# Vicariously Touching Products through Observing Others' Hand Actions Increases Purchasing Intention, and the Effect of Visual Perspective in This Process: An fMRI Study

Yi Liu <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup>\* Xuelian Zang, <sup>1,2</sup> Lihan Chen, <sup>3</sup> Leonardo Assumpção, <sup>2</sup> and Hong Li<sup>1,4</sup>\*

 <sup>1</sup>College of Psychology and Sociology and Shenzhen Key Laboratory of Affective and Social Cognitive Science, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, 518060, China
 <sup>2</sup>General and Experimental Psychology, Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich, 80539, Germany
 <sup>3</sup>School of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences and Beijing Key Laboratory of Behavior and Mental Health, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
 <sup>4</sup>Center for Intelligence Development and Protection, Shenzhen Institute of Neuroscience, Shenzhen, 518057, China

**Abstract:** The growth of online shopping increases consumers' dependence on vicarious sensory experiences, such as observing others touching products in commercials. However, empirical evidence on whether observing others' sensory experiences increases purchasing intention is still scarce. In the present study, participants observed others interacting with products in the first- or third-person perspective in video clips, and their neural responses were measured with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). We investigated (1) whether and how vicariously touching certain products affected purchasing intention, and the neural correlates of this process; and (2) how visual perspective interacts with vicarious tactility. Vicarious tactile experiences were manipulated by hand actions touching or not touching the products, while the visual perspective was manipulated by showing the hand actions either in first- or third-person perspective. During the fMRI scanning, participants watched the video clips and rated their purchasing intention for each product. The results showed that, observing others touching (vs. not touching) the products increased purchasing intention, with vicarious neural responses found in mirror neuron systems (MNS) and lateral occipital complex (LOC). Moreover, the stronger neural activities in MNS was associated with higher purchasing intention. The effects of visual perspectives were found in left superior parietal lobule (SPL), while the interaction of tactility and visual perspective was shown in precuneus and

Key words: vicarious experience; purchasing intention; mirror neuron system; visual perspective; fMRI

## INTRODUCTION

"Sensory marketing" refers to a type of strategy used to promote products consumption by delivering product's sensory information to potential consumers. The term emphasizes the importance of the role played by sensory experiences in consumer behavior [Krishna, 2012; Krishna and Schwarz, 2014]. In traditional shopping, firsthand sensory experience is important for product judgments. For example, consumers are more confident in their attitude towards a product when they can touch it, rather than otherwise [Peck and Childers, 2003]. However, not all types of shopping outlets enable their consumers to engage in direct sensory experiences, such as online stores. The continuous growth of online shopping requires retailers to generate new forms of virtual tactile inputs to improve consumer's shopping experience and increase purchasing intention. This issue could be addressed by inducing vicarious tactile experiences, for example, by showing others' experiences with the products of interest.

To date a few studies have attempted to deliver product's sensory information, however by asking participants to deliberately imagine the sensations they could have from the products. For example, Escalas [2004] used advertisement texts to encourage a group of consumers to imagine themselves upgaving 8(to)4(visionselveralides) 24

imagine themselves wearingim6.8(to)4(vicimselvcrelides)-347.3(in)4844.1(theim6.ades.)]TJT\*[(Ini)7555849(gnorep)4696.[(shides)-776.9(a)551

ele37179.pt0(r)2276(et0(se-418.el1779(ntir36422(st)-558.ud)-166.y.)-36414.T(to)5698(4n)1796xiltb7422trortbs36422(st0(e)1798.i)1691(son1698(ry)

interactions with products. In doing so, we aimed to investigate whether and how observing others' hand actions (i.e., touch vs. no-touch) towards a product affect purchasing intention, and what the neural correlates underlying this process are. Regarding vicarious experience, it is known that it helps us understand others' physical sensations, action intention and emotional states during social interaction[Gallese et al., 2004; Iacoboni and Dapretto, 2006]. In the same vein, vicariously experiencing a product might be helpful to infer its sensory features, which may contribute to purchasing intention. Therefore, we hypothesize that vicariously touching a product through observing others' hand actions will increase purchasing intention. What is more, vicarious neural responses should be found in MNS (i.e., premotor cortex, somatosensory cortex) and correlated with the increased purchasing intention.

