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Abstract

Price discrimination is a key pricing strategy employed by many service firms to remain profitable by charging the right price to the right customer and better allocating typically perishable capacities. Paying a different price than a co-consumer can, however, elicit strong emotional reactions among consumers, such as anger, pride, or gratitude. Most previous studies in behavioral pricing research have applied a valence-based approach to study affective price phenomena. They have shown that positive price emotions increase positive consumer responses, while negative price emotions induce negative reactions. However, the adequacy of this valence-based approach to accurately predict consumer behavior has been questioned as different emotions of the same valence have been found to exert a distinct effect on consumers' judgments and behaviors.

The thesis at hand uses a discrete emotions approach and systematically investigates consumers' discrete emotional responses to price discrimination. By primarily drawing on appraisal theories of emotion, this thesis develops and empirically tests a conceptual framework to study the antecedents of consumers' specific emotions in response to paying a different price than a co-consumer and their consequences on post-purchase behavior. Specifically, the results of a set of four experiments provide evidence that combinations of how consumers cognitively appraise a price discrimination event in terms of distributive fairness (advantaged versus disadvantaged unfairness) and the attribution of agency for the price difference (self-, service provider-, circumstance-, versus unspecified agency) provide pertinent conditions to differentiate between a set of relevant emotions (i.e., anger, negative self-conscious emotions, pride, gratitude, pity, malicious pleasure, surprise, relief). Moreover, the results demonstrate that although paying more than a co-consumer elicits negative emotions, not all types of negative emotions are bound to induce negative consumer responses. Negative self-conscious emotions, for example, were found to positively affect word of mouth behavior. Similarly, not all positive emotions elicited when paying less are accompanied by an equal extent of positive behaviors. It depends on the specific emotion that is elicited.

The present thesis provides a comprehensive but parsimonious framework to the study of price advantaged and disadvantaged consumers' emotions to more accurately predict post-purchase intentions beyond the emotions' valence. The results at hand further add perspective to previous findings on the negative impact of perceived price unfairness and propose conditions when feeling pride is socially acceptable versus attenuated. From a practical perspective, these findings provide implications for marketers on how price discrimination systems can be designed and communicated more effectively.
Zusammenfassung


1 Introduction

1.1 Research problem

"Unlike the economic belief regarding price as simply a representation of utility, consumers often get emotional with prices, with different emotion states leading to different behavior intentions." (Liu & Soman, 2008, p. 677)

Everyday personal experiences suggest that consumers often respond with a variety of different emotional responses to the prices of goods and services (Liu & Soman, 2008; O'Neill & Lambert, 2001). For instance, people may become angry when they notice that the customer sitting next to them on the plane paid much less for the same ticket or they may feel proud after booking a room at their favorite hotel for a real bargain. However, behavioral pricing research on affective price phenomena is relatively young (Homburg & Koschat, 2005b; O'Neill & Lambert, 2001; Peine, Heitmann, & Herrmann, 2009). Initial studies have largely been based on a valence-based approach, studying the formation and impact of positive versus negative price affect on consumers' judgments and/or behavioral responses (see e.g., the studies by Lii & Sy, 2009; Matzler et al., 2005; Peine, 2008; Peine et al., 2009; Suri, Manchanda, & Kohli, 2002; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Xia & Monroe, 2010). They empirically demonstrated that price affect plays a crucial role in explaining consumers' responses to price information beyond price cognitions (e.g., Peine et al., 2009; Tsai & Lee, 2007). Moreover, they found that consumers who feel negative price affect are likely to respond negatively to the firm, while positive price affect relates to positive post-purchase actions (e.g., Lii & Sy, 2009; Peine et al., 2009).

Recent studies in consumer behavior question the adequacy of this valence-based approach to comprehensively explain consumers' behavior. Their findings suggest that emotions of the same valence may have different, and even valence-incongruent, impacts on judgment, choice and further behavioral outcomes (see e.g., Han, Lerner, & Keltner, 2007; Lerner, Small, & Loewenstein, 2004; Soscia, 2007). For example, while empirical results indicate that angry customers are more likely to complain and spread negative word of mouth (Nyer, 1997; Soscia, 2007), feeling guilty seems to inhibit consumers' complaining and negative word of mouth activities (Soscia, 2007). Hence, although the widely applied valence-based approach is parsimonious in nature and has substantially contributed to a better understanding of affect in marketing, including behavioral pricing research, it does not provide an adequate explanatory basis for such findings (Watson, 2005; Watson & Spence, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Thus, several authors in consumer behavior (e.g., Han et al., 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004) and in behavioral pricing research (e.g., Xia, Monroe, & Cox, 2004; Zielke, 2009) have proposed applying a discrete emotions approach. Appraisal theories of emotion
are regarded as a particularly promising theoretical basis for studying the formation and impact of discrete emotions (i.e., qualitatively distinct emotions like anger, pride, gratitude, etc.) to more accurately predict consumer behavior (e.g., Bagozzi, Gopinath, & Nyer, 1999; Han et al., 2007; Watson & Spence, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Appraisal theories assume that it is not the event itself but rather a person's specific cognitive interpretation of the event with respect to personal well-being (appraisal) that gives rise to a certain emotion that, in turn, can have distinct consequences on cognitions and behavior (coping) (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Lazarus, 1991; Siemer, Mauss, & Gross, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). How consumers cope with specific emotions is a vital issue for marketers because different emotions may have an idiosyncratic impact on post-purchase behaviors, such as complaining, word of mouth, or repurchase, any of which could be used as coping mechanisms (Nyer, 1997; Yi & Baumgartner, 2004).

Price discrimination (or variable/dynamic pricing) asks different prices from different customers for virtually the same product (Cox, 2001; Heyman & Mellers, 2008; Kimes & Wirtz, 2003). Hence, it is regarded as particularly likely to elicit emotional responses (Liu & Soman, 2008; Xia et al., 2004). Discriminating prices is a vital pricing strategy for many firms to absorb differences in consumers' price sensitivity and, particularly in the service industries, to more evenly allocate the typical high fluctuations in demand to the relatively fixed, perishable capacities (see e.g., airline, hotel, or tour operator industry) (Bieger, 2007; Desiraju & Shugan, 1999; Kimes & Wirtz, 2003). Therefore, considering its potential to increase a firm's profitability (Kimes & Wirtz, 2003) and its increased popularity due to advances in technology and Internet marketing (Haws & Bearden, 2006), it is of substantive interest to understand the formation and behavioral impact of emotions accompanying price discrimination systems. Adopting a discrete emotions approach suggests that the positive emotions associated with offering a lower price to customer A (advantaged party) do not necessarily pay off in terms of positive consumer responses and that the negative emotions elicited by charging a higher price for customer B (disadvantaged party) may not induce negative consumer responses (as would be predicted by the emotions' mere valence) – it depends on the specific emotion that is elicited (e.g., anger as opposed to guilt, etc.). Moreover, the direction of the emotional response of customer A is less clear, given that the awareness of being advantaged implies that there is someone else who is disadvantaged. While equality is proposed to be associated with positive emotions and being disadvantaged with negative emotions, it is an ongoing issue in social justice research whether advantaged inequity will lead to positive and/or negative emotions and under what conditions (see e.g., de Cremer & van Kleef, 2009; van den Bos, Peters, Bobocel, & Ybema, 2006). In behavioral pricing, a number of researchers have proposed that being price advantaged will lead to negative emotions (e.g., guilt, unease) (Cox,
2001; Xia et al., 2004), while others have also suggested the occurrence of positive emotional responses (e.g., happiness) (Wirtz & Kimes, 2007). A recent valence-based study found directional (although not significant) evidence that paying a lower price than a friend elicits higher positive emotions than the equal pricing condition but also more intense negative emotions (Xia & Monroe, 2010), which indicates a potential for mixed emotions in a social comparison setting. Disentangling this issue is particularly relevant as it implies that a company's investments in offering lower prices for customer segment A may not only result in negative consumer responses through specific negative emotions from the disadvantaged party B but also from the advantaged segment A.

