

# Deal or No Deal?

## Predicting Contestants' Decisions Based on Non-Verbal Cues

A. Bastings, I.M.C. Crujisen, E.M. Schutte, J.S. Snijders, H.L. Vu

### Abstract

This study examines the extent to which participants are able to accurately predict which decision contestants of the television show 'Deal or No Deal' make. A questionnaire with 11 Deal and 11 No Deal clips (of the moment before the decision was made) was filled in by 41 participants, 18 females and 23 males. It was expected that the ability of participants to predict the decision of the contestants whether or not to take the deal, was above chance level. Besides that, it was expected that woman would perform better than man in predicting the right outcome, and that man would be more certain about their answers than woman. The results show that participants were not significantly able to accurately predict the decision of the contestants in the No Deal condition and that the participants were significantly able below chance level to predict the decision of the contestant in the Deal condition. Furthermore, it was found that females were not significantly better in predicting which decision was made, and that males were not significantly more certain about their answers.

**Keywords:** nonverbal communication; decision making process; deal or no deal; facial cues; decoding ability; gender differences

### Introduction

Nonverbal messages constitute a large part of the communication system. Because of this, skills in encoding and decoding nonverbal messages are important. It is one of the reasons why there is a great interest in the decoding abilities of nonverbal behaviour in the communicative sciences. Decoding is defined as the ability to perceive, recall and understand nonverbal expressions (Burgoon, Guerrero & Manusov, 2011). The ability to perceive and react appropriately to facial expressions of emotion is a central facet of communication in everyday life.

The decoding abilities of people are mainly tested by the use of pictures or short videoclips that participants have to interpret. Most of the time, these clips are made by the researcher and in this way controlled for certain criteria. However, the consequence of this is that these videoclips show people in a non-natural environment. In this research the decoding abilities of participants is tested by the use of short clips of the program Deal or No Deal. The game consists of a contestant opening briefcases which all contain a different amount of money, varying between 1 pence and 250 000 English pounds. At the beginning of the game the contestant chooses one briefcase. His goal will be to sell this

briefcase for the highest possible amount to the 'bank'. Each round the contestant has to open a set number of briefcases, the amounts in these briefcases will be eliminated from the game. After each round the bank will make an offer for the contestant's briefcase. The offer is based on probability-calculation. The lower the amounts in the chosen briefcases, the higher the chance the contestant's briefcase will contain a high amount, so the bank's offer will be higher. Now the contestant has two options. He can take the deal (Deal) and receive the amount of money the bank offered or reject the deal (No Deal) and keep playing and open more briefcases.

The specific communicative action that is central to this research is the decision-making moment in which the contestant of the program decides whether he or she takes the deal. While this focuses on a specific communicative action in real life, the clips were made to entertain the viewers of the television program and the program makers have edited the clips as such.

Literature regarding the decoding abilities of individuals in decision-making processes is limited. In this research we even go a bit further by letting participants predict what the decision of the contestant will be. Because of the lack of literature, the research question and hypotheses are based upon more general studies on nonverbal communication. This research could be an interesting addition in the field of decision-making processes in communicative science. The following research question was formulated:

*To what extent are participants able to accurately predict whether contestants take the deal, based on nonverbal, facial cues in video clips of the television program Deal or No Deal?*

Emotions are essential for decision-making. They are largely signalled and experienced nonverbally and unconsciously. This makes decision-making largely an emotional and therefore nonverbal process (Morgan, 2010). Nonverbal skills matter, because the ability to transmit and acquire information accurately is one of the fundamental requirements of social life. However, not all humans are evenly equipped to decode emotions or other nonverbal signals and some individuals are naturally more amendable to learn nonverbal skills than others (Burgoon, Guerrero & Manusov, 2011). Gender and personality may provide a source for this variation (Edgar, McRorie & Sneddon, 2012). To be able to decode nonverbal expressions, interpersonal sensitivity is needed according to Rosip and Hall (2004). This interpersonal sensitivity is defined as the ability to sense and perceive accurately one's personal, interpersonal and social environment. Because of this interpersonal sensitivity, individuals are able to achieve

accuracy in decoding the states and traits of nonverbal signals above chance (Rosip & Hall, 2004). Therefore the first hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H1: *Participants will be able to accurately predict the outcome of the decision, to either take the deal or to reject it, above chance.*

According to Burgoon, Guerrero and Manusov (2011) four components are needed to decode nonverbal signals: (1) *attention*, which refers to the perception of cues, (2) *clarity*, which makes it able to make fine-grained discriminations, (3) *knowledge*, which refers to the cognitive understanding and assimilation of emotions and (4) *reflective regulation*, which pertains to the ability to control emotional states (Burgoon, Guerrero & Manusov, 2011).

