J Financ Serv Mark (2017) 22:97–98
DOI 10.1057/s41264-017-0032-7

EDITORIAL

Editorial

Tina Harrison[1]

© Macmillan Publishers Ltd 2017

In this third issue of volume 22, I am delighted to present the following five papers. In the first paper, *Click me: An examination of the impact size, color, and design has on banner advertisements generating clicks,* Michael North and Michael Ficorolli examine which features of insurance banner ads are most likely to generate click-through. Since the advent of the internet, advertising has increasingly moved online. Banner ads are now so prevalent that many consumers find them annoying and typically ignore them or block them using ad-blocking software. Indeed, the authors note that the average click-through rate is less than 1%. For insurance, which is largely an unsought product, advertising is particularly important. A key question for insurance companies, though, is how to ensure their banner ad stands out from the crowd and generates the all-important click-through.

Based on an analysis of weekly performance of 22,978 instances of banner ad placements used by the same insurance company throughout 2016, North and Ficorolli examine the impact of three variables pertaining to design—size, colour and static versus animated—on users click-through rates. The study focuses primarily on design as the key aspect that grabs the attention of consumers. The authors acknowledge that a banner advertisement's message and content are important, but this did not form the key focus of the study. However, the authors note that the messages within the banner advertisements in the sample were relatively constant.

The study finds that size is important in generating clicks, but larger is not always better. The optimal size seemed to be 300 × 250 pixels. In fact, average clicks increased from ad sizes of 728 × 90 (the smallest size under review) up to 300 × 250 and then gradually decreased as ad sizes increased. Colour also seems to be important, with blue ads generating more than four times as many clicks on average as red banner advertisements. Moreover, banner advertisements featuring a photograph generated three times more clicks on average than red banner ads. Finally, static designs seem to be favoured over animated designs. Static banner ads generated almost twice as many clicks as animated banner ads. These findings should be of use to insurance companies attempting to improve the click-through rate of banner ads.

In the second paper, *Reactions of dissatisfied investors: Exit, voice or loyalty*, Muge Tasci and Ozlem Ozdemir examine the reactions of individual investors that invested in the stocks of companies that have subsequently been delisted from the stock market. In common with other consumers, investors may experience dissatisfaction following an investment. Whilst some investors may be dissatisfied due to fluctuations in stock prices, investors may also be adversely affected when the stock they have invested in is delisted from the stock exchange. The implications of this may extend far beyond the individual to the stock market participation in general. Hence, understanding the reactions of investors in such situations is useful in understanding broader investment behaviour. The study specifically examines the factors determining the likelihood of three potential outcomes: exit (withdrawal of investment); voice (voicing complaint or dissatisfaction); or loyalty (remaining true to the investment). The authors note a lack of studies focusing on investment failure in the behavioural finance literature. This paper therefore provides a useful contribution from a marketing/psychological perspective.

Based on a survey of 67 investors of Borsa Istanbul, and using multinomial logistic regression, the authors find

✉ Tina Harrison
Tina.Harrison@ed.ac.uk

[1] University of Edinburgh Business School, 29 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh EH8 9JS, UK

several key factors determining investors' reactions, with perceived knowledge about the stock market being the most important factor affecting how investors react. Investors with higher perceived knowledge exhibited a higher tendency towards loyalty (to continue investing), whereas more experienced investors exhibited a higher tendency to complain (voice). The authors suggest a role for financial education to improve the knowledge of individual investors.

The third and fifth papers in this issue focus on financial services apps. The use of mobile banking and financial services apps has increased tremendously in recent years. In the UK alone, the British Banking Association reported that downloads of mobile banking apps in 2016 were 25% higher than the previous year, and log-ins to mobile apps were 50% higher over the same period. The convenience of financial services apps no doubt contributes to this increased use, but improvements in security features, such as fingerprint ID, are also helping to increase the confidence of users too. Given the rise of use in financial services apps, it is appropriate to consider what contributes towards greater app service quality and app satisfaction.

In the third paper, *App service: How do consumers perceive the quality of financial service apps on smart devices?*, Emily Treen, Leyland Pitt and John Bredican use an adapted version of SERVQUAL to identify service quality dimensions of financial services apps. The authors note that apps on smart devices have changed the character of service in many ways including the nature of service quality. Based on data gathered from an online survey of 194 users of financial services apps recruited using MTurk, the analysis revealed three dimensions specific to app service quality: reliability, personal and visible. The study indicates that consumers are reasonably satisfied with the quality of service provided by their financial apps and prefer them to visits to service providers' physical locations. Examination of the specific characteristics of the three dimensions of reliability, personal and visibles will enable financial services firms to understand how to better enhance the quality of their apps.

Still on the topic of app quality and satisfaction, the final paper, *Financial Services Apps: What Makes the Difference between a Great and a Ghastly Review?* by Joseph Vella, Åsa Wallström and Mana Farshid, considers app reviews as a means of understanding customer perceptions of financial services apps. The authors note, evidence from mobile device studies, suggests that consumers often rely on app reviews and consider star ratings before deciding to install an app. Mobile app reviews would therefore seem to have a major impact on the potential success of an app. Taking six of the most popular financial services apps on Apple's App Store as the sample, the study provides an analysis of app reviews using DICTION software.

App reviews were categorized as either favourable or unfavourable based on the overall star rating. Detailed analysis of the text revealed the terms often associated with positive and negative reviews. Average word size, as well the use of unique words, seems to be highly correlated with favourable reviews. Accomplishment, motion, optimism and certainty were predominantly expressed in positive reviews, whereas ambivalence and temporal terms were prevalent in negative reviews. Human interest seemed to be uniformly distributed between both types of reviews, perhaps suggesting that this can have both a positive and negative dimension.

The fourth paper in this issue, *Reducing the distance: Financial services education in web-extended learning environments*, by Pierre Berthon, Tamara Rabinovich and Ivan Fedorenko addresses whether virtual technology can deliver a comparable quality of financial services educational experience to face-to-face teaching using the theory of transactional distance.

The theory of transactional distance postulates that for optimal learning, the cognitive gap between instructor(s) and learner(s) needs to be minimized. Employing a four-dimensional operationalization of the dialog construct (i.e. student–instructor, student–student, student–content and student–interface), the authors empirically examine how dialog and overall transactional distance vary according to attendance modality (i.e. in-class, online and blended). The sample consisted of 235 graduate students enrolled in 14 financial services courses at a single US university.

The courses were delivered in a synchronous Web-extended format in which live on-campus face-to-face classes are delivered simultaneously to students on campus and remote students on the Web, who attend the classes via Web-conferencing software. Data were gathered via surveys distributed in class and online to evaluate the differences in the students' perceived overall transactional distance in each financial services course among the three attendance modes. The findings reveal that although transactional distance nominally appeared to increase with virtual attendance, in practice the difference among the three attendance modes was not significant. However, types of interaction differed in their influence on transactional distance by attendance mode, suggesting that some forms of interaction are more effective in some modes of delivery in reducing transactional distance. The authors conclude that in less traditional learning settings with greater reliance on remote technology, financial services content plays a less important role in students' educational experiences compared with the method of conveying the content. The authors suggest that transactional distance in online settings may be minimized by improving the technology confidence skills of online students.

Tina Harrison
Editor