As a result, it is crucial for marketers to gain a better understanding of the conditions that are likely to elicit different discrete emotions in response to price discrimination between customers and of consumers' specific subsequent behavioral coping responses in order to design more effective variable price systems and to more accurately predict post-purchase behavior. Recent studies have investigated the effect of price discrimination on emotions from a valence-based perspective (Lii & Sy, 2009; Xia & Monroe, 2010; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Wu, Liu, Chen, & Wang, 2012) or on single emotions (like regret, see Tang & Jia, 2008; shame/anger Bolton, Keh, & Alba, 2010), while a new study advanced knowledge on the formation and impact of different discrete emotions when the customer is price advantaged (Gelbrich, 2011). However, to the knowledge of the author, a comprehensive study investigating the elicitation and consequences of consumers' discrete emotions in response to advantaged and disadvantaged price inequality is lacking. As a consequence, this thesis intends to add to the existing findings in behavioral pricing and social justice research by systematically examining (1) the conditions that give rise to different discrete emotional responses to price discrimination (antenecedents), and (2) their subsequent impact on post-purchase behaviors (consequences). Regarding the theoretical foundation, this thesis follows a discrete emotions approach and primarily draws on cognitive appraisal theories of emotion to derive hypotheses. With regard to methodology, four scenario experiments in a service pricing context are conducted.

1.2 Literature review and research gap

This chapter outlines the body of knowledge and gaps in existing research on the formation and impact of emotions in response to price discrimination. Specifically, it provides a review of previous behavioral pricing research on affective price phenomena focusing on price discrimination works and of existing social justice research on affective responses to distributive inequity.
Although the "ability of price to elicit strong feelings" (Schindler, 1989, p. 447) has long been recognized, past research in behavioral pricing has focused heavily on cognitive phenomena such as reference prices, price knowledge, or perceived price fairness, while largely neglecting the affective aspects (Homburg & Koschat, 2005b; O'Neill & Lambert, 2001; Peine et al., 2009). An early study by Schindler (1998) showed that a price discount elicits more positive feelings in the form of pride rather than gratitude when consumers perceive themselves as responsible for having received a discount rather than it resulting from an external cause. A first attempt to more systematically define and introduce the concept of price affect was provided by O'Neill and Lambert (2001). By integrating a set of discrete emotions proposed by Izard's (1991) Differential Emotions Scale into the price acceptability model of Lichtenstein, Bloch, and Black (1988), they found significant associations linking cognitive price-related phenomena with surprise and enjoyment. Since the exploratory study by O'Neill and Lambert (2001), several empirical studies on associations between price and affect have been conducted (for an overview, see Appendix I). They originated from different streams within behavioral pricing research, particularly price fairness (e.g., Bolton et al., 2010; Campbell, 2007; Heussler, Huber, Meyer, Vollhardt, & Ahlert, 2009; Lii & Sy, 2009; Matzler et al., 2005; Tang & Jia, 2008; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Wu et al., 2012; Xia, Kukar-Kinney, & Monroe, 2010; Xia & Monroe, 2010), reference price (e.g., Ackerman & Perner, 2004) and price image research (e.g., Zielke, 2009), but also from consumer behavior and decision-making research in general (e.g., Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2005; Shampanier, Mazar, & Ariely, 2007). Only a limited number of studies explicitly related their work to the investigation of the concept of price affect (e.g., O'Neill & Lambert, 2001; Peine et al., 2009) or the study of price-related emotions (e.g., Gelbrich, 2011; Zielke, 2009). Moreover, the vast amount of data was collected in the retail/goods context (see Appendix I), with only a few focusing on service industries (Matzler et al., 2005; Peine et al., 2009; Tang & Jia, 2008; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Wu et al., 2012).

As an important first finding, these works provide empirical evidence that consumers respond emotionally to a portfolio of different price stimuli. These include actual prices encountered (e.g., O'Neill & Lambert, 2001), price increase and decrease situations (e.g., Campbell, 2007; Matzler et al., 2005; Peine et al., 2009), price promotions (e.g., Honea & Dahl, 2005; Louro et al., 2005; Schindler, 1998; Xia et al., 2010), different pricing strategies and tactics (e.g., fixed everyday low pricing vs. variable discounted pricing, see Suri et al., 2002; one-step vs. gradual phasing out of price promotions, see Tsiros & Hardesty, 2010), installment patterns (Peine, 2008), or a firm's price-level image (Zielke, 2009), and – most important for this thesis – price differentiation between customers (e.g., Ackerman & Perner, 2004; Bolton et al., 2010; Gelbrich, 2011; Lii & Sy, 2009; Tang & Jia, 2008; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Wu et al.,
Beyond these works on price stimuli-related integral affect, further studies found that normatively unrelated, incidental affect (e.g., consumers' general mood induced by seeing pictures) also influences consumers' perceptual (e.g., Heussler et al., 2009) and behavioral (e.g., Cai, Tang, & Jia, 2009) responses to prices (on integral vs. incidental emotions, see Han et al., 2007; Lerner, Han, & Keltner, 2007).

Most of these initial studies on price and affect have conceptualized affect as valence-based feeling states and have studied the formation and impact of groupings of positive versus negative price affect on judgmental and/or behavioral responses (e.g., Lii & Sy, 2009; Matzler et al., 2005; Peine, 2008; Peine et al., 2009; Suri et al., 2002; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Xia & Monroe, 2010). These valence-based studies add important knowledge on the interplay between price information, price cognitions, price affect, and behavior. First and foremost, the study by Peine et al. (2009) established that price affect is an incrementally valid construct that enhances the prediction of consumers' responses to price stimuli beyond the effect of price cognitions (see also Tsai & Lee, 2007). More specifically, it was found that consumers feeling negative price affect are likely to respond negatively or passively to the firm, while positive price affect relates to positive, proactive post-purchase actions (e.g., Lii & Sy, 2009; Peine et al., 2009). Second, several studies suggest that, in line with appraisal theories of emotion, price affect mediates the impact of price cognitions on consumer behavior (e.g., Lii & Sy, 2009; Peine et al., 2009; Tsai & Lee, 2007).

However, in accordance with recent findings in consumer behavior research which suggest that emotions of the same valence may have different and even valence-incongruent impacts on consumers' responses (see e.g., Han et al., 2007; Lerner et al., 2004; Soscia, 2007), several recent conceptual papers highlight the need to better understand discrete price-related emotions in order to more accurately predict consumers' responses to prices (Liu & Soman, 2008, Raghurib, Inman, & Grande, 2004; Raghurib, 2006; Rotemberg, 2008; Xia et al., 2004). In an early conceptual attempt, Schindler (1989) proposed that price promotions may elicit ego-expressive "smart-shopper feelings" (p. 447) such as pride, smartness, or excitement, but also anger, resentment, or regret. Similarly, Raghurib and colleagues (Raghurib, 2006; Raghurib et al., 2004) suggest that emotions related to promotions, spending, and saving, such as smartness, excitement, self-worth, pain of paying, embarrassment, guilt, regret, or disappointment, may impact consumers' decision making and behavior. As a result, several recent empirical studies have focused on investigating price-related discrete emotions such as regret (Tang & Jia, 2008; Tsiros & Hardesty, 2010), pride (Louro et al., 2005), entitlement (Xia et al., 2010), or shame and anger (Bolton et al., 2010). While these latter studies focused on single emotions, few studies exist which systematically investigated the differences between diverse discrete price-related emotions. Among these are the study by Zielke (2009) on a firm's price-
level image and the studies by Ackerman and Perner (2004) or Gelbrich (2011) on price inequalities among consumers.

 Regarding the context of price discrimination, the existing studies provide initial fragmentary information to this thesis’ problem of understanding the elicitation and impact of discrete emotions in advantaged and disadvantaged price inequity conditions. The exploratory study by Ackerman and Perner (2004) provides indications on the qualities of the discrete negative emotions elicited in disadvantaged price conditions. Recalling situations in which the focal customer did not get a bargain while a friend did was found to elicit higher levels of anger, regret, and shame compared to when the focal customer was advantaged. The study by Tang and Jia (2008) confirms that perceived unfairness due to price differences between customers can lead to intense regret, which in turn was found to have a negative effect on repurchase intentions. Further, Bolton et al. (2010) found that collectivistic consumers feel more intense shame when paying a higher (vs. lower) price compared to a friend than compared to a stranger, while in the individualistic U.S. sample, shame was not affected by the different comparative referent parties. The study further revealed that shame mediates the interactive effect of the comparative referent and price differences on repurchase intentions in the collectivistic sample, while it is anger that mediates the effect of price differences on repurchase in the individualistic sample. Regarding discrete emotions in advantaged price inequity, the study by Ackerman and Perner (2004) showed that respondents recalling a situation where they got a better price than a friend display higher levels of happiness and a composite index including gratitude and pride compared to when the friend got a bargain. Given that being advantaged implies that someone else is disadvantaged, some behavioral pricing researchers propose that this may elicit negative emotions, such as guilt or unease (Cox, 2001; Xia et al., 2004), whereas others also suggest the occurrence of positive emotional responses, such as happiness (Wirtz & Kimes, 2007). The valence-based study by Xia and Monroe (2010) found that paying a lower price than a friend elicits descriptively higher positive emotions than the equal pricing condition but also more intense negative emotions (although both were nonsignificant), which indicates a potential for mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged.

 The latter findings parallel current social justice research on affective responses to distributive inequity. It has been proposed that while equality evokes positive feelings and disadvantaged inequity negative feelings, being advantaged may spur negative feelings, given the unfair outcome distribution, but may also elicit positive feelings of self-interested pleasure about receiving the relatively better outcome (Loseman, Miedema, van den Bos, & Vermunt, 2009; van den Bos et al., 2006). In line with this reasoning, van den Bos et al. (2006) provide empirical evidence that people in an equal outcome condition feel more satisfied than when being advantaged, whereas disadvantaged people feel least satisfied (for a discussion on different
patterns found in equity studies, see Peters & van den Bos, 2008). Although this mixed-motive character of advantaged inequity has to date received little empirical attention (Loseman et al., 2009), recent valence-based works have advanced knowledge on conditions that are proposed to shape the salience of self-interest versus distributive fairness concerns and that hence were shown to impact the emotional response to advantaged inequity. It was found that people feel more satisfied or experience higher positive affect in being advantaged when cognitive processing was strongly (vs. weakly) limited (van den Bos et al., 2006), when faced (vs. not faced) with a self-threat (Loseman et al., 2009), or when the comparative other was an unknown person (vs. a friend) (Peters, van den Bos, & Karremans, 2008; Peters & van den Bos, 2008). Further, being advantaged was found to increase feelings of self-esteem when the reference party expressed happiness (vs. disappointment) about his/her outcome, but only among persons scoring low (vs. high) in need for structure (i.e., who are motivated to make sense of (emotional) information) (de Cremer & van Kleef, 2009).

Regarding discrete emotions, early social justice theorists proposed that being disadvantaged is likely to elicit anger, while advantaged inequity might induce guilt (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961). In an early exploratory attempt, Mikula, Scherer, and Athenstaedt (1998) found that recalling experiences of injustice are related to negative emotions such as anger, or disgust, but also sadness, fear, guilt, and shame. However, similarly to behavioral pricing research, empirical social justice research on affective aspects is relatively young (de Cremer & van den Bos, 2007) and initial empirical works on emotional responses to distributive inequity have mainly applied a valence-based or satisfaction-based approach (e.g., Loseman et al., 2009; Miedema, van den Bos, & Vermunt, 2006; Peters & van den Bos, 2008; Peters et al., 2008; van den Bos et al., 2006) or have studied the effect on a single emotion (like self-esteem, see de Cremer & van Kleef, 2009). Hence, several scholars consider the examination of the distinctions in discrete emotional responses to being relatively (dis)advantaged as a vital future research avenue (de Cremer & van Kleef, 2009; Loseman et al., 2009; Peters et al., 2008; but see works on discrete emotional responses to procedural fairness by Krehbiel & Cropanzano, 2000; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999).

Taken together, empirical works on behavioral pricing and social justice research suggest that price inequity between customers elicits emotions of different qualities, which may impact consumers' behavior. Nevertheless, it remains unclear under what conditions one discrete emotion is likely to be elicited over another and how these price-related emotions systematically impact post-purchase behavior. Some of the studies on affect and price provide initial evidence of conditions explaining variability in price-related emotions. First, these studies suggest that a consumer's emotional response may not only depend on the price difference between consumers per se, but may further vary due to situational conditions such as attribu-
tions of responsibility (Gelbrich, 2011; Honea & Dahl, 2005; Schindler, 1998) or the comparative party considered (Bolton et al., 2010; Gelbrich, 2011). Second, they may also depend on individual differences such as cultural aspects (Bolton et al., 2010). Nevertheless, recent studies on price discrimination have investigated consumers' emotions from a valence-based perspective (Lii & Sy, 2009; Xia & Monroe, 2010; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Wu et al., 2012) or on a single emotion (like regret, see Tang & Jia, 2008; shame/anger, see Bolton et al., 2010), while a new study by Gelbrich (2011) advanced knowledge on the formation and impact of discrete emotions when an individual is price advantaged. Gelbrich (2011) provides evidence that being price advantaged can elicit various discrete positive (i.e., happiness, pride, gratitude, and malicious joy) and negative emotions (i.e., outrage, guilt, and pity), depending on the quality of the relationship with the reference party and the attribution of agency and that these discrete emotions mediate consumer responses (i.e., satisfaction, loyalty, WOM referral, and WOM activity). However, to the knowledge of the author, a comprehensive account that systematically investigates the elicitation and consequences of consumers' discrete emotions in response to advantaged and disadvantaged price discrimination is lacking.

1.3 Research objective and research questions

To advance scientific knowledge on the theoretical research gap derived from the literature review and the prevalent practical research problem, this thesis pursues the following research objective. It aims to investigate consumers' emotional responses to price discrimination in the service context by analyzing the situational conditions which give rise to different discrete emotions (antecedents) as well as their specific impact on post-purchase behavior (consequences). Specifically, the thesis intends to answer the following research questions:

(RQ 1-a) What are the relevant discrete emotions and (RQ 1-b) how do they interact with cognitive aspects in consumers' processing of price discrimination information?

(RQ 2) How and why do discrete emotions arise in consumers' processing of price discrimination information? (antecedents/situational conditions)

(RQ 3) How and why do discrete emotions toward price discrimination information influence consumers' post-purchase behavior? (consequences)

(RQ 4) Which positive and/or negative discrete emotions are elicited in price advantage situations – when (situational conditions) and for whom (individual differences)?

To theoretically answer these research questions and derive hypotheses, this thesis follows a discrete emotions approach and primarily draws on appraisal theories of emotion. With respect to methodology, a set of four scenario experiments in a service pricing context serve to test these hypotheses.
1.4 Scope and outline of the research project

The following paragraphs define the scope of this thesis (i.e., field of research, unit of analyses, and industry focus) (see also Table 1) and outline the structure of the manuscript.

Field of research. The present thesis is grounded in the field of behavioral pricing research. Behavioral pricing research deals with the phenomenon of "how consumers actually perceive, evaluate, and respond to price offers" (Estelami & Maxwell, 2003, p. 353; see also Monroe & Lee, 1999). Behavioral pricing goes beyond the simplistic microeconomic (price-) stimulus-response models and explicitly integrates investigations of internal organismic processes (stimulus-organism-response paradigm) (Homburg & Koschate, 2005a; Jacoby, 2002; Siems, 2003; Wricke, Herrmann, & Huber, 2000). Thus, it refrains from the assumptions of rational choice theory and builds on a more psychological foundation of consumers' processing of and responses to price stimuli (Estelami & Maxwell, 2003; Liu & Soman, 2008; Monroe & Lee, 1999; Pechtl, 2005; Peine, 2008).

While previous behavioral pricing research has heavily drawn on cognitive psychology (Homburg & Koschate, 2005b; Peine, 2008), this thesis is particularly grounded in research on the concept of price affect incorporating emotion psychology. Price affect has been referred to as "[...] the role of emotion with respect to prices." (O'Neill & Lambert, 2001, p. 218) or, more specifically, "[...] consumers’ emotional responses to price information [...]" (Peine et al., 2009, p. 39). In psychology, affect is considered a general category or "[...] umbrella for a set of more specific mental processes including emotions, moods, and (possibly) attitudes." (Bagozzi et al., 1999, p. 184). Building on Cohen, Pham, and Andrade (2008), who conceptualize affect as an "internal feeling state" (p. 297) incorporating mood and emotions rather than attitudes that they regard as evaluative judgments (Cohen et al., 2008), this thesis considers price affect as consumers' mood and emotions in response to price information.

While the literature review on price affect (cf. Chapter 1.2) was guided by this broad conceptualization, the research objective of this thesis is restricted to the investigation of consumers' price-related emotions, which have been referred to as the "[...] emotions that result from evaluating a firm's pricing activities." (Zielke, 2009, p. 325). While various definitions of the concept of emotion have been proposed in psychology (Scherer, 2005), this thesis builds on the definition provided by Bagozzi et al. (1999), who consider an emotion "a mental state of readiness that arises from cognitive appraisals of events or thoughts; has a phenomenological tone; is accompanied by physiological processes; is often expressed physically (e.g., in gestures, posture, facial features); and may result in specific actions to affirm or cope with the emotion, depending on its nature and meaning for the person having it." (p. 184). This thesis
is guided by Bagozzi et al.'s (1999) definition of emotion because, first, it aligns with the general assumptions of appraisal theories of emotion, which serve as the main theoretical underpinning of this thesis; second, it portrays emotions as a syndrome encompassing different components, which is in line with the definition of emotion provided by several prominent emotion psychologists (e.g., Lazarus, 1991, Scherer, 2005); and third, it points to the difference between emotions and feelings, which are often misused as synonyms (Scherer, 2005). Feelings are widely regarded as one of the components of emotions (Scherer, 2005; Schmidt-Atzert, 1996), more specifically, "the subjective emotional experience component of emotion" (Scherer, 2005, p. 699) or "phenomenological tone" (Bagozzi et al., 1999, p. 184). Compared to emotions, moods are often conceived of as being longer lasting and lower in intensity than emotions. Moreover, emotions are viewed as intentional and related to an object or referent, while moods are generally considered as more global or diffuse and not as directly linked with an event, specific appraisals, or actions (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Meyer, Reisenzein, & Schützwohl, 2001; Otto, Euler, & Mandl, 2000; Scherer, 2005). As this study is particularly interested in the intentional basis of affect and its particular link with appraisals and coping actions, the present focus is on specific emotions rather than global mood states. Specifically, this thesis follows the definition by Bagozzi et al. (1999) and considers price-related emotions as syndromes but explicitly examines specific components, namely the cognitive appraisals, emotional experiences (feelings), and the subsequent behavioral responses, while excluding physiological processes and physical expressions.

Unit of analysis. This thesis investigates customers and their discrete emotional response to price discrimination in social comparison settings. Price discrimination aims at capturing an individual's price sensitivity and results in asking different prices from different customers for virtually the same good or service based, for example, on different customer characteristics, sellers, and quantities or time purchased (Cox, 2001; Haws & Bearden, 2006; Heyman & Mellers, 2008; Kimes & Wirtz, 2003). According to equity theory (Adams, 1965), people evaluate transactions by comparing their input-outcome ratio with the input-outcome ratio of a comparative party (Xia et al., 2004). Inequity exists when the two ratios are unequal, resulting in one party being relatively overbenefitted (advantaged inequity) and the other being relatively underbenefitted (disadvantaged inequity) (Peters & van den Bos, 2008). When the compared outcomes are prices, three sources of comparative reference parties can be considered: the customer her-/herself (e.g., price paid in the past), different organizations (e.g., price another store charges), or other customers (e.g., price another customer paid) (Xia et al., 2004).

Drawing on social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), Xia et al. (2004) propose that the price comparison with similar other customers exerts the greatest influence on a focal custom-
er's price evaluation. Social comparison research suggests that when people want to make accurate self-evaluations, they tend to compare themselves with similar others (Suls & Wheeler, 2012) and only when others are absent or too dissimilar, do they draw on other reference parties such as the self (Major, 1994). Accordingly, paying a higher price compared to another customer was found to elicit higher unfairness perceptions than compared to the self (e.g., at different times) or other sellers/price-setters (Haws & Bearden, 2006; similar see Xia & Monroe, 2005). With the fast and widely accessible social information-sharing mechanisms now available, consumers can easily determine the price others have paid (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Yelp etc.) (Haws & Bearden, 2006; see also Campbell, 2007; Cox, 2001). Hence, given its theoretical and practical value, this thesis builds on self/other customer price comparisons in conditions where prices between customers differ, which result in one party paying less (price advantaged) while the other pays more (price disadvantaged) (see e.g., Xia et al., 2004).

More specifically, in the experimental scenarios the other customer will be operationalized as a friend (rather than an unknown person). First, people typically perceive themselves as similar to people to whom they feel psychologically close (e.g., friends) (Suls, Martin, & Wheeler, 2002). Second, it is argued that when the comparative party is a friend rather than a stranger, it is not only one's own comparative outcome, but also the other person's relative outcome that tends to matter (Peters & van den Bos, 2008). Hence, inequity in close relationships is expected to be more emotionally distressing compared to casual or distant relationships (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994). Therefore, using a friend as the comparative other facilitates the study of potential mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged and fosters external validity as it is more common in daily life to interact with known rather than unknown others (Peters & van den Bos, 2008). Moreover, it explicitly relates to previous research on price discrimination and affect, which also studied self/other customer price discrepancies where the co-customer was a friend (e.g., Ackerman & Perner, 2004; Bolton et al., 2010; Lii & Sy, 2009; Tang & Jia, 2008; Tsai & Lee, 2007; Xia & Monroe, 2010).

Industry focus. While the conceptual framework and hypotheses are derived generically (i.e., industry independent), the experimental scenarios describe a service pricing context. The service pricing context is regarded as particularly fruitful to test the hypotheses both from a theoretical and a practical perspective. Theoretically, empirical behavioral pricing research has mainly been applied to consumer goods, while data from the service context is under-represented (for a review see Homburg & Koschatte, 2005a; 2005b; Xia et al., 2004). The same applies to research on the concept of price affect and, particularly, works on affect and price discrimination (see Appendix I and Chapter 1.2).

From a practical perspective, price discrimination is a vital and prominent revenue tool in the service industries enabling them to charge prices according to consumers' willingness to pay,
and particularly, to more evenly allocate the typically perishable capacities to the variable
demand levels (e.g., airline or hotel industry) (Bieger, 2007; Desiraju & Shugan, 1999; Kimes
&Wirtz, 2003). Moreover, previous service research indicates that post-purchase behaviors,
which are central to this thesis, such as word of mouth or complaining, may considerably
affect service firms, given the typical characteristics of services compared to goods. For ex-
ample, because most services involve a certain degree of intangibility and perceived risk,
word of mouth referrals from friends, relatives, and other persons were found to have an
important impact on service purchase decisions (e.g., Bansal & Voyer, 2000; Murphy, Mascar
do, & Benckendorff, 2007). Further, co-consumers who are present in a servicescape (and
who, for example, might talk about unfair prices or complain) were shown to substantially
influence the overall service experience and evaluation of the focal customer (e.g., Grove &
Fisk, 1997; Moore, Moore, & Capella, 2005; Wu, 2008). Moreover, many services are charac-
terized by advance pricing where the act of purchasing often occurs long before consuming
(Shugan & Xie, 2000). Thus, negative word of mouth, which an angry customer might spread
after noticing that her/his neighbors paid much less for exactly the same vacation package,
may endure and considerably harm a firm, until the person finally consumes the vacation and
her/his emotions, judgments, and behaviors vis-à-vis the service firm may (or may not) ame-
liorate.

Table 1: Outline of the research project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of research</th>
<th>Behavioral pricing research. Concept of price affect, specifically, price-related emotions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>Customers and their discrete emotional responses to price discrimination information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research objective</td>
<td>Investigating customers’ emotional responses to price discrimination information in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service context by analyzing the situational conditions which give rise to different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrete emotions (antecedents) as well as their specific impact on post-purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavior (consequences).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical relevance</td>
<td>Compared to previous research on price affect, the thesis explicitly goes beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotions’ valence and systematically analyzes why different discrete emotional responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to price discrimination occur and how they impact behavioral responses in order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better predict consumers’ distinct post-purchase behavior to price-related emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical relevance</td>
<td>A detailed understanding of the conditions eliciting different price-related emotions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consumers’ consequent behavioral responses is crucial in order for marketers to design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and communicate variable pricing systems more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main theoretical approach</td>
<td>Appraisal theories of emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main methodical approach</td>
<td>Scenario experiments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry focus</td>
<td>Data is collected on service pricing, which has been relatively under-represented in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previous behavioral pricing and price affect research compared to consumer goods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own illustration.
Introduction

The thesis at hand is structured as follows (cf. Figure 1): Chapter one introduces the research problem. It further reviews previous research and the existing research gaps related to the research problem and delineates the research questions as well as the scope of this thesis. Chapter two derives the conceptual framework and hypotheses, building on the theoretical background of several disciplines and research areas. It mainly draws on emotion psychology, particularly appraisal theories of emotion but also on consumer behavior research, including behavioral pricing research, as well as on social psychology, including social justice and social comparison research. Chapter three outlines the methodological and analytical approach to test these hypotheses. Chapters four to seven present the design, analyses and results of the four scenario experiments, while Chapter eight summarizes the results of the hypothesis tests across studies. Chapter nine provides a general discussion of the research findings including their theoretical and managerial implications and closes with limitations and avenues for future research.

Quick readers will find an outline of the research problem and questions in Chapter 1.1 and 1.3, an overview of the empirical strategy, including the design and key results of the four studies in Chapter 3.3, a summary of the hypothesis tests across studies in Chapter 8, and a review of the studies' results and their academic and practical contribution in Chapter 9.

Figure 1: Structure of the present thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 1: Introduction</th>
<th>Outline of the research problem, research questions, and scope of the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: Theoretical background and hypotheses</td>
<td>Review of the main theoretical foundations, and development of a conceptual framework and hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Methodology</td>
<td>Outline of the methodological approach, analytical strategy, and overview of the empirical studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4-8: Study 1 to 4 and hypothesis tests</td>
<td>Description of the design, analyses and results of the four experiments, and synopsis of the hypothesis tests across studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9: General discussion</td>
<td>Discussion of the results, implications, limitations, and avenues for future research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own illustration.
2 Theoretical background and hypotheses development

This chapter outlines the main theoretical background of the thesis (cf. Chapter 2.1) and develops specific hypotheses on the present research questions (cf. Chapter 2.2).

2.1 A discrete emotions approach

2.1.1 Conceptual approaches to the study of emotions

Conceptually, two main approaches can be adopted in the scientific study of emotions: a dimensional or a discrete emotions approach (see e.g., Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001; Scherer, 2005; for more detailed conceptions with three theoretical positions see e.g., Gendron & Barrett, 2009; Scherer, 2009a). The dimensional approach suggests that variance in emotions can be captured along gradual differences in a small number of underlying dimensions, such as the emotions' valence or pleasantness (e.g., positive versus negative), their arousal or activation (e.g., high versus low), and sometimes also their potency or dominance (see Fontaine, 2009a for a review). It is considered as the most widespread approach to assess subjective affective experiences (Fontaine, 2009a). Popular dimensional models are, for example, the Positive and Negative Affect model of Watson and Tellegen (1985) or the Pleasure-Arousal-Dominance model of Mehrabian and Russell (1974).

The discrete (or specific) emotions approach focuses on specifying central qualitatively different emotions (e.g., anger, pride, gratitude) by investigating their distinct experiential characteristics, antecedent conditions, and consequences (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Dimensions such as intensity or valence are also included in most discrete emotions approaches but among a variety of other differentiating characteristics (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001; Roseman, 2011; Ruth, Brunel, & Otne, 2002). In discrete emotions approaches, such dimensions are conceived of as subordinate to an emotion's quality, while in the dimensional approach the assessed emotion items are regarded as subordinate to a minimal number of dimensions (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001).

This thesis attempts to go beyond mere valence-related price affect and to investigate the discrete emotional responses to price discrimination, including their specific antecedents and consequences. Hence, it applies a discrete emotions approach and particularly draws on appraisal theories of emotion, which are regarded as a promising theoretical basis for the study of the formation and impact of discrete emotions (e.g., Bagozzi et al., 1999; Lerner & Keltner, 2000; Watson & Spence, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004).
2.1.2 Appraisal theories of emotion

As a core tenet, appraisal theories of emotion assume that it is a person's subjective cognitive interpretation of an event (‘appraisal’) – rather than the event itself – which elicits and differentiates between emotions (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Lazarus, 1991; Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009; Siemer et al., 2007). More specifically, they suggest that specific configurations of how people interpret an event along a set of appraisal dimensions determines which discrete emotion is elicited over another (Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009; Siemer et al., 2007). For example, an event appraised as relevant but incongruent with one's goals and caused by another person is proposed to elicit anger (Smith, Haynes, Lazarus, & Pope, 1993). Appraisal theorists suggest that these appraisals can occur from conscious, deliberative information processing to unconscious, automatic processing (Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009). Given the subjective nature of appraisals, appraisal theories can explain why different events may elicit the same emotional response or why emotions toward the same event may vary from person to person and over time – it all depends on an individual's interpretation of that event in terms of her/his personal well-being (Roseman & Smith, 2001; Roseman, Spindel, & Jose, 1990).

Although each appraisal theorist proposes a somewhat different set of appraisal dimensions and discrete emotions (see e.g., appraisal theories of Lazarus, 1991; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988; Roseman et al., 1990; Scherer, 2001; Weiner, 1985), a high degree of convergence on the nature of the appraisal dimensions exists (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Scherer & Ceschi, 1997). As a fundamental appraisal dimension, individuals are viewed as evaluating the relevance ('goal relevance' Lazarus, 1991) and congruence ('goal congruence' Lazarus, 1991 or 'motive consistency' Roseman et al., 1990) of an event with regard to personal goals or motives. While goal relevance evaluations determine whether an event is personally relevant and hence an emotion is elicited at all (i.e., intensity of emotions), the motive consistency appraisal discriminates between emotions' valence: An event appraised as motive-consistent is suggested to elicit positive emotions and an event judged as motive-inconsistent is likely to produce negative emotional responses (Lazarus, 1991; Roseman et al., 1990; Smith et al., 1993). However, particularly relevant for the research objective of this thesis are the appraisal dimensions that assist in further differentiating between discrete emotions beyond mere valence, such as the attribution of agency for an event, the appraised fairness, novelty, or familiarity of an event, or the appraised potential to cope with that event (for a review, see e.g., Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009; Weiss et al., 1999; Watson & Spence, 2007).

Some appraisal theorists further assume that people cope with emotions in an adaptive manner that affects cognitive processes and/or behavior (‘coping’) (Roseman & Smith, 2001; Lazarus, 1991; 2001). From a functional perspective, emotions are conceived of as preparing
an individual for an appropriate adaptive response to the demands of a personally relevant event (Roseman & Smith, 2001; Scherer, 2005; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). Hence, emotions comprise strong motivational forces (Frijda & Scherer, 2009), and discrete emotions were found to have distinct action tendencies (Roseman, Wiest, & Swartz, 1994), or coping responses (Yi & Baumgartner, 2004). Anger, for example, is suggested to lead to confrontive coping behavior (Yi & Baumgartner, 2004) and to be associated with the tendency to feel like hitting someone, yelling at somebody, or saying something nasty (Roseman et al., 1994).

Appraisal theories of emotion are particularly relevant for this study for the following reasons. First, they provide indications on the idiosyncratic appraisals (antecedents) and coping responses (consequences) of discrete emotions. For that reason, they help to specify hypotheses on why and which specific emotions arise in response to a personally relevant price discrimination event and to predict what specific behaviors customers are likely to engage in (Nyer, 1997; Peine et al., 2009; Ruth et al., 2002; Watson & Spence, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Second, the main assumption of appraisal theories on the interplay of cognitive, affective, and behavioral concepts has been empirically established in the pricing context. Price affect was found to be elicited by price stimuli-induced cognitive appraisals and was shown to mediate the impact of these price-related cognitions on behavioral intentions (Peine et al., 2009; similar see e.g., Gelbrich, 2011; Li & Sy, 2009). Moreover, most current affective science researchers along with appraisal scholars agree that some sort of appraisal is associated with most emotional experiences (Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009). Given their generative theoretical framework, appraisal theories of emotion have gained popularity in marketing (Bougie, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2003; see e.g., Nyer, 1997; Soscia, 2007), including behavioral pricing research (see e.g., Gelbrich, 2011; Peine et al., 2009; Zielke, 2009).

### 2.2 A discrete emotions approach to price discrimination

This thesis primarily draws on appraisal theories of emotion to integrate discrete emotions into exiting cognitive conceptions of consumers' processing of price discrimination. Based on this theoretical foundation, Chapter 2.2.1 proposes a conceptual framework to systematically study discrete emotional responses to price discrimination. Guided by this framework, specific hypotheses are developed, first, on the situational conditions that elicit relevant price-related emotions (cf. Chapter 2.2.2); second, on the mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged (cf. Chapter 2.2.3); third, on the emotions' subsequent coping consequences in the form of post-purchase behavior (cf. Chapter 2.2.4); and finally, on the interplay between appraisals, emotions, and consumer behavior (cf. Chapter 2.2.5).
2.2.1 Proposed conceptual framework

Drawing on the assumptions of appraisal theories as well as previous research in behavioral pricing, this thesis proposes the following theoretical framework to study antecedents and consequences of relevant discrete emotional responses to price discrimination (cf. Figure 2). This framework is in the tradition of the price stimulus-organism-response models applied to behavioral pricing research (e.g., Siems, 2003; Wricke et al., 2000; cf. Chapter 1.4). In the following subchapters, the parameters are discussed.

Figure 2: Proposed conceptual framework

![Proposed conceptual framework diagram]

Note. P-/N-WOM = positive/negative word of mouth; NE = negative emotions.
Source: Own illustration based on Watson, 2005; Watson & Spence, 2007; Peine et al., 2009.

Price stimuli

According to appraisal theories, it is the occurrence of a stimulus event that triggers appraisals and subsequent emotions. These events encompass perceived or materialized but also remembered or imagined situations (Roseman & Smith, 2001; Scherer, 2005). In this study the focus is on a price discrimination event, including its related contextual information.

Antecedent appraisals

Appraisal theories maintain that a set of appraisal dimensions combine to act as antecedents to evoke various discrete emotions. Thus, the same appraisal dimension can be involved in the production of multiple emotions, depending on its distinct feature and combination with other appraisals (Roseman & Smith, 2001). Roseman's (2001) appraisal model, for example, provides a framework that specifies how seven theory-relevant appraisals systematically combine to determine which of 17 discrete emotions will occur. However, the relative importance of the different appraisal dimensions has been found to be context specific (Scherer & Ceschi, 1997). Therefore, rather than including all appraisal dimensions proposed by a certain appraisal theory, this thesis focuses on key appraisal dimensions that are relevant to the price
discrimination context. In particular, this thesis primarily builds on the appraisal dimensions of fairness and agency. According to Hareli and Parkinson (2008), agency and fairness appraisals represent crucial 'social appraisals', which are distinctively related to other people. Social appraisals address issues such as social comparisons and considerations of social norms (Hareli & Parkinson, 2008) and thus closely correspond to a context in which prices are compared between consumers. As will be discussed in the following subchapters, fairness and agency are regarded as important cognitive concepts in both emotion and behavioral pricing research. Therefore, they are herein considered key to integrating a discrete emotions approach into existing cognitive models of consumers' processing and response to price discrimination and to delimiting the range of potentially relevant discrete emotions.

**Fairness**

*Fairness* (or *justice*) is among the most important appraisal dimensions that incorporate the social context of appraisals and emotions (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003). Mikula et al. (1998) note that, although the term fairness (or justice) is rarely explicitly mentioned by appraisal theorists (see Frijda, Kuipers, & ter Schure, 1989 for an exception), some scholars have built on dimensions that imply the perception of fairness such as 'legitimacy' (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985) and 'approval' (Ortony et al., 1988). In psychology, fairness perceptions have proved to be a relevant differentiator between discrete emotions (e.g., Weiss et al., 1999) and were found to play a particularly powerful role in the formation of discrete negative emotions (Mikula et al., 1998). Fairness appraisals are social in nature and can be referred to as a comparison of the distribution of positive or negative events between individuals with regard to normative standards (Hareli & Parkinson, 2008).

In behavioral pricing, price fairness has been extensively researched in the last 20 years (Maxwell, 2008; see Xia et al., 2004 for a review) and is acknowledged to be an important concept in marketing, given its impact on a firm's profitability (Xia et al., 2004). Among the various price-related cognitive concepts (see Homburg & Koschate, 2005a; 2005b for a review), price fairness is key for the present research endeavor for two reasons: First, previous research provides strong evidence that price discrimination events trigger price (un)fairness perceptions (e.g., Haws & Bearden, 2006; Xia & Monroe, 2010) and that perceived price (un)fairness substantially affects consumers' judgmental and behavioral responses to prices, such as customer satisfaction (e.g., Herrmann, Wricke, & Huber, 2000; Herrmann, Xia, Monroe, & Huber, 2007), purchase intentions (e.g., Kukar-Kinney, Xia, & Monroe, 2007; Maxwell 2002), or post-purchase actions such as complaining or word of mouth (see Xia et al., 2004 for a review), which are central to this thesis. Second, these negative post-purchase behavioral responses to perceived price unfairness are suggested to be primarily driven by
negative emotions (Xia et al., 2004). Typical revenge actions, such as negative word of mouth to punish the supplier for price unfairness, can serve as a means to cope with these negative emotions and to 'get even' psychologically (Xia et al., 2004; Xia & Monroe, 2005). Accordingly, empirical evidence exists that price fairness appraisals significantly influence positive and negative price affect, which mediate the impact on consumers' purchase intention and word of mouth behavior (Peine et al., 2009; similar see Tsai & Lee, 2007; Lii & Sy, 2009).

To operationalize fairness, this thesis draws on the concept of distributive justice (Homans, 1961) and particularly equity theory (Adams, 1965). This is in line with the distributive outcome conception of social fairness appraisals of Hareli and Parkinson (2008; similar Smith & Ellsworth, 1985) and other studies in appraisal (e.g., Mikula et al., 1998), social justice (e.g., van den Bos et al., 2006; Peters & van den Bos, 2008), and behavioral pricing research (e.g., Oh, 2003; Xia et al., 2004). According to Homans (1961), distributive justice in an exchange relation is established when the profits between individuals are proportional to their investments. Equity theory (Adams, 1965) further specifies that people compare their own input/outcome ratio with the input/outcome ratio of comparable other individuals to form equity judgments (Peters & van den Bos, 2008; Xia et al., 2004). Equity is suggested to exist when these ratios are equal, while inequity results when the focal person perceives her-/himself to be relatively underbenefitted or disadvantaged, but also when s/he is relatively overbenefitted or advantaged (Peters & van den Bos, 2008). This comparison can take place in a direct exchange relationship (e.g., customer/seller comparison), but also among two parties in an exchange relationship with a third person (e.g., self/other customer comparison interacting with a seller) (Adams, 1965). As discussed in Chapter 1.4, the focus of this thesis is on price discrimination between customers and thus on self/other customer price comparisons.

Transferred to the context under study, consumers' fairness appraisals in response to price discrimination in the self/other customer comparison setting can theoretically have three parameter levels: prices can be appraised as fair (e.g., own price and co-consumer's price are equal), advantaged unfair (e.g., own price lower than co-consumer's price), or disadvantaged unfair (e.g., own price higher than co-consumer's price) (e.g., Xia et al., 2004). However, for the present research problem all three parameter levels do not appear equally relevant. Conceptually, unfairness judgments are typically sharper, clearer, and more concrete, while it is more difficult for individuals to articulate what is fair (Xia et al., 2004). Moreover, Zielke (2008) found that consumers regard price fairness as a 'must-be' requirement. Thus, it seems questionable whether price equality between customers is likely to elicit strong positive emotions or emotions at all. Supporting this notion, Xia et al. (2004) posit that the "perception of price equality normally does not trigger a fairness perception, or if one is triggered, it may lead to perceived fairness" (p. 2). As a result, consumers' evaluations of price discrimination
events as advantaged versus disadvantaged unfair are regarded as the most promising fairness appraisal levels for the study of strong emotional responses and the capturing of the relevant emotional responses to price discrimination.

Agency

Agency is considered to be one of the backbones of virtually all currently active appraisal theories (see Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Roseman et al., 1990 for a review), and nearly all appraisal theorists postulate a dimension termed 'agency', 'responsibility', or 'causation' (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003). Agency appraisals refer to an individual's evaluation of what or who caused an event to happen (Roseman, 2009). Agency is grounded in attribution theory (Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009; Weiner, 1985), which posits that individuals attempt to make causal inferences to determine why an event has occurred (Folkes, 1984; Vaidyanathan & Aggarwal, 2003). However, a study by Smith et al. (1993) proposes that it is not the mere attribution of a causal locus, but rather the appraisal of the agent's degree of accountability for an event that directly relates to the emotion elicitation.

Agency is regarded as an equally important cognitive concept in the consumer pricing context. First, attribution theory has been shown to provide a promising theoretical framework to investigate the contextual antecedents that influence consumers' responses to price events (Vaidyanathan & Aggarwal, 2003; see Homburg & Koschate, 2005a; Xia et al., 2004 for a review). Related effects of attributions have been shown, for example, in price fairness (e.g., Bolton, Warlop, & Alba, 2003; Campbell, 1999a; 1999b; 2007; Maxwell, 2002; Vaidyanathan & Aggarwal, 2003) or reference price research (e.g., Kopalle & Lindsey-Mullikin, 2003; Lichtenstein & Bearden, 1988). Second, in consumer behavior research, agency appraisals were found to constitute the most important differentiator of discrete emotions beyond mere valence (Ruth et al., 2002; see also Honea & Dahl, 2005). Finally, in line with Peine et al. (2009), who suggest including agency as a relevant appraisal dimension to study discrete price-related emotions, Gelbrich (2011) demonstrated that agency differentiates among discrete emotions in price advantaged inequity conditions.

Drawing on attribution theory, agency appraisals can be conceptualized as having three parameter levels: An outcome can be appraised as being caused by the individual her/himself, some other person (e.g., the service provider), or the circumstances (Roseman et al., 1990; Roseman, 2009). However, in previous studies impersonal circumstance-agency appraisals proved to be a less clear differentiator for discrete emotions, compared to self- or other person-agency (see e.g., Roseman et al., 1990; 1996; Roseman, 2009). Therefore, the two human parameter levels (i.e., self and service provider) are, in this thesis, regarded as the most crucial antecedents for clearly distinguishing between specific price-related emotions. Moreover, they
direct the focus of the study on relevant social interactions in the customer/service provider dyad.

**Discrete emotional response**

The proposed theoretical framework suggests that specific configurations of fairness and agency appraisals help to confine the set of the most relevant discrete emotional responses to price discrimination. Hypotheses on the specific appraisal-emotion relationships and their interplay with behavioral aspects will subsequently be developed (cf. Chapter 2.2.2 to 2.2.5).

**Consequences on consumer behavior**

Several appraisal scholars propose that emotions can have an adaptive value in coping with the event that catalyzed them (Roseman & Smith, 2001; see also Lazarus, 1991; Scherer, 2005). Coping is an important issue for marketers because how consumers cope with emotions may impact post-purchase behaviors, such as repurchase, complaining, or word of mouth (Nyer, 1997; Yi & Baumgartner, 2004). Accordingly, different discrete emotions were found to be distinctively associated with specific behavioral responses (see e.g., Bougie et al., 2003; Nyer, 1997; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Coping may also affect cognitive processes through strategies such as reinterpretting or denying an event (e.g., 'emotion-focused coping' see Lazarus, 1991). However, this thesis is solely concerned with coping through post-purchase behavior.

Building on previous studies in consumer behavior investigating appraisals, emotions, and several types of (post-)purchase intentions (e.g., Bougie et al., 2003; Folkes, Koletsky, & Graham, 1987; Nyer, 1997; Soscia, 2007; Peine et al., 2009; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004)

1, this thesis proposes the following four post-purchase behaviors as coping mechanisms relevant to price-related emotions: complaining, positive and negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions. Complaining "refers to consumer-initiated communications to the service provider to obtain remedy or restitution for problems in particular market transactions" (Bougie et al., 2003, p. 383). Positive word of mouth (P-WOM) and negative word of mouth (N-WOM) are regarded as all positively or negatively valenced informal communication between individuals about products as well as their evaluation and constitute a form of social-
ly sharing personal emotions (Wetzer, Zeelenberg, & Pieters, 2007). Repurchase intention refers to the willingness of a consumer to repurchase the firm's product (Folkes et al., 1987). Hypotheses on the specific emotion-behavior relationships are developed in detail below (cf. Chapter 2.2.4).

### 2.2.2 Hypotheses on appraisal-emotion relationships

In the following, hypotheses on the relevant discrete emotions that are elicited by the proposed fairness by agency appraisal pattern are developed. To the knowledge of the author, no appraisal theory, consumer behavior, or social justice study to date has combined these appraisal dimensions and levels in a comparable way. Some studies have either investigated agency appraisals together with motive consistency (e.g., Butt & Choi, 2006; Soscia, 2007; Watson, 2005) or fairness appraisals together with motive consistency (e.g., Weiss et al., 1999). As a consequence, there is not one particular appraisal framework, or one tested set of appraisal-emotion relationships that can be relied upon. As a result, this thesis draws on multiple indications from emotion psychology, social justice, consumer behavior, and behavioral pricing research to develop hypotheses on the relevant discrete emotions that are most likely elicited by the appraisal pattern proposed. The resulting appraisal-emotion hypotheses are summarized in Figure 3 and subsequently developed.

**Figure 3: Hypothesized appraisal-emotion relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAIRNESS</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>self-caused</th>
<th>service provider-caused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disadvantaged price unfairness</td>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions (H1)</td>
<td>anger (H2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantaged price unfairness</td>
<td>pride (H3a)</td>
<td>gratitude (H4a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H5a,b)</td>
<td>(H5a,b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(negative self-conscious emotions (H3b))</td>
<td>(anger (H4b))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distribution contradicts social fairness concerns (Loseman et al., 2009; van den Bos et al., 2006). Incorporating agency considerations assists in further differentiating between the specific type of negative emotion elicited.

**Disadvantaged/self-caused condition (H1).** Building on Roseman et al. (1990), a motive-inconsistent event for which oneself has to be blamed (rather than someone else or the circumstances) is suggested to elicit the negative emotions of guilt, shame, and regret. Some scholars propose that guilt is elicited by a violation of a norm and a lack of one's effort, while shame arises because of an attribution of the failure to low personal ability (Hareli & Weiner, 2002). Regret is suggested to be evoked when an individual realizes or imagines that the present situation could have been better if s/he had acted differently (Zeelenberg, 1999; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004; 2007). These three self-evaluative negative emotions have been subsumed under the concept of negative self-conscious emotions (Lewis, 2008; see also Fontaine, 2009b; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). In the literature, guilt and shame have often been treated as overlapping emotions (Lazarus, 1991) and Smith and Ellsworth (1985) found the antecedent appraisal patterns of guilt and shame to be indistinguishable from each other. Their study further showed that when recalling past experiences "[f]or both emotions subjects always described situations in which they had done something that they regretted" (p. 833). Similarly, Feather, McKee, and Bekker (2011) posit that beginning in childhood, people learn that guilt and regret commonly go hand in hand when the self transgresses. Turning to the context of price discrimination, if a consumer determines that s/he paid more for the same plane ticket than a co-consumer and blames her-/himself for it (e.g., because s/he missed the discount rate), that consumer is hypothesized to feel negative self-conscious emotions. They might have the form of shame for the lack of ability, guilt for the lack of effort to be a smart customer (e.g., Hareli & Weiner, