6Q8

(Analyzed by Clarence Lee)
6. Conclusion

6.1 Effectiveness of advocacy

We found that the Advocacy web site had an impact to the customers’ behavior deeply. Generally we found three points in terms of effectiveness of advocacy. First, the basic condition was necessary before advocacy. Second, an advocacy web site had a strong positive impact to the customers’ behavior. Finally, a well-designed advocacy web site had a possibility to fill the gap of brand recognition or perception of products, which was built by advertisements with a lot of expense.

As the Advocacy pyramid (Figure 1) shows, the precondition of advocacy is needed. If the products were not attractive to the customer, the more customers knew about the provider, the less they chose their products. Actually, Company-A provided an attractive card loan that offered an easy and quick screening process in exchange of a higher interest rate, but that attribute didn’t attract panelists in this survey compared with other attributes, such as interest rate or higher borrowing limit. As a result, less people considered Company-A as their loan provider after the site visit. On the other hand, Company-O and Suruga Bank had a comprehensive product in terms of attractiveness, and got more responders, who considered them as their loan provider.

The advocacy site caused significant change in consideration for not only Company-O and Suruga Bank, but also for Company-A. If we assumed that each provider presented the site, the people who considered the provider increased significantly (More than double for Company-O and Suruga bank, and more than four times for Company-A) in spite of the same product provided. That’s meant that the customers considered their providers based
on not only the attractiveness of the products attributes, but also the trust for the firm.

In addition, compared with Company-O and Suruga Bank, there was a big difference before the site experience that was probably caused by the advertisements, but the difference disappeared after the site visit, because the products, which were provided by each company, had very similar attributes. It meant that the advocacy web site had potential power to make the existing firm’s position in the market void. It can be said that advocacy can be a key factor to rebuild the existing order of the firm in the market.

6.2 Effectiveness of morphing

We found three points about effectiveness of morphing. First, morphing was effective in terms of site evaluation. The more morphing available, the higher the visitors evaluated the site. Second, we couldn’t find obvious overall verification of correlation between morphing and probability of purchase, although there was a sign of relationship. Finally, we found some factors that affected the probability of purchase.

If the fixed morph site was provided randomly, the more morphing dimensions were matched to the panelists, the more points the panelists gave. There was a significant correlation between “number of morph matched” and “site evaluation”. The panelists regarded the more matched site as a good decision making tool. They also indicated that the more matched site was trustworthy. It can be said that the people felt comfortable if the site fit to their own cognitive or cultural style, and trusted it and recognized the value of the site. We can say that the idea of morphing was effective with this result of the research.

However, the correlation between “morphing” and “probability of purchase” was not
significant, though there was a sign of relationship. In fact, the probability of purchase increased significantly after the site visit for all three companies. One reason of this increase could be morphing, but there was probably another reason that affected a lot to the probability of purchase. I couldn’t clarify the important factors, that affected the probability of purchase in this research, and it will be a theme for future research.

Some interesting results from Clarence Lee’s analysis of this research data were that hierarchical people tended to purchase Suruga products, and the group of hierarchical people who browsed collectivistic site had a high probability of purchase. Those were the part of the factors, which affected the probability of purchase.

It is important to make a clear path from theoretical idea to economic value for the company who try to put theoretical idea into practice use. For that purpose, clarifying all factors is important and the factor analysis of probability of purchase will encourage the company to adopt the morphing web site in order to enhance their competitive advantage.
7. Future research

7.1 From fixed morph to dynamic morph

I conducted a survey with the fixed morphing web site, which provided the visitor a particular type of morph randomly. This was because the purpose of the survey of this stage was to make sure the effectiveness of the idea of morphing, and I needed to compare the responders who browsed the matched site to those who didn’t browse the matched site. However, the practical site should serve as a suitable site automatically, and we have to know the cognitive and cultural style of each visitor before we serve the particular morphing site, which fit to the visitor. The Professor Urban’s morphing research team’s approach for this matter was that we learn the visitor’s cognitive and cultural style by the visitor’s activity on the web site.

To realize this solution, we had to know the characteristics of each link to every page, and had to analyze which link was most likely to be clicked by the people with each cognitive style and cultural style. The morphing research team of Professor Urban had analyzed the characteristic of each link of the first three pages of the card loan-morphing site, which we used for this research, and put those data into the morphing engine. Now the dynamic morphing site was ready to test. I will conduct the next research with this dynamic morphing site, and make sure the effectiveness of it. I believe this research will bring the morphing site to the next practical level.