Women are generally better equipped in encoding and decoding nonverbal signals (Hall 1978; Burgoon, Guerrero & Manusov, 2011; Rosip & Hall, 2004). This superiority exists regardless of age but may be limited to visual cues, non-deceptive messages and positive rather than negative emotions (Rosip & Hall, 2004). Rosip and Hall (2004) state that it is expected that women have more knowledge of the nonverbal cues and have in this way a better cognitive understanding of emotions. However, this remains untested (Rosip & Hall, 2004). Hall (1978) also mentioned two other possible explanations for the superiority of women in decoding nonverbal signals. She states that women, that have less than optimal social power, may learn to act on and employ subtle cues in order to effect more social control, or that women are just 'wired' from birth to be especially sensitive to nonverbal cues (Hall, 1978). More recent work of Hall in cooperation with Murphy and Mast (2006) shows that women have a more accurate recall of nonverbal behaviours in videotaped interviews as well as when they were recalling actual interaction partners. Based on the literature about this superiority of women in decoding nonverbal signals, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H2: *Women are better than men at predicting a contestants' decision, to either take the deal or to reject it.*

According to Collier and Bear (2012) there are gender differences in confidence in perceptions of personal expertise. On average, men have a stronger belief in their expertise on subjects and they are more motivated to assert their opinions. The confidence differences are not an indication of differences in actual ability and expertise. In some cases, even when females achieve as well or better than their male counterparts, they remain under-confident in their performance. The difference in certainty might not be a result of females being under-confident but potentially by males being overconfident, even when they are incorrect. (Collier & Bear, 2012). Research of Lenney (1977) indicates that women do not necessarily have lower self-confidence than men in achievements settings, but the

availability of feedback on performance does have an effect on the self-confidence of women (Lenney, 1977). This led to the following hypothesis:

H3: *Men are more certain about the correctness of their decision than women.*

These hypotheses will be tested with a perception test in the form of an online survey. Clips from the UK version of the program Deal or No Deal were used as stimuli for the perception test.

## **Stimuli collection**

### **Selection Criteria and Procedure**

The social video sharing website YouTube was used for collecting videos of the Endemol television production "Deal or No Deal". In total there were 22 clips selected. Eleven of the clips were of a Deal and 11 clips were of a No Deal. All selected video clips originated from the UK version of the show, which is broadcasted by British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) with Noel Edmonds as the host. This version of Deal or No Deal was chosen because the images of the contestants were relatively clear compared to other versions of the show. This criterion was important to make it possible to analyse the nonverbal signals of the contestants. Next to this, the video had to contain a moment in which a deal was offered by the shows presenter to the contestant. Another criterion was that the contestant did not immediately make a choice after receiving an offer. Instead, the contestant had to show a moment of deliberation.

### **Video Editing**

The selected videos were edited with video editing software. The editing process was equal for all clips. Each video was cut directly after the moment the deal was offered by the host of the show. Right before the contestant made his or her choice known to the public the video was cut again. The resulting video footage consists of short clips between 2 and 19 seconds. The mean duration of the clips was 7.82 seconds. Fragments of the audience, the presenter, a family member or a friend were as much as possible removed and the sound of each of the videos was taken out of the videos. On top of that, the amounts of money that were still in the game (that are typically displayed on both sides of the screen) and the offer of the bank were replaced with black boxes. This was done to prevent participants to analyze the likelihood of the contestant making a decision on the basis of the information that these amounts provide.

## **Perception Test**

### **Experimental design**

The experiment that was conducted had a 2x2 design with gender (male or female) as a between-subjects factor and the decision of the contestant in the show (Deal or No Deal) as

a within-subjects factor. So, all men and women watched all the video clips that were selected and edited.