In addition, previous research demonstrated that vicarious motor and sensory experiences, and the corresponding neural responses are sensitive to visual perspectives (i.e., first-person perspective (1PP) or third-person perspective (3PP)). However, the neural representation of visual perspective and its effects on vicarious experiences in previous findings have been mixed. Jackson et al. [2006] showed that 1PP observation of non-object-directed/ intransitive actions induced stronger neural activities in motor cortex than 3PP did, thus suggesting that 1PP facilitated vicarious motor representation in the brain. Similarly, observing painful stimulation on others' hand in 1PP also increased observer's somatosensory activation compared to the 3PP condition, suggesting that 1PP enhances vicarious neural representation of sensations [Canizales et al., 2013]. Schaefer et al. [2009] on the other hand, showed that both 1PP and 3PP observation activated somatosensory cortex during observation of touch, but that 1PP observation involved the anterior part of the primary sensory cortex, while 3PP involved the posterior part. In addition to the motor and somatosensory neural activities mentioned above, 1PP (vs. 3PP) action observation or imitation showed activation of cuneus, while 3PP (vs. 1PP) action imitation activated lingual gyrus, surperior occipital gyrus and inferior frontal gyrus [Jackson et al., 2006]. In Ruby and Decety [2001], simulating actions in 1PP (vs. 3PP) activated the inferior parietal lobule and somatosensory cortex in the left hemisphere. While 3PP (vs. 1PP) action simulation activated the precuneus, posterior cingulate, right inferior parietal, and frontopolar cortex [Ruby and Decety, 2001]. In a behavioral study, Vandenbroucke et al. [2015] asked participants to observe the hand of an actor being stimulated with painful input in the 1PP or 3PP, while the participants themselves received a vibrotactile stimulation on their own hand in 75% of the trials. Participants' task was to report whether they felt the vibrotactile stimulation. False alarmed detection of the stimulation (i.e., reporting presence of vibration when it was actually absent) was regarded as vicarious tactile experiences. The results showed that 1PP (vs. 3PP)

increased the correct detection of the vibrotactile stimulation, while the vicarious experience was unaffected by visual perspective. Ultimately, the collection of mixed findings demonstrate that the role of visual perspective can vary depending on the nature of the vicarious experiences (actions, pain, touch, etc.), and a broad region of the brain is involved in perspective taking. Therefore, such variability raises the questions as to whether the visual perspective (during the observation of others' hand action towards a product) may interact with vicarious tactile experiences and benefit purchasing intention, and which brain regions are involved. To answer these questions, the hand actions presented in this study were viewed by participants either in 1PP or 3PP. In addition, after identification of the brain regions sensitive to the interaction between vicarious tactility and visual perspective, how these regions connected with other brain regions, and how the connectivity were modulated by vicarious tactility, visual perspective and the interaction of them were also explored.

To sum up, the aims of the current study are to investigate (1) whether and how observing others' hand interactions with products affect purchasing intention, and its neural correlates; and (2) the effect of visual perspective in this process. We used video clips exhibiting products (common objects or food) with hand actions as stimuli. Vicarious tactility was manipulated using hand actions operating the products (referred to as touch), compared with hand actions around the products (referred to as no-touch). Visual perspective was manipulated by showing the hand actions in 1PP or 3PP. Participants watched the video clips and made judgments about their purchasing intention for each product. Using fMRI, vicarious neural activities were accessed and associated with self-reported purchasing intention. We hypothesize that vicarious tactile experiences (touch vs. notouch) will increase purchasing intention. Moreover, we predict that this process will be associated with vicarious neural responses in MNS. Last but not least, we will shed light on the effect of visual perspectives (1PP and 3PP) on vicarious neural responses and purchasing intention.

### METHOD

#### **Participants**

Twenty-five participants (age range = 19-28, M = 22.60, SD = 2.84 years, 13 females) were recruited as paid volunteers. All were right-handed and had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Written informed consent was given prior to participation. This study was approved by the ethics committee of Peking University.