Also, there was another issue we had to solve. If we served the full morphing site, which would keep morphing as long as the visitor clicked, we might be able to serve the most suitable site for the visitor’s cognitive and cultural style. On the other hand, the full
morphing site may be bothersome for the visitor, because it changes its appearance too much. To avoid the visitors’ penalty, which is caused by too many morphs, we have to clarify the best timing to morph and the acceptable numbers of morph that visitors feel comfortable with. This will be a future research as well.

7.2 Practical contents creation for the morphing web site

The morphing web site I used for this research had 4 dimensions (2 cognitive dimensions and 2 cultural dimensions) and 2 levels (ex: Analytic or Holistic). Therefore, there should be at most 16 patterns (2 to the 4 power) for each page. However, if we wanted to add more dimensions or more levels (ex: Analytic, Even, or Holistic), we need a huge number of patterns for each page. Even just 16 patterns were difficult to create. To be put to practical use of the morphing web site, this was an inevitable problem.

Efficient contents creation can be a future theme of research for diffusion of the practical morphing web site. The contents bank, which gathers content parts saved and serves the site automatically, can be a good solution for it, but needs more improvement for a practical use of firm.

7.3 Site design for Suruga bank

This time, we created the card loan web site. There were many reasons why we focused on card loan. Although card loan is popular in the Japanese market, it is complicated with many alternatives and hassles to search, and if the consumer chooses the wrong product, the detriment of the consumer would be great. From Suruga bank’s point of view, card loan is
one of the most important products, and web marketing is critical to expand its business without physical bases such as branches. Therefore, effective card loan web site is a meaningful solution for Suruga bank.

We found that a web site created with the idea of "advocacy" and "morphing" could improve the customer experience. It would be a meaningful application for Suruga bank not only for the card loan business, but also for other important contents such as mortgage, or mutual fund business.

In fact, there are still a few unsolved issues in order to realize the advocacy and morphing web site. For example, especially for banking business, providing a competitor’s interest rate information in a morphing web site needs a lot of effort, because that information changes very frequently without notice. Those issues are necessary to be solved for implementing.

However, even allowing for those efforts, advocacy and morphing are attractive ideas to be realized in an applicative site. Those ideas have a potential power to change the order of the trade position in the industry.
Appendix 1 "Morphing patterns"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Tables and Graphs</th>
<th>8 version 2x2x2</th>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Holistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 2D detailed map</td>
<td>- 3D whole map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More attributes on list</td>
<td>- Less attributes on list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- With explanation for map</td>
<td>- No explanation for map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More choices on list</td>
<td>- Less choices on list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Calculators</th>
<th>2 version</th>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Holistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisors</th>
<th>Expert Advisor</th>
<th>8 version 2x2x2</th>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Holistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More choices on list</td>
<td>- Less choices on list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumers</th>
<th>Consumer Advisor</th>
<th>8 version 2x2x2</th>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Holistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More choices on list</td>
<td>- Less choices on list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
<th>Deliberative</th>
<th>Impulsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Single character photo</td>
<td>- Multiple characters photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recommended loans</td>
<td>- Popular loans fit for you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Forum</td>
<td>Consumer Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 version 2x2x2</td>
<td>8 version 2x2x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Holistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 6 categories</td>
<td>- 3 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliberative</th>
<th>Impulsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Long text</td>
<td>- Short text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No voting system</td>
<td>- Voting system - Result of vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Tracking History</th>
<th>Your Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Version (no morph)</td>
<td>1 Version (no morph)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic</th>
<th>Holistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 6 categories</td>
<td>- 3 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliberative</th>
<th>Impulsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Long text</td>
<td>- Short text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No voting system</td>
<td>- Voting system - Result of vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tell Us More About You</th>
<th>Deliberative</th>
<th>Impulsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Version (no morph)</td>
<td>- Long text</td>
<td>- Short text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No voting system</td>
<td>- Voting system - Result of vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Screen shots of test morphing site
Data

Card loan table

Payback planning calculators
2nd page- Advisor

Adviser

- Expert advisor
- Consumer advisor
Fast Solution

- Comparison chart of card loans
- Use examples of card loans
- Quick Application
Learn & Info

Basic info of card loan

Frequently asked question

Tips for card loan users
Personal

Personal track of the site visit

Tell us more about you
Full information including comparison with competitors (Advocacy)