## Participants

Participants were recruited from among friends, family and acquaintances of the researchers. These participants were approached through email, Facebook or Whatsapp between the 6th and 13th of March 2015. All the participants were Dutch native speakers and ranged in age from 18 to 71 ( $M = 29.3$ ,  $SD = 13.7$ ). A total of 97 participants were recruited, but unfortunately only the answers of 41 participants were useful for further analyses. This was due to the fact that 56 participants did not complete the whole questionnaire.

As mentioned before, the experiment had a 2x2 design, where gender (male or female) and the decision made by the contestant (Deal or No Deal) were the factors. For this design it is important that the distribution of gender was approximately equal. This is the case, because of the 41 persons participated in the experiment 18 (43.9%) were female and 23 (56.1%) were male.

Education was labeled based on the Dutch educational system. The educational levels of participants ranged from ‘middelbaar onderwijs’ to ‘WO master’. ‘Middelbaar onderwijs’ was the highest completed level of education for 9 (22%) of the participants, ‘MBO’ for 10 (24.4%) participants, ‘HBO’ for 8 (19.5%) of the participants, ‘WO bachelor’ for 9 (22%) of the participants and five (12.2%) participants had ‘WO master’ as their highest completed level of education.

Participants were also asked if they were familiar with the show before they participated in this experiment. Of the 41 participants, 23 participants (56.1%) were familiar with the show and 18 (43.9%) were not familiar with the show.

## Materials and Procedure

The participants filled in a questionnaire containing 22 clips with three questions for each video clip. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix A. This online questionnaire was created with the use of online survey software “Qualtrics”. First, participants were introduced to the questionnaire which outlined the content of this study. Immediately thereafter, the participants saw a photo of the contestant that was the subject in the particular video. This was done so the participant knew who to focus on, when the video clip contained more people. After this the video and the three questions were displayed each on separate pages. The participants were asked to watch the video clip in which the contestants consider the choice to take the deal or to refuse it. Participants were able to watch this clip more than once if they liked. The first question “Which decision do you think the contestant made?” had to be answered by choosing either the option “The contestant does take the deal” or the option “The contestant does not take the deal”. The second question “How certain are you of your decision?” had to be answered on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 as very uncertain to 7 as very certain. The third question “What did you base your decision on?” was a multiple choice question

as well and had eight response options. These were “hand gestures”, “head movement”, “Eyes”, “Eyebrows”, “Mouth”, “I don’t know”, “I gambled” and “Other, namely...”. Participants were allowed to fill in more than one answer. If the participant chose the last option (Other, namely...) they had to write down what they based their answer on. At the end of the questionnaire the participants were asked to fill in their age, gender and their level of education. They were also asked if they were familiar with the English version of the show.

The order of Deals and No Deals were randomly arranged in the questionnaire. The clips were shown in the same order to all participants.

## Results

The data that was obtained by the questionnaires was analyzed with SPSS. Recoding of the variables was necessary in order to conduct further analyses.

### Correctness

First, a one sample T-test was conducted to assess the first hypothesis: ‘People are able to accurately predict a contestant’s decision, to either take the deal or reject it, above chance.’ In the No Deal condition participants were not significantly able to predict this decision above chance,  $t(40) = -1.63$ ,  $p = .111$ . In the Deal condition participants were not significantly able to predict this decision above chance. In fact they predicted the decisions significantly below chance,  $t(40) = -2.55$ ,  $p = .015$ . This means that participants overall predict 42.79% of the Deal cases as a deal, which is lower than the chance level of 50.0%. In table 1 the means (in percentages) and standard deviations (between brackets) of the percentage correct predicted decisions are presented divided in males, females and the two combined.

Table 1  
Means (M) and Standard Deviations of the Percentage Correct Predicted Decisions (SD, between brackets) Divided between Males, Females and the Participants Overall.

	Male		Female		Total	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
Deal condition	43.48	(19.18)	41.92	(17.19)	<b>42.79</b>	<b>(18.10)</b>
No Deal condition	46.64	(11.73)	46.97	(14.03)	<b>46.78</b>	<b>(12.62)</b>

The second hypothesis is ‘Women are better than men at predicting a contestant’s decision, to either take the deal or to reject it.’ A repeated measures ANOVA, with the between-factor gender (2 levels) and the within-factor type of deal (2 levels) was performed to address this hypothesis. Before performing the analysis, the assumptions of

sphericity, normality, and independence were looked at. Since both factors (gender and correctness) consisted of two levels, perfect sphericity was present. The assumptions of sphericity were met. In Table 2 the values of Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, skewness and kurtosis are presented. For the men in the No Deal condition it seemed like there was a problem with normality. However, the Q-Q plot and the histogram appeared normally distributed. The assumption of normality was met. The participants were all approached individually, and instructed to complete the survey on their own. The assumption of independence was therefore met.

Table 2  
*Assessing Normality Statistics for all of the Conditions*

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Skewness	Kurtosis
	Statistic	df	p	Statistic (SE)	Statistic (SE)
<b>Males</b> Deal	0.166	23	.098	0.41 (0.48)	-0.40 (0.94)
<b>Males</b> No Deal	0.288	23	< .001	0.15 (0.48)	-1.52 (0.94)
<b>Females</b> Deal	0.183	18	.115	0.82 (0.54)	0.58 (1.03)
<b>Females</b> No Deal	0.154	18	.200	-0.10 (0.54)	-0.22 (1.04)

The result of the ANOVA showed that there was no significant effect of gender on the correctness of the prediction for the Deal and No Deal conditions,  $F(1,39) = 0.03$ ,  $p = .854$ ,  $\eta^2 = .001$ . There was also no significant interaction effect of gender and Deal or No Deal condition.  $F(1,39) = 0.07$ ,  $p = .799$ ,  $\eta^2 = .002$ . This means that the female participants were not significantly better at predicting a deal in the Deal condition, and a no deal in the No Deal condition in comparison to the male participants.

#### Quantitative analysis of individual video clips

A new repeated measures analysis, with the between-factor gender (2 levels) and the within-factor video clips (22 levels), and a post-hoc test was conducted to assess the differences between correctness scores in individual video clips. The post-hoc test consisted of a contrast analysis of the deviation type (i.e., comparing each level with the mean).

Before performing the analysis, the assumptions of sphericity, normality and independence were assessed. Mauchly's test presented a significance value of .153. This value was not significant so the assumption of sphericity was met. The skewness, kurtosis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov values for all combinations of the conditions were looked at as well. Four out of the 44 groups in total showed minor problems for skewness. Their skewness statistics were 1.461, -1.461, 1.461, and -1.167. None of the kurtosis values were problematic with -2.267 being the highest value. All Kolmogorov-Smirnov had a significance value of < .001, which may have been caused by the low sample sizes. This implies that the assumption of normality was

met. Also, the participants were all approached individually, and instructed to complete the survey on their own. The assumption of independence was therefore met.

The results showed that there was no statistically significant effect of gender,  $F(1,39) = 0.34$ ,  $p = .854$ ,  $\eta^2 = .001$ . This, again, means that men did not perform better than women, nor vice-versa. The results also indicated that two videos, a Deal and a No Deal, deviated significantly from their respective means ( $M = 4.71$  and  $M = 5.15$ ). Video clip number 17 contained a No Deal,  $F(1,39) = 18.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .32$ . The total performance score for this video clip was high ( $M = 0.76$ ,  $SD = 0.435$ ), as well as for men ( $M = 0.74$ ,  $SD = 0.45$ ) and women ( $M = 0.78$ ,  $SD = 0.43$ ) separately. Of the 41 participants 31 (75.6%) made the correct prediction and 10 participants (24.4%) made the wrong prediction.

In contrast to this, video clip number 19,  $F(1,39) = 18.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .32$ , with a Deal, had a low overall score ( $M = 0.22$ ,  $SD = 0.46$ ). The total performance score for this video clip was low for both men ( $M = 0.35$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ) and women ( $M = 0.22$ ,  $SD = 0.43$ ). Twelve of the 41 participants (29.3%) were able to correctly identify this clip as a Deal and 29 participants (70.7%) made the wrong prediction. Based on this, we decided to analyse these clips qualitatively as well.

#### Qualitative analysis of individual clips

Clip 17 had a duration of two seconds and contained a female contestant named Constance, the participants had already seen her before in an earlier clip. As mentioned above, the overall performance on this clip was high. Thirty-one participants correctly identified this clip as a No Deal. The majority of the participants, 30 in total, reported they based their answer on head movement. Mouth (17 times) and eyes (10 times) were also mentioned quite frequently as a factor the participants based their answers on. As mentioned before participants were able to choose more than one answer when asked what they based their answer on.

Upon further analysis, the researchers recognized a clear shaking of the head of the contestant, which could easily be identified as an unaffirmative 'no-movement'. In addition the contestant licked her lips clearly and her eye gaze changed direction, she looked away. The researchers and the participants recognized the same nonverbal communication in this particular clip.

A possible explanation for the good performance of the participants for clip 17 could be that the nonverbal behavior of this contestant was clearly unaffirmative. Participants had seen this contestant before, and it is possible this gave them the opportunity to get used to the nonverbal behavior of this particular person. Therefore they possibly became better at interpreting her nonverbal behavior cues.

Clip 19 had a duration of two seconds and contained a male contestant named Tolick. As mentioned above participants performed poorly. Twentynine participants incorrectly identified this clip as a No Deal. Ten participants

did correctly identify this clip as a Deal. The majority of the participants, 35 in total, reported they based their answer on the eyes of the contestant. Also mouth (17 times), eyebrows (14 times) and head movement (10 times) were mentioned frequently as factor the participants based their answers on.

Upon further analysis, the researchers recognized a slight shaking of the head of the contestant, which could be identified as an unaffirmative ‘no-movement’. In addition the contestant puckered his lips clearly and he squinted his eyes and his eye gaze changed direction and he looked away. He also slightly moved his eyebrows. The researchers and the participants recognized the same nonverbal behavior in this particular person and recognized it as more unaffirmative. A possible explanation for the bad performance of the participants for clip 19 could be that the nonverbal behavior of this contestant was not representative of his cognitive process of decision making, making it harder to predict his behavior solely based on his nonverbal behavior.

The nonverbal behavior of contestants Constance and Tolick actually was quite similar, even though they made different decisions. Therefore it is understandable that a majority of the participants interpreted their nonverbal behavior similarly as a No Deal, which was only correct in one of the cases. Nonverbal behavior can vastly differ for each person, however, and at this point it is not possible to make any further conclusions based on these findings. Perhaps, contestant Constance’s nonverbal behavior is better in line with her decisions (cognitive processes of decision making) than contestant Tolick.

### **Certainty**

The hypothesis for certainty is that males are more certain about the correctness of their predictions than females. For this analysis, a variable was created for the mean certainty of all the clips for one participant. The mean certainty of females was 4.08 ( $SD = 1.05$ ) and for males 4.54 ( $SD = 0.91$ ). We tested this hypothesis by performing a factorial ANOVA. The results show that there is no significant effect of gender on the mean certainty,  $t(39) = 2.27, p = .140$ . Males are not significantly more certain about the correctness of their prediction than females.

### **Discussion**

The first hypothesis of this research was that participants would be able to accurately predict the outcome of the clip above chance level. The results show however, that participants are not able to do this. In the Deal condition participants actually performed significantly below chance level. In the No Deal condition there were no significant effects. The results do not support this hypothesis.

The second hypothesis was that females would be better at accurately predicting the outcome of the clips than males. The results showed that there was no significant effect, so there was no significant difference between the accuracy of the predictions of males and females. The results do not support this hypothesis.

The last hypothesis was that men would be more certain of their answers. The results do not support the last hypothesis because there was no significant effect found. Males were not significantly more certain about the correctness of their answers than females.

Possible explanations of these results could perhaps mostly be found in the first three limitations of this research. First of all the clips which were used were not specifically made for the purpose of this research. Therefore the researchers were completely dependent on the availability of clips from the program Deal or No Deal on Youtube. The program is created purely for amusement, so they are fast cut, edited and there is a lot of movement in the clips. The contestant, who was the ‘decisionmaker’, was not always the focal point of the clip. This might make it harder for the participants to accurately interpret the nonverbal behavior of the contestants. In addition the number of participants was not very high. A larger scale research of this specific subject might show different results. Besides the lower number of participants, the survey had a duration of 20 minutes. Several participants complained that they experienced the survey as very long. This might have had an effect on their motivation and the accuracy of their answers. As mentioned above there was a high dropout rate, 97 participants were recruited and only 41 participants finished the survey.

Another limitation of this research is that Dutch participants judged English contestants of the program Deal or No Deal. Both the Netherlands and the United Kingdom can be classified as Western cultures and studies (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Knapp & Hall, 2010) indicate that facial expressions of Western people are more accurately recognized by Western groups rather than non-Western groups. This advantage comes from the existence of “emotion dialects”. Individuals who share the cultural, national or ethnic background share the same ways of expressing nonverbal cues (Knapp & Hall, 2010). However it might be possible that these cultures do differ in some ways and maybe Dutch people have different expressions of nonverbal behavior than English people. However, this is not expected to have a big impact.

Another possibility is that the familiarity of the participants with the show increases the accuracy of their predictions. As a result, this might not accurately reflect the ability of people in decoding nonverbal behavior in the decisionmaking process. Future research in nonverbal communication needs to include familiarity as a factor when using clips of an existing program or movie as their stimuli.

The subject of nonverbal communication might be better suited for qualitative research, because nonverbal behavior can vastly differ among people, gender, age and cultures. This can be done both on a smaller scale and a larger scale, when the required tools, money and time are accessible.

### **Conclusion**

This research examined whether participants of a perception test were able to accurately predict the decisions that were

made by contestants of the show Deal or No Deal. They did this by watching 22 short video clips which contained no audio, as the focus was on nonverbal communication. The results did not support the three hypotheses of this research. First of all the results indicate that participants are not able to accurately predict the outcome of the clips above chance level. In the Deal condition participants performed significantly below chance level and in the No Deal condition there were no significant effects at all. Furthermore there were no significant effects found for gender. Females did not have a significantly higher accuracy rate than men, nor vice-versa. Last, there was no significant effect found for gender and certainty, meaning that males are not more certain about the correctness of their answers than females.

### References

- Burgoon, J.K., Guerrero, L.K., & Manusov, V. (2011). Nonverbal signals. *ML Knapp & JA Daly, The Sage Handbook of Interpersonal Communication (4th Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 239-282.
- Collier, B., & Bear, J. (2012). Conflict, confidence, or criticism: An empirical examination of the gender gap in Wikipedia. In *Proceedings of the ACM 2012. Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York* (pp. 383-392).
- Edgar, C., McRorie, M., & Sneddon, I. (2012). Emotional intelligence, personality and the decoding of non-verbal expressions of emotion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 295-300.
- Elfenbein, M. A. & Ambady, N. (2002). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(2), 203.
- Hall, J.A. (1978). Gender effects in decoding nonverbal cues. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85(4), 845 - 857
- Hall, J.A., Murphy, N.A., & Mast, M.S. (2006). Recall of nonverbal cues: Exploring a new definition of interpersonal sensitivity. *Nonverbal Behaviour* (30), 141-155.
- Knapp, M. & Hall, J. (2010). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Lenney, E. (1977). Women's self-confidence in achievement settings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(1), 1-13
- Morgan, N. (2010). The basic principles of nonverbal communication. Retrieved from <http://publicwords.com/the-basic-principles-of-nonverbal-communication-4/>
- Rosip, J.C., & Hall, J. A. (2004). Knowledge of nonverbal cues, gender and nonverbal decoding accuracy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behaviour*, 28(4), 267-286.

### Appendix A - The questionnaire

The questionnaire was conducted with Dutch native speaking participants. For this reason the questionnaire was written in Dutch. The links of the clips and the snapshots of the contestants are provided in a separate document.

Beste Deelnemer,

Deze survey is opgezet in het kader van ons Masterprogramma aan Tilburg University en gaat over het beoordelen van beslissingen die mensen maken op basis van een videofragment. Het videofragment bevat geen geluid. In deze survey krijgt u eerst een foto te zien van een persoon die u in het daarop volgende filmpje goed in de gaten moet houden. Over deze persoon wordt u daarna een vraag gesteld. Als u deze vragen heeft beantwoord krijgt u een nieuwe foto te zien en vervolgens weer een filmpje met een vraag. Deze procedure wordt enkele malen herhaalt. De survey sluit af met enkele demografische vragen en zal ongeveer 10 - 15 minuten van u tijd in beslag nemen. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden mogelijk. Het gaat om úw mening! Uw antwoorden zullen alleen voor onderzoeksdoeleinden gebruikt worden. Wij willen u bij voorbaat hartelijk danken dat u deze survey in wilt vullen!

Anne Bastings  
Inge Cruijsen  
Elise Schutte  
Jordy Sniijders  
Vu Huong Linh

-----  
U krijgt filmfragmenten te zien van het kansspel 'Deal or No Deal'. In dit programma hoopt een kandidaat een zo hoog mogelijk geldbedrag te winnen.

Het spel draait om het openen van koffers, die allemaal een ander geldbedrag bevatten variërend van 1 pence tot 250,000 Engelse pond. Het is niet bekend welk bedrag in welke koffer zit.

De kandidaat kiest een koffer en speelt hier het spel mee. In elke ronde die de kandidaat speelt, moet hij of zij telkens een aantal koffers kiezen om te openen, waardoor de bedragen in deze koffers uit het spel gespeeld worden. Deze bedragen kan de kandidaat niet meer in zijn of haar koffer hebben. Na een vooraf bepaald moment komt de bank met een bod om de koffer van de kandidaat te kopen. Dit bod wordt gedaan op basis van kansberekening. Hoe lager de bedragen in de gekozen koffers, des te hoger is het bedrag dat de bank biedt. De kandidaat kan ervoor kiezen om dit bod te accepteren (Deal) of hij/zij kan ervoor kiezen om het bod niet te accepteren en meer koffers open te maken (No Deal).

Dit is (ongeveer) dezelfde opzet als het Nederlandse programma "Postcode loterij Miljoenenjacht".

-----  
De man op onderstaande foto is de presentator van de show. Hij komt in veel filmfragmenten voor. U hoeft zich niet te focussen op deze persoon, maar op de kandidaten. (Het laden van de foto kan even duren.)



Het onderstaande filmpje is een voorbeeld van het soort fragmenten dat u te zien krijgt. De kandidaat moet hier zijn beslissing maken. Bij de fragmenten die u hierna te zien krijgt is er geen audio en zijn de geldbedragen niet meer zichtbaar. Zodra u op "volgende" klikt beginnen we met de vragenlijst.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LtWcodn9MIQ>

Let in het volgende videofragment goed op onderstaande persoon. Dit is de kandidaat die de beslissing moet nemen. (Het laden van deze foto kan even duren.)

Bekijk onderstaand fragment goed. Als u wilt kunt u het fragment meerdere malen bekijken.

Welke beslissing denkt u dat de persoon in dit fragment gemaakt heeft

- De persoon heeft gekozen voor de deal
- De persoon heeft niet gekozen voor de deal

Hoe zeker bent u van uw beslissing?

Helemaal niet zeker   0   0   0   0   0   0   0 Helemaal zeker

Waar heeft u uw antwoord op gebaseerd? (Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk.)

- Handgebaren
- Bewegingen van het hoofd
- Ogen (Blikrichting, knipperen, opkijken etc.)
- Wenkbrauwen
- Mond (Lippen tuiten, lachen, op de lip bijten, mond openen etc.)
- Ik weet niet waar ik mijn antwoord op gebaseerd heb
- Ik heb gegokt
- Anders namelijk .....

*The last three blocks of the questionnaire were repeated 22 times with a different clip each time.*

Wat is uw geslacht?

- Vrouw
- Man

Wat is uw leeftijd (in cijfers)?

.....

Wat is uw hoogst afgerond opleidingsniveau?

- Basisonderwijs
- Middelbaar onderwijs
- MBO
- HBO bachelor
- HBO master
- WO bachelor
- WO master
- WO PhD

Was u voor dit onderzoek al bekend met de Engelse variant van de show 'Deal or No Deal'?

- Ja
- Nee

Dit is het einde van de vragenlijst! Bedankt voor het invullen!

Anne Bastings  
Inge Cruijsen  
Elise Schutte  
Jordy Sniijders  
Vu Huong Linh