#### **Stimuli and Procedure**

Fifty-six products (28 types of food and 28 objects; see Supporting Information for itemized list) were used for purchasing intention rating. Each product was exhibited





(a) Example of one of the products shown in the touch (TA) vs. no-touch actions (NTA) in either IPP or 3PP, which resulted in 4 conditions (TA-IPP, NTA-IPP, TA-3PP, NTA-3PP). Each product was randomly assigned to only one of the conditions for each subject. (b) behavioral results for purchasing intention in different conditions. (c) behavioral results for subjective rating

with hand movements in a 3 seconds (s) video clip. A 2  $\times$  2 factorial design with Tactility (touch action (TA) vs. no-touch action (NTA)) and Perspective (1PP vs. 3PP) was adopted in the current experiment. Tactility was manipulated by showing the stimulus hands touching or not touching the products, whereas perspective was manipulated by showing the actions in 1PP or 3PP (see Fig. 1a for an illustration). The 56 products were randomly assigned to 4 conditions (TA-1PP, NTA-1PP, TA-3PP, NTA-3PP) for each subject. Each product was shown only once to each subject, resulting in 14 trials in each condition. The results of the 2 (TA vs. NTA)  $\times$  2 (1PP vs. 3PP) ANOVA on the market price of the products confirmed that the price of the products in 4 conditions were matched (ps > 0.4).

The fMRI experimental procedure was designed in a slow event-related manner in 2 functional scans. For each trial, a 3s video clip  $(4.2^{\circ} \times 2.7^{\circ})$  was presented on a black background at the center of the screen with the name of the product above the video to help participants recognize the product. In the sequence a 4-point Likert scale in white letters was presented for 3s. The four numbers (i.e., 1,2,3,4) on the screen corresponded to the four buttons present in two response boxes (2 buttons per response box). The four buttons were held by participants with two fingers of each

on preferences, demands and familiarity to the products in different conditions. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. TA: touch action; NTA: no-touch action; IPP: first-person perspective; 3PP: third-person perspective; \*P < 0.05. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

hand (i.e., left-middle, left-index, right-index, right-middle). Participants had to press a button to make a judgment as to what extent they would like to buy the presented product (i.e., 1: not at all, 4: very much). After the button press, the corresponding choice number on the screen changed into green. Thereafter, a central fixation cross was presented for nine seconds, followed by the next trial.

After the fMRI scanning, pictures of each product (without hand actions) were shown to the participants at the center of the screen. Participants were asked to rate their preference, demand and familiarity to each product using 8-point scales (1: not at all, 8: very much). Three of the eight buttons (1–8) were pressed successively as the rating scores of preference, demand and familiarity respectively.

#### fMRI Data Acquisition and Analysis

Brain images were acquired using a 3.0T GE Signa MR750 scanner (GE Healthcare; Waukesha, WI) with a standard head coil. Functional images were acquired by using T2-weighted, gradient-echo, echo-planar imaging (EPI) sequences sensitive to BOLD contrast ( $64 \times 64 \times 32$  matrix with  $3.75 \times 3.75 \times 5$  mm<sup>3</sup> spatial resolution, repetition time = 2,000 ms, echo time = 30 ms, flip

angle = 90°, field of view =  $24 \times 24$  cm). A high-resolution T1-weighted structural image (512 × 512 × 180 matrix with a spatial resolution of  $0.47 \times 0.47 \times 1.0$  mm<sup>3</sup>, repetition time = 8.204 ms, echo time = 3.22 ms, flip angle = 12°) was acquired before the functional scans.

Functional images were preprocessed using SPM12 (the Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging, London, UK). The functional data were first time corrected to compensate for delays associated with acquisition time differences between slices. Functional images were realigned to the first scan to correct for head movement between scans; six movement parameters (translation; x, y, z and rotation; pitch, roll, yaw) were extracted for further analysis in the statistical model. The anatomical image was co-registered with the mean realigned functional image and further normalized to the standard Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) template. The functional images were resampled to  $3 \times 3 \times 3$  mm<sup>3</sup> voxels, normalized to the MNI space using the parameters of anatomical normalization and then spatially smoothed using an isotropic of 8 mm full-width half-maximum (FWHM) Gaussian kernel.

Fixed effect analyses were first conducted by applying a general linear model (GLM) to the fMRI data. All four conditions (TA-1PP, NTA-1PP, TA-3PP, NTA-3PP) were included in the model with reaction time in each trial as a regressor of no interest (for a similar method see also Knutson et al. [2007]). The design matrix also included the realignment parameters to account for any residual movement-related offect. A box-car function was used to convolve with the canonical hemodynamic response each condition. Whole-brain random effect analyses were then conducted on the contrast images of TA vs. NTA (collapsing 1PP and 3PP) to access the vicarious tactile neural responses regardless of visual perspective. The contrast values of TA vs. NTA were extracted (using MarsaR: http://marsbar.sourceforge.net/for the brain regions that showed significant main effect of Tactility The contrast values were correlated with the differential purchasintention (TA vs. NTA) to link the brain activity with ubjective purchasing intention. Apart from the betweensubject correlations, we also extracted beta values for each rial to check whether the trial-wise-brain activity in these brain regions was correlated with the purchasing intention for each product. After Fisher's r to z transformation the correlation coefficients of brain activity and purchasing intention within each subject were subjected to one-sample t-tests to test whether the within-subject correlations were significantly different from zero in the group level.