2D detailed map (Analytic)

With explanation (Deliberative)
Full information including comparison with competitors (Advocacy)

3D whole map (Holistic)

No explanation (Holistic)
Full information including comparison with competitors (Advocacy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>銀行・消費者金融提携系</th>
<th>おすすめのローンを一覧表にしました。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>提供者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本政策金融公社</td>
<td>日本政策金融公社</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三菱東京UFJ銀行</td>
<td>三菱東京UFJ銀行</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More attributes (Analytic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>銀行系・信託系</th>
<th>おすすめのローンを一覧表にしました。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>提供者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>クレディークドカード</td>
<td>クレディークドカード</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>クレディークドカード</td>
<td>クレディークドカード</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More choices (Deliberative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>消費者金融系</th>
<th>おすすめのローンを一覧表にしました。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>提供者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三菱東京UFJ銀行</td>
<td>三菱東京UFJ銀行</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三菱東京UFJ銀行</td>
<td>三菱東京UFJ銀行</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51
Full information including comparison with competitors (Advocacy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>銀行・消費者金融関係一覧</th>
<th>提供者</th>
<th>申込上限金額 (円)</th>
<th>金利</th>
<th>領収書取得可能時間</th>
<th>備考</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>デリケートケース</td>
<td>スルガ銀行</td>
<td>300 9% 18%</td>
<td>新規は200万円まで</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>マッシュウェン</td>
<td>三菱東京DC התקלות</td>
<td>300 12% 18%</td>
<td>新規39時間</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>メトロライン</td>
<td>三井住友銀行の</td>
<td>100 18% 18%</td>
<td>新規30分</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>銀行系・信保系</th>
<th>提供者</th>
<th>申込上限金額 (円)</th>
<th>金利</th>
<th>領収書取得可能時間</th>
<th>備考</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wフレンズカード</td>
<td>オリックス</td>
<td>500 6.9% 17.6%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td>200万円以上は年金4年以内</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>サーフィンプラン</td>
<td>エルゴマビジオン</td>
<td>500 15% 15%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td>30万円まで</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>フジファイナンスプラン</td>
<td>みずほファイナンス</td>
<td>500 7.6% 7.6%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td>最小200万円は次年500万円以上,最大500万円は次年1000万円以上</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>消費者金融系</th>
<th>提供者</th>
<th>申込上限金額 (円)</th>
<th>金利</th>
<th>領収書取得可能時間</th>
<th>備考</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ダイソルローンディメン</td>
<td>シャイン</td>
<td>300 12.88% 17.88%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td>5年</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>テーラースリー</td>
<td>シンキ</td>
<td>200 15% 18%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td>7日間</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>フジファイナンスプラン</td>
<td>フジファイナンス</td>
<td>500 7.9% 7.9%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>有償無卡借入</th>
<th>提供者</th>
<th>申込上限金額 (円)</th>
<th>金利</th>
<th>領収書取得可能時間</th>
<th>備考</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ファミリー</td>
<td>みずほ銀行</td>
<td>1000 3.375% 3.375%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>エクスタス</td>
<td>サイバーエイズ</td>
<td>1000 3.5% 3.5%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>フジファイナンスプラン</td>
<td>エルゴマビジオン</td>
<td>1000 5.5% 15%</td>
<td>新規</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less attributes (Holistic)

Less choices (Impulsive)
Educational contents- the way to calculate interest rate (Advocacy)

Short text (Impulsive)
Spoken language (Egalitarian)

No example (Holistic)
Educational contents - the way to calculate interest rate (Advocacy)

Card Loan Guide

Card Loan Guide

Card Loan: Calculation of Interest Rate

Card loans are primarily calculated on a yearly basis, but in practice, they are charged monthly. Therefore, for the sake of understanding, and in order to actually pay it off, we need to make sure we understand how to calculate the interest rate.