To explore the effect of visual perspective while observing others' hand actions towards a product, similar analyses were conducted on the contrast images of 1PP vs. 3PP (collapsing TA and NTA) and on the contrast images of interaction between Tactility and Perspective (vector: TA-1PP: 1, TA-3PP: -1, NTA-1PP: -1, NTA-3PP: 1) to access the brain regions showing significant main effect of Perspective and its interaction with Tactility.

Following the identification of the brain regions sensitive to the interaction between tactility and visual perspective, we were also interested in how these regions connected with the brain regions sensitive to tactility and visual perspective respectively. Thus, we conducted generalized psychophysiological interaction analyses (gPPI) [McLaren et al., 2012] to find the brain regions that are functionally connected with the seed regions and modulated by tactility, visual perspective or their interaction. Seed regions are defined as spheres with 5-mm-radius, centered at coordinates of the peak voxels in the brain regions that showed significant Tactility  $\times$  Perspective interaction across all participants. The time series of each seed region was extracted. The psychophysiological interaction regressors were calculated as the product of brain activity and a vector coding x9r each condition. The psychophysiological interaction regressors reflected the interaction between each psychological condition (TA-1PP, NTA-1PP, TA-3PP, NTA-3PP) and the activation of the seed regions. The functional connectivity images modulated by Tactility, Perspective, or Tactility  $\times$  Perspective were subsequently subjected to one-sample t-tests to find the brain regions functionally connected with the seed regions. Finally, the beta values of the functional connectivity in different conditions were extracted and correlated with purchasing intention.

Brain activations in the whole brain analyses were defined using a threshold of P < 0.05 under false discovery rate (FDR) correction with single voxel threshold of P < 0.001.

## RESULT

#### **Behavioral Results**

We calculated the self-reported purchasing intention in TA-1PP, NTA-1PP, TA-3PP and NTA-3PP conditions respectively. A 2

 $^{2} = .420)$ 

with stronger purchasing intention for the products exhibited in the touch compared to no-touch condition (Fig. 1b). Consistent with our hypothesis, the vicarious tactility increased purchasing intention. However, neither the main effect of Perspective (F(1, 24) = .030, P = .864,  $\eta^2$ 



 $^2$  = .245; demands: *F* (1,24) = 8.341, *P* = .008,  $\eta^2$  = .258) with higher scores for TA products than NTA products (preferences: *P* = .010; demands: *P* = .008). Neither the main effect of Perspective

k = 75) (Table I, Fig. 2c). These left hemispheric activations in 1PP vs. 3PP were similar to previous findings [Ruby and Decety, 2001]. Although purchasing intention in 1PP and 3PP was not significantly different from one another, the contrast values of 1PP vs. 3PP in left SPL were positively correlated with the differential purchasing intention (1PP-3PP) (r(25) = .524, P = .007, Fig. 2d). The withinsubject correlations between beta values in each trial and purchasing intention for each product were also significantly above zero in left SPL (t(24) = 3.939, P = .001) and M1 (t(24) = 5.844, P < .001) but not in left EBA (t(24) = .633, P = .533) or left SOG (t(24) = .162, P = .873). These results suggest that, although the 1PP did not increase purchasing intention significantly, stronger activation of the left SPL during 1PP observation (vs. 3PP) was correlated with stronger purchasing intention.

In addition, the effect of visual perspective was also modulated by tactility and resulted in significant Tactile x Perspective interaction in precuneus (x/y/z = -9/-61/47, z = 4.03, k = 341) and other brain regions (Table I, Fig. 3a). Beta values in different conditions were extracted and showed that, in the TA condition, the activation of the precuneus was stronger in 3PP than in 1PP (t(24) = 3.547, P = .002), while the pattern was reversed in NTA condition (t(24) = -2.375, P = .026) (Fig. 3a). These results suggest that tactility modulated the effect of visual perspective.

Using the precuneus as a seed region, gPPI analyses showed that, the functional connectivity between precuneus and bilateral LOC (left: x/y/z = -48/-73/-10, z = 3.69, k = 85; right: x/y/z = 54/-67/-13, z = 3.50, k = 76) was also sensitive to Tactile x Perspective interaction. The precuneus-LOC connectivity increased in 1PP compared with 3PP when observing touch actions, while a decreased connectivity in 1PP compared with 3PP was observed when tactile information was limited by no-touch actions (Fig. 3b). We calculated the differential purchasing intention (i.e., (TA)



Figure 3.

(a) Brain regions showing significant tactility x perspective interaction and the beta values of different conditions in precuneus.
(b) Brain regions functionally connected with precuneus and modulated by tactility x perspective interaction. Beta values of the precuneus-LOC functional connectivity in different conditions are also shown. (c) Cross-subject correlations between

95% CI of the correlation coefficients in the respective conditions (TA: left: 95% CI = [.007 .722]; right: 95% CI = [.127 .769]; NTA: left: 95% CI = [-.759 -.311]; right: 95% CI = [-.723 -.301]) (Fig. 3c). Similarly, the functional connectivity and purchasing intention correlations were calculated for 1PP and 3PP conditions respectively collapsing TA and NTA conditions. However, no significant correlation was found in 1PP or 3PP condition (ps > 0.1). Taken together, the effects of visual perspective on precuneus activity, precuneus-LOC connectivity and its association

precuneus-LOC functional connectivity and purchasing intention in TA and NTA conditions. TA: touch action; NTA: no-touch action; IPP: first-person perspective; 3PP: third-person perspective; LOC: lateral occipital complex. \*P < 0.05. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

with purchasing intention were dependent on tactile accessibility. Similar gPPI analyses using other brain regions (i.e., brain regions showed significant Tactility x Perspective interaction) as seed regions did not show any functional connectivity with other brain regions that was significantly modulated by psychophysical interaction.

We also analyzed the data separately for food and objects. The results (both behavior and fMRI results) were quite similar for these two types of products. Therefore, we did not report the results of food and objects separately.

### DISCUSSION

The current study investigated whether and how vicariously interacting with products through observing others' hand actions affect purchasing intention, and the effect of visual perspectives in this process. Participants observed others' hand actions towards a number of products, and rated their own purchasing intention during fMRI scanning. Behaviorally, the present study provided the first empirical evidence that, observing others touching a product significantly increased purchasing intention, as well as the subjective preference and demand of the product. At the neural level, the vicarious neural responses were found in bilateral PMv, SI/SII, and LOC. Moreover, the neural activities in PMv and SI/SII were associated with increased purchasing intention. Compared to 3PP, watching others' actions in 1PP activated SPL, EBA and M1 in left hemisphere. Although visual perspectives did not significantly increase purchasing intention, the neural activity in left SPL was associated with purchasing intention. In addition, tactility of the actions also modulated the effect of visual perspective. This modulation was manifested in precuneus activity and its functional connectivity with bilateral LOC. The increased precuneus-LOC functional connectivity was associated with increased purchasing intention when observing others' direct contact with the products, while the association was reversed when no tactile information was observed in others' actions.

Previous studies demonstrated that the PMv was the typical region showing vicarious neural activity for hand actions/motion [Iacoboni and Dapretto, 2006; Iacoboni et al., 1999; Molenberghs et al., 2012; Morin and Grezes, 2008], while the somatosensory regions such as SI and SII showed vicarious neural activity for tactile sensations [Ebisch et al., 2008; Gazzola and Keysers, 2009]. Our results showed that, observing actions of the "touch" condition (vs. no-touch) activated both PMv and SI/SII, suggesting that vicariously experiencing a product involved sensory-related activity for tactile sensations as well as motor-related activity for hand movements in bilateral MNS. These results are consistent with previous findings that the premotor and parietal network were preferentially active during objectdirected actions, rather than during non-object-directed actions [Agnew et al., 2012]. Moreover, vicarious neural responses were positively correlated with self-reported purchasing intention. These neural activities in bilateral MNS indicate embodied mental simulation of others' hand actions and tactile sensations [Ando et al., 2015; Gallese, 2007, 2014; Grafton, 2009]. Such simulated experiences could have provided sensory information about the products, which helped increase participants' purchasing intention. The correlation between the increased purchasing intention and the increased preferences to the TA products (vs. NTA products) suggests that preference of the products might serve as the psychological mechanism behind of increase purchasing intention as function of tactile sensation.