The calculation of the interest rate is as follows:

1. Calculate the daily interest rate:
   \[ \text{Daily Interest Rate} = \frac{\text{Annual Interest Rate}}{365} \]

2. Calculate the interest for the actual number of days:
   \[ \text{Interest} = \text{Principal} \times \text{Daily Interest Rate} \times \text{Number of Days} \]

For example, if the principal is 20,000 yen, the annual interest rate is 15%, and the number of days is 30 days:

\[ \text{Interest} = 20,000 \times 0.15 \times \frac{30}{365} = 2,460 \text{ yen} \]
ユーザーレビュー (アドバイザー)

カードローンガイド

レビュー

タイトル：審査が厳しくないのはどこ？
By: たいち
2007-12-30

3人が少ないが、この書き込みは役に立ったと考えています。

投票システム (集団的)

コメント (2)
1. Posted by TAKU on Feb 6th, 08:56
センスは審査が結構緩めという話。融資額が大きくなれば低利やになるし、消費者金融ではなくセンスという安心感はやはり大きい。

2. Posted by おる on Feb 6th, 08:58
クレジットカードでも流通系や審査が緩く、銀行系ほど審査が厳しいのが Ebola。カードローンも同様に流通系のほうが審査が緩い。ユーザーのデータベースや審査基準は変わらないので当然といえば当然だが。
ユーザーのレビュー（アドバイス）

No voting system (Individual)

タイトル：審査が厳しくないのはどこ？

By: たいち
2007-12-30

1. Posted by TAKU on Feb 6th, 08:56
ユーザーは審査が簡単という説明。無義を大きくすれば低利がなくなる。無義の金融ではなくセゾンという安心感はやはり大きい。

2. Posted by ゆり on Feb 6th, 08:58
クレジットカードも対価を求める。銀行窓口は審査が厳しいのが定命。カードローンも同様に無義のほうが審査が緩い。ユーザーのデータベースや審査基準は変わらないので当然といえば当然だが。
Advisor that provides recommendation (Advocacy)

Card Loan Guide

Single character photo (Individual/Expert)
Advisor which provide recommendation (Advocacy)

Card Loan Guide

利用者アドバイザー

アドバイザーからひとこと
あなたは「手軽な審査」を重視すると答えました。
一般的に、これらのローンは金利が高いことが多
いです。（18%以上など）
一部のローンは、手軽さを追求する代わりに金利
がやや低い（10%以下など）ものもあります。
手軽さと同時に金利も重視しますか？
○ 手軽さが優先。
○ 金利が優先。

Multiple characters photo
(Collectivistic/Consumers)
教育内容- 利率差の効果（Advocacy）

カードローン・ガイド

金利差による効果

ローン返済の総支払い額は、金利によって大きく左右されます。低金利と高金利の違いをチェックしてみましょう。
以下の例だと金利が5％と20％では、同じ金額を借りて、毎月同じ金額ずつ返済しても、返済回数は2倍近くになります。
同じ条件で支払い総額を比べると、9倍以上の差になります。
これは極端な例ですが、金利の差によって大きな影響が出ることが分かります。

例定：
借入額：1,000,000円
月間返済額：20,000円

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>金利</th>
<th>返済回数</th>
<th>支払い利息総額</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57回返済 (4年5ヶ月)</td>
<td>￥123,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>85回返済 (5年8ヶ月)</td>
<td>￥258,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>98回返済 (6年7ヶ月)</td>
<td>￥579,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>106回返済 (9年1ヶ月)</td>
<td>￥1,168,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
あなたの返済計画には無理がないですか？
あなたの税引前の年収を入力して下さい。
（一般的に借入には200万円以上の年収が必要です。）

1000万円（年収）
今回のカードローンの月々の返済額を入力して下さい。

3万円（毎月）
今回のカードローン以外の借入（住宅ローン、マイカーローンなど）があれば、その年間返済額を入力して下さい。

200万円（年間）

返済計画診断結果：安全面です
（あなたの返済比率は23.60％です）
返済回数を計算しない場合はここをクリック！
Payment simulation which is necessary for purchase decision (Advocacy)
Appendix 3

Survey questionnaires

Note:
This is an English translation for survey questionnaires.
Actual survey was conducted in Japanese
SECTION 1: Screening Questions (Note to SURVEY PROVIDER)

The first part of the survey is to screen out individuals who don’t fit Suruga’s target profile.

If answer of SQ1 was 20 or more, and any one of the answers for SQ2 or SQ6 was “Yes”, then participant continues with the pre- and post-survey. If SQ1 was less than 20, or both answers for SQ2 and SQ6 were “No”, terminate survey.
Instructions:

Our first several questions are for qualification/screening purposes and they enable us to select individuals who meet our target profile to participate in the survey.

SQ1. What is your age? ( ) years old
(If the answer for SQ1 was less than 20, terminate this survey.)

SQ2. Have you ever had card loan account?
1. Yes, I had card loan account more than 5 years ago, but I closed it already.
2. Yes, I had card loan account less than 5 years ago, but I closed it already.
3. Yes, I have card loan account now.
4. No, I have never had.

(If the answer for SQ2 was “1”, “2”, and “3”, then ask this question.)

SQ3. Have you ever used card loan?
1. Yes, I had used it more than 5 years ago.
2. Yes, I had used it less than 5 years ago.
3. Yes, I am using it now.
4. No, I have never used it.

(If the answer for SQ2 was “1”, “2”, or “3”, then ask this question.)

SQ4. What kind of card loan did you have (do you have)? Check all that apply.
1. Card loan offered by bank
2. Card loan offered by bank and consumer finance
3. Card loan offered by credit finance
4. Card loan offered by consumer finance
5. Others ( )

(If the answer for SQ2 was “1”, “2”, or “3”, then ask this question.)

SQ5. How many card loans do you have now? ( )

(If the answer for SQ2 was “4”, then ask this question.)

SQ6. Are you considering a card loan in the near future?
1. Yes
2. No

(If the answer for SQ6 was “2. No”, terminate this survey.)

SECTION 2: Pre-Survey

CARD LOAN CONSIDERATION, OPINION, PREFERENCE AND ACQUISITION INTENTIONS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our survey being conducted to help us better understand your card loan preferences. This survey will take approximately 25 - 30 minutes to complete.

Please read each question carefully before answering it. Even if you are not certain about the exact answer to a question, mark the answer that is closest to your opinion and go to the next question. Your responses will be kept in the strictest of confidence.

Thank you for your time and effort!

First, we would like to know your consideration, opinions, preferences and acquisition intentions for card loan services. This section will take you approximately 5 minutes to complete. Next, you will be asked to click on a link that will take you to another Website. It takes about 10 minutes to review the site. After reviewing this site we will ask you to indicate your reactions to the site. This will take about 7 minutes. Finally we will ask you a few demographic questions that will take less than 5 minutes.

Caution!

Please browse the site enough and carefully in order to have a meaningful answer for the survey. Otherwise (if we make a judgment that you don’t have enough experience), you may not be eligible for the survey. We are taking a record of your visit history. We will ask some questions about the site after the site experience.

For the people who are using a card loan now,

Please browse the site and answer the question as if you have refinanced the loan.

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER - Please present this “Caution!” and “For the people who is using car loan now” as a kind of agreement require the subject to check a box for “I agree” before they can proceed to the next question.)
Consideration
Q1. From the list of providers below, which provider would you consider as a possible provider for a card loan?

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______

[If they choose more than 5 providers in Q1]
Q1a. You stated that you would consider __________. Of these providers, which are the top five you consider as possible providers for your next card loan?

**CHOOSE FIVE**

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______

**Opinion**

Q2. Now we would like to understand your opinion of providers that you have indicated you would consider.
You will be presented with the list of providers you have chosen and a statement that may or may not describe these providers. Please read each statement and using the scale below as a guide, tell us if you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to the providers listed.

1- Strongly Disagree  
2- Disagree  
3- Neutral (Neither Disagree nor Agree)  
4- Agree  
5- Strongly Agree

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER: This section includes each of the providers that the respondent has chosen in the consideration question. If the respondent chose more than 5 providers in consideration question 1 above, we may need to prompt them to give the top 5 providers they would consider. List the provider selected and then the 5-point agree-disagree scale. Repeat for each of the providers selected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I trust the provider</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The provider offers service at a better values</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The provider offers more flexibility in loan screening</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The provider offers speedier in loan screening.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The provider offers better interest rate.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The provider is open, honest, and transparent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The provider is willing to assist and support me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would recommend this provider to a friend.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preference Rating of Providers Considered

Q3. Please rank the providers you have selected in order of your preference for your card loan. Assume you have been given 100 chips. Please allocate the chips among the providers you have chosen in terms of order of preference. Allocate more points to the providers that you are more likely to obtain a card loan from and fewer points to the providers less likely to obtain a card loan. Please be sure to enter values that sum to 100.

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER -- Site should be able to show the providers provided here and a space next to the plans for entering chip amount. Survey should also be able to tell the respondent how many chips are left each time an amount is input. This is a typical constant sum preference task)

Purchase Intentions/Likelihood of Purchase

Q4. Now we would like to understand how likely you are to acquire a card loan from each provider in which you have indicated an interest.

For each provider, please rate on a scale of 0-10 your likelihood of acquiring a card loan in the next 5 years.

10. Certain, Practically certain (99 chances out of 100)
  9. Almost sure (9 chances out of 10)
  8. Very probable (8 chances out of 10)
  7. Probable (7 chances out of 10)
  6. Good Possibility (6 chances out of 10)
  5. Fairly good possibility (5 chances out of 10)
  4. Fair possibility (4 chances out of 10)
  3. Some possibility (3 chances out of 10)
  2. Slight possibility (2 chances out of 10)
  1. Very slight possibility (1 chance out of 10)
  0. No chance, almost no chance (0 out of 100)

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER: List providers that respondent selected and the 11 point scale for each plan)
SECTION 3: Experiencing the Website

Now we would like you to experience a Website, which has information about loans in order to help you make the best decision for you. Please act as if you are looking to acquire a provider loan. If you already have a card loan, go to the site and browse the site as you would if you were switching to another card loan provider.

Click on the below URL to access the Website.

Caution!
Please browse the site enough and carefully in order to have a meaningful answer for the survey. Otherwise (if we make a judgment that you don’t have enough experience), you may not be eligible for the survey. We are taking a record of your visit history. We will ask some questions about the site after the site experience.

SECTION 4: Site Evaluation (Navigation, Ease of Use, Advice, Etc)

Q5. For each statement below, please indicate the number that best indicates your level of agreement.

Site Characteristics: Navigation/Ease of Use etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  The site is easy to use.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The site provides accurate and relevant information.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The site provides me with sufficient information to make a decision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The site has useful support tools (such as a calculator or planner).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Card loan offerings can easily be compared. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The site is helpful to me in reaching my acquisition decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I enjoyed the overall experience of the site. 1 2 3 4 5
8. This site appears to be more trustworthy than other sites I have visited. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I would acquire a card loan at this site. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I would recommend this site to a friend. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I would bookmark this site. 1 2 3 4 5
12. The advisor on this site asked me too many questions. 1 2 3 4 5
13. To recommend more suitable loan packages, I would be willing to answer more questions. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The content was written in a way that I found very appealing. 1 2 3 4 5
15. The information and content was presented in a way that I am most comfortable with. 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION 5: Post-Survey
Post Site Visit: Consideration, Opinion and Acquisition Intentions

Post Visit Consideration

Q6. Assuming that Orix brought you this website, which providers would you now consider from the list of providers below, as a card loan provider?

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______

[If they choose more than 5 providers in Q6]

Q6a. You stated that you would consider ________. Of these providers, which are the top five you consider as possible providers for your next card loan?

**CHOOSE FIVE**

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______

Post Visit Opinion

Q7. Now we would like to understand your opinion of Orix after visiting the website.

You will be presented with a statement that may or may not describe Orix. Please read each statement and using the scale below as a guide, tell us if you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to Orix.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral (Neither Disagree nor Agree)
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I trust Orix</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Orix offers service at a better values</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Orix offers more flexibility in loan screening</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Orix offers speedier in loan screening.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Orix offers better interest rate.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Orix is open, honest, and transparent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Orix is willing to assist and support me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would recommend Orix to a friend.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post Visit Rating of Providers Considered**

Q8. Please rank the providers you have selected in Q6 in order of your preference for your card loan. Assume you have been given 100 chips. Please allocate the chips among the providers you have chosen in terms of order of preference. Allocate more points to the providers that you are more likely to obtain a card loan from and fewer points to the providers less likely to obtain a card loan. Please be sure to enter values that sum to 100.

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER -- Site should be able to show the providers provided here and a space next to the plans for entering chip amount. Survey should also be able to tell the respondent how many chips are left each time an amount is input. This is a typical constant sum preference task)

**Post Visit Intentions/Likelihood of Purchase from Providers that brought you the Website**

Q9. We are interested in your chances of acquiring a card loan from Orix given the information provided in the Website you have just viewed. On the following scale, how probable is it that you would acquire a card loan package that you have learned about on the site?

Please rate on a scale of 0-10 your likelihood of acquiring a card loan from Orix.
10. Certain, Practically certain (99 chances out of 100)
9. Almost sure (9 chances out of 10)
8. Very probable (8 chances out of 10)
7. Probable (7 chances out of 10)
6. Good Possibility (6 chances out of 10)
5. Fairly good possibility (5 chances out of 10)
4. Fair possibility (4 chances out of 10)
3. Some possibility (3 chances out of 10)
2. Slight possibility (2 chances out of 10)
1. Very slight possibility (1 chance out of 10)
0. No chance, almost no chance (0 out of 100)

(Now for Suruga)

Q6. Assuming that Suruga bank brought you this website, which providers would you now consider from the list of providers below, as a card loan provider?

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______

[If they choose more than 5 providers in Q6]

**Q6a.** You stated that you would consider __________. Of these providers, which are the top five you consider as possible providers for your next card loan?

**CHOOSE FIVE**

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______

Post Visit Opinion

Q7. Now we would like to understand your opinion of Suruga bank after visiting the website.

You will be presented with a statement that may or may not describe Suruga bank. Please read each statement and using the scale below as a guide, tell us if you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to Suruga bank.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral (Neither Disagree nor Agree)
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I trust Suruga bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suruga bank offers service at a better values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suruga bank offers more flexibility in loan screening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suruga bank offers speedier in loan screening.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suruga bank offers better interest rate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Suruga bank is open, honest, and transparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suruga bank is willing to assist and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
support me.

8. I would recommend Suruga bank to a friend.  

1 2 3 4 5

Post Visit Rating of Providers Considered

Q8. Please rank the providers you have selected in Q6 in order of your preference for your card loan. Assume you have been given 100 chips. Please allocate the chips among the providers you have chosen in terms of order of preference. Allocate more points to the providers that you are more likely to obtain a card loan from and fewer points to the providers less likely to obtain a card loan. Please be sure to enter values that sum to 100.

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER -- Site should be able to show the providers provided here and a space next to the plans for entering chip amount. Survey should also be able to tell the respondent how many chips are left each time an amount is input. This is a typical constant sum preference task)

Post Visit Intentions/Likelihood of Purchase from Providers that brought you the Website

Q9. We are interested in your chances of acquiring a card loan from Suruga bank given the information provided in the Website you have just viewed. On the following scale, how probable is it that you would acquire a card loan package that you have learned about on the site?

Please rate on a scale of 0-10 your likelihood of acquiring a card loan from Suruga bank.

10. Certain, Practically certain (99 chances out of 100)
9. Almost sure (9 chances out of 10)
8. Very probable (8 chances out of 10)
7. Probable (7 chances out of 10)
6. Good Possibility (6 chances out of 10)
5. Fairly good possibility (5 chances out of 10)
4. Fair possibility (4 chances out of 10)
3. Some possibility (3 chances out of 10)
2. Slight possibility (2 chances out of 10)
1. Very slight possibility (1 chance out of 10)
0. No chance, almost no chance (0 out of 100)

(Now for Acom)

Q6. Assuming that Acom brought you this website, which providers would you now consider from the list of providers below, as a card loan provider?

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other ______
[If they choose more than 5 providers in Q6]

Q6a. You stated that you would consider __________. Of these providers, which are the top five you consider as possible providers for your next card loan?

**CHOOSE FIVE**

1. Rakuten
2. Orix
3. Orico
4. JCB
5. Mitsubishi Tokyo UFJ Bank
6. Mitsui Sumitomo Bank
7. Mizuho Bank
8. Resona Bank
9. Suruga Bank
10. Japan net Bank
11. Cyuo Mitsui Trust Bank
12. Sumitomo Trust Bank
13. Lake
14. Promise
15. Acom
16. Aiful
17. Dic
18. Shinki
19. Takefuji
20. Mobit
21. @Loan
22. Cash One
23. Other _______
Post Visit Opinion

Q7. Now we would like to understand your opinion of Acom after visiting the website.

You will be presented with a statement that may or may not describe Acom. Please read each statement and using the scale below as a guide, tell us if you agree or disagree with the statement as it pertains to Acom.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral (Neither Disagree nor Agree)
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I trust Acom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acom offers service at a better values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acom offers more flexibility in loan screening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acom offers speedier in loan screening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acom offers better interest rate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Acom is open, honest, and transparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acom is willing to assist and support me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would recommend this Acom to a friend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post Visit Rating of Providers Considered

Q8. Please rank the providers you have selected in Q6 in order of your preference for your card loan. Assume you have been given 100 chips. Please allocate the chips among the providers you have chosen in terms of order of preference. Allocate more points to the
providers that you are more likely to obtain a card loan from and fewer points to the providers
less likely to obtain a card loan. Please be sure to enter values that sum to 100.

(Note to SURVEY PROVIDER -- Site should be able to show the providers provided here and a
space next to the plans for entering chip amount. Survey should also be able to tell the
respondent how many chips are left each time an amount is input. This is a typical constant
sum preference task)

Post Visit Intentions/Likelihood of Purchase from Providers that brought you the
Website

Q9. We are interested in your chances of acquiring a card loan from Acom given the information
provided in the Website you have just viewed. On the following scale, how probable is it that
you would acquire a card loan package that you have learned about on the site?

Please rate on a scale of 0-10 your likelihood of acquiring a card loan from Acom.

10. Certain, Practically certain (99 chances out of 100)
9. Almost sure (9 chances out of 10)
8. Very probable (8 chances out of 10)
7. Probable (7 chances out of 10)
6. Good Possibility (6 chances out of 10)
5. Fairly good possibility (5 chances out of 10)
4. Fair possibility (4 chances out of 10)
3. Some possibility (3 chances out of 10)
2. Slight possibility (2 chances out of 10)
1. Very slight possibility (1 chance out of 10)
0. No chance, almost no chance (0 out of 100)
**SECTION 6: Consumer Characteristics and Demographics**

We are interested in learning more about your cognitive and cultural style. You will be presented with a list of statements that may or may not describe you. Please read each statement and using the scale below as a guide, tell us if you agree or disagree with the statements as it pertains to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m usually afraid to express disagreement with my superiors or important persons</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer planning before acting</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In choosing my ideal job it would be very important to have sufficient time for my personal life</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see what I read in mental pictures</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I buy products in order to differentiate myself from other people</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying products for my family and friends is more important to me than buying things for myself</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree (+2 C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Agree (+1 C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Undecided (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Disagree (+1 I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Strongly disagree (+2 I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am detailed oriented, and start with the details in order to build a complete picture</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree (+2 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Agree (+1 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Undecided (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Disagree (+1 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Strongly disagree (+2 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value mostly experts’ opinions when I buy a product</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree (+2 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Agree (+1 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Undecided (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Disagree (+1 E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Strongly disagree (+2 E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy deciphering graphs, charts and diagrams about products and services</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree (+2 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Agree (+1 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Undecided (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Disagree (+1 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Strongly disagree (+2 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like detailed explanations</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree (+2 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Agree (+1 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Undecided (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Disagree (+1 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Strongly disagree (+2 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m usually more interested in parts and details than in the whole</td>
<td>○ Strongly agree (+2 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Agree (+1 A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Undecided (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Disagree (+1 H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Strongly disagree (+2 H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think authority and leadership are very important in my life

- Strongly agree (+2 H)
- Agree (+1 H)
- Undecided (0)
- Disagree (+1 E)
- Strongly disagree (+2 E)

I like to make purchases without thinking too much about the consequences

- Strongly agree (+2 I)
- Agree (+1 I)
- Undecided (0)
- Disagree (+1 D)
- Strongly disagree (+2 D)

I will read an explanation of a graphic/chart before I try to understand the graph/chart on my own

- Strongly agree (+2 A)
- Agree (+1 A)
- Undecided (0)
- Disagree (+1 H)
- Strongly disagree (+2 H)

(Shane’s Questions - Measures Deliberative vs. Impulsive)

1. A bat and a ball cost $1.10 in total. The bat costs $1.00 more than the ball. How much does the ball cost? [ENTER CENTS]
   ___ Cents

2. If it takes 5 machines 5 minutes to produce 5 widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to produce 100 widgets? [ENTER MINUTES]
   ____ minutes

3. In a lake, there is a patch of lily pads. Every day the patch doubles in size. If it takes 48 days for the patch to cover the lake, how long would it take for the patch to cover half of the lake? [ENTER DAYS]
   ____ days
DEMOGRAPHICS

DQ1: What is your gender?
1. Male
2. Female

DQ2: What is your level of education?
1. High school graduate or less
2. Carrier College, Junior College graduate
3. Undergraduate degree
4. Advanced degree

DQ3: Family and children
1. Unmarried
2. Married, no child
3. Married, with child(ren)

SECTION 7: Site Survey

Open ended Questions related to the card loan Site

01. What did you think of this site?

02. What did you like most about the site?

03. What did you like least about the site?

04. What would you tell a friend about the site?

05. Do you trust the site? And if not, what would be useful to build your trust for the site?
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