However, this speculation of the psychological mechanisms underlying the effect of vicarious sensory experiences on purchasing intention needs to be tested in further research.

Furthermore, bilateral LOC was also activated when watching touch actions compared with no-touch actions. LOC is known as the central region for shape processing of graspable objects [Kourtzi and Kanwisher, 2001; Kourtzi et al., 2003], perceived through both visual and tactile modalities [Amedi et al., 2002]. On this ground, we propose two possible explanations for the activation of the LOC in our study. First, in contrast to no-touch condition in which the product was shown in front view, in the touch condition the product was seen from different angles. It is possible that LOC activation reflected visually shape processing through observing the products from different angles. The second explanation stems from the idea that, observing others touching the products may have activated the LOC to process the shapes through vicarious tactile sensations rather than a visual process. Visual perspective is a manipulation that may affect vicarious sensations [Canizales et al., 2013] but not visual angles of the products. Thus, if the sole cause of LOC activation in TA vs. NTA contrast was the variance of angles in which observers viewed the products (i.e., products were shown from different angles in TA vs. static front view in NTA condition), then LOC activity should not be sensitive to visual perspective. Given that we found that the functional connectivity of LOC and precuneus was modulated by the interaction of tactility and visual perspective (discussed below), we hold the latter explanation more plausible, that is, LOC activation was at least partially related to vicarious tactile sensations. Nevertheless, the current experimental design does not allow us to fully discriminate whether the LOC activation stems from seeing the products from different angles or from vicariously touching the products; an issue worth investigating in future research.

We also investigated the effect of visual perspectives during the observation of others touching the products. However, behaviorally, the effect of visual perspective on subjective purchasing intention was not significant. Whereas at the neural level, regardless of tactility, 1PP vs. 3PP activated SPL and EBA in left hemisphere. Moreover, the activation of the left SPL in 1PP vs. 3PP was associated with increased purchasing intention in 1PP vs. 3PP. Because the 1PP is congruent to "self" perspective and induces self-attribution of the observed actions or sensations, and the 3PP is more likely to attribute the actions or sensation to others, 1PP was more tightly coupled to MNS than 3PP for stronger mental imagery or simulation of the actions and sensations [Jackson et al., 2006]. The SPL, a core cite in MNS [Iacoboni et al., 1999; Molenberghs et al., 2012] was found to be responsible for motor imagery [Hanakawa et al., 2003]. The EBA was also found to be activated for motor imagery and self-generated body movements [Astafiev et al., 2004]. Thus, the stronger activation of left SPL and EBA suggest a stronger motor imagery or mental

simulation when observing actions in 1PP rather than 3PP. In addition, the left rather than right hemispheric activation in 1PP vs. 3PP was consistent with the findings in Ruby and Decety [2001]. Although the visual perspective did not show significant effect on subjective purchasing intention, we found that stronger activation of the left SPL was correlated with stronger purchasing intention. The correlation results suggest that, compared to 3PP, 1PP benefited purchasing intention through inducing left SPL activation for motor imagery.

The findings regarding tactility and visual perspective interaction in the precuneus, is in line with previous studies investigating perspective taking, that showed precuneus activation when participants incorporated an allocentric viewpoint, or engaged in external agency attribution [Farrer and Frith, 2002; Ruby and Decety, 2001; Sperduti et al., 2011; Vogeley et al., 2004]. For example, Ruby and Decety [2001] asked participants to imagine themselves (1PP) or another person (3PP) performing an object-directed action. The mental simulation in 3PP vs. 1PP activated precuneus, which was said to index the overactivation of self-representation to distinguish self from others in 3PP. In the present study, we found precuneus activation in 3PP vs. 1PP for touch actions, which is consistent with Ruby and Decety [2001]. The lack of precuneus activation during 1PP condition could have been caused by a 'blurred' self-other distinction, as 1PP is congruent with the visual perspective of observing self. Interestingly, we observed a reversed pattern of the precuneus activity in 3PP vs. 1PP when participants observed notouch actions, thus suggesting that the role of self-other distinction in perspective taking depends on the expected tactile sensations of the action. In our study, vicarious tactile sensations of the products were important towards purchasing, as participants expected tactile contact with products following hand movements. Thus, it is possible that the unexpected lack of contact in the no-touch condition increased self-other distinction and precuneus activity.

In addition, the functional connectivity between precuneus and bilateral LOC also showed tactility x perspective interaction, with an opposite pattern of the activation of the precuneus. Given that the precuneus activity represented self-other discrimination [Kircher et al., 2002; Kjaer et al., 2002; Ruby and Decety, 2001], and LOC activity represented shape processing through tactile sensation [Reed et al., 2004], we speculate that the precuneus-LOC connectivity reflected tactile agency attribution to compensate for the decreased activation of precuneus. Moreover, the association between precuneus-LOC connectivity and purchasing intention was modulated by tactile accessibility. When tactile information was available (touch actions), stronger precuneus-LOC connectivity was associated with stronger purchasing intention, whereas when tactile information was limited (no-touch actions), stronger connectivity was associated with weaker purchasing intention. The results

concerning functional connectivity suggest that observing others touching the products increased purchasing intention not only through vicarious neural activities in MNS (i.e., PMv, SI/SII), but also through precuneus-LOC connectivity which might be related to agency attribution. Nevertheless, the speculation of the functional meaning of the precuneus and precuneus-LOC connectivity requires further investigation.

Of note, no reward-related brain regions were found between conditions in whole brain analysis. One possible reason may be that we only asked participants to rate their purchasing intention, not actually purchase the products or directly rate the extent to which they like/want the products. Up to now, neural mechanism of purchasing decision making has been rarely investigated. There is only one study conducted by Knutson et al. [2007] that showed that nucleus accumbens, insular and medial prefrontal cortex were activated during purchase-related decision making. The activation of nucleus accumbens was correlated with ones' preference for products but not with actual purchase decision. The insular and medial prefrontal cortex were activated for "gain-loss" calculation when the price information was given. For real consumption, price may dominate purchase decision. Thus, in order to obtain the pure effect of vicarious tactile experiences, we did not provide price information. Since price is essential for purchasing decision making and was not provided in our design, we measured purchasing intention instead. Although the relationship between purchasing intention and actual purchase has been shown to be modulated by factors such as the type of product [new vs. existing, durable vs. nondurable; Morwitz et al., 2007], self-reported purchasing intention has been widely used as a proxy measurement for purchase behavior [Chang and Wildt, 1994; Guido et al., 2010; Schlosser, 2003]. An interesting avenue for future research would be to investigate the effects of vicarious tactile experiences in real purchasing decision making towards items whose prices are also manipulated. It would be informative to assess whether the reward system is involved in this process.

One limitation of our study regards the small sample size, i.e., 25 subjects with their age ranging from 19 to 28 years, which might have limited our findings. There might be not enough power to detect effects that could survive conservative correction for multiple tests (i.e., correlation analyses) with a sample of 25 subjects. Thus, the significance of the correlations between purchasing intention and neural activities were reported without correction for multiple tests in different brain regions. In addition, future studies should test larger samples so that individual differences, i.e., gender, income, age, could also be investigated.

In conclusion, our study provided first empirical evidence that vicarious experiences (i.e., tactility) acquired while observing others touching products increased purchasing intention by increasing the neural activity in bilateral MNS. The effect of visual perspective was found in left SPL, and the interaction of tactility and visual perspective was demonstrated in precuneus activity and precuneus-LOC connectivity. The precuneus-LOC connectivity was associated with purchasing intention but depended on the accessibility of tactility. Our findings help to understand how the human brain functions when a subject observes others' object-directed actions in the context of purchasing. What is more, it allows marketing researchers to develop more effective advertising strategies to stimulate consumption.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

We have no conflicts of interest to declare.

#### REFERENCES

- Agnew ZK, Wise RJ, Leech R (2012): Dissociating object directed and non-object directed action in the human mirror system; implications for theories of motor simulation. PLoS One 7: e32517.
- Amedi A, Jacobson G, Hendler T, Malach R, Zohary E (2002): Convergence of visual and tactile shape processing in the human lateral occipital complex. Cereb Cortex 12:1202–1212.
- Ando A, Salatino A, Giromini L, Ricci R, Pignolo C, Cristofanelli S, Ferro L, Viglione JD, Zennaro A (2015): Embodied simulation and ambiguous stimuli: The role of the mirror neuron system. Brain Res 1629:135–142.
- Astafiev SV, Stanley CM, Shulman GL, Corbetta M (2004): Extrastriate body area in human occipital cortex responds to the performance of motor actions. Nat Neurosci 7:542–548.
- Canizales DL, Voisin JI, Michon PE, Roy MA, Jackson PL (2013): The influence of visual perspective on the somatosensory steady-state response during pain observation. Front Hum Neurosci 7:849.
- Chang TZ, Wildt AR (1994): Price, product information, and purchase intention: An empirical study. J Acad Mark Sci 22:16–27.
- Ebisch SJ, Perrucci MG, Ferretti A, Del Gratta C, Romani GL, Gallese V (2008): The sense of touch: Embodied simulation in a visuotactile mirroring mechanism for observed animate or inanimate touch. J Cogn Neurosci 20:1611–1623.
- Escalas JE (2004): Imagine yourself in the product: mental simulation, narrative transportation, and persuasion. Journal of Advertising 33:37–48.
- Farrer C, Frith CD (2002): Experiencing oneself vs another person as being the cause of an action: The neural correlates of the experience of agency. Neuroimage 15:596–603.
- Gallese V (2007): Embodied simulation: From mirror neuron systems to interpersonal relations. Novartis Found Symp 278: 3–12. discussion 12–19, 89–96, 216–221.
- Gallese V (2014): Bodily selves in relation: Embodied simulation as second-person perspective on intersubjectivity. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 369:20130177.
- Gallese V, Keysers C, Rizzolatti G (2004): A unifying view of the basis of social cognition. Trends Cogn Sci 8:396–403.
- Gazzola V, Keysers C (2009): The observation and execution of actions share motor and somatosensory voxels in all tested subjects: Single-subject analyses of unsmoothed fMRI data. Cereb Cortex 19:1239–1255.
- Grafton ST (2009): Embodied cognition and the simulation of action to understand others. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1156:97–117.

- Guido G, Peluso AM, Provenzano M (2010): Influence of brand personality-marker attributes on purchasing intention: The role of emotionality. Psychol Rep 106:737–751.
- Hanakawa T, Immisch I, Toma K, Dimyan MA, Van Gelderen P, Hallett M (2003): Functional properties of brain areas associated with motor execution and imagery. J Neurophysiol 89: 989–1002.
- Iacoboni M, Dapretto M (2006): The mirror neuron system and the consequences of its dysfunction. Nat Rev Neurosci 7:942–951.
- Iacoboni M, Woods RP, Brass M, Bekkering H, Mazziotta JC, Rizzolatti G (1999): Cortical mechanisms of human imitation. Science 286:2526–2528.
- Jackson PL, Meltzoff AN, Decety J (2006): Neural circuits involved in imitation and perspective-taking. Neuroimage 31:429–439.
- Keysers C, Gazzola V (2009): Expanding the mirror: Vicarious activity for actions, emotions, and sensations. Curr Opin Neurobiol 19:666–671.
- Keysers C, Wicker B, Gazzola V, Anton JL, Fogassi L, Gallese V (2004): A touching sight: SII/PV activation during the observation and experience of touch. Neuron 42:335–346.
- Kilner JM, Friston KJ, Frith CD (2007): Predictive coding: An account of the mirror neuron system. Cogn Process 8:159–166.
- Kilner JM, Neal A, Weiskopf N, Friston KJ, Frith CD (2009): Evidence of mirror neurons in human inferior frontal gyrus. J Neurosci 29:10153–10159.
- Kircher TT, Brammer M, Bullmore E, Simmons A, Bartels M, David AS (2002): The neural correlates of intentional and incidental self processing. Neuropsychologia 40:683–692.
- Kjaer TW, Nowak M, Lou HC (2002): Reflective self-awareness and conscious states: PET evidence for a common midline parietofrontal core. Neuroimage 17:1080–1086.
- Knutson B, Rick S, Wimmer GE, Prelec D, Loewenstein G (2007): Neural predictors of purchases. Neuron 53:147–156.
- Kourtzi Z, Erb M, Grodd W, Bulthoff HH (2003): Representation of the perceived 3-D object shape in the human lateral occipital complex. Cereb Cortex 13:911–920.
- Kourtzi Z, Kanwisher N (2001): Representation of perceived object shape by the human lateral occipital complex. Science 293: 1506–1509.
- Krishna A (2012): An integrative review of sensory marketing: Engaging the senses to affect perceptionGa-4112001g t-352.(Scien(Kri342.5(rrdfree

Rizzolatti G, Craighero L (2004): The mirror-neuron system. Annu Rev Neurosci 27:169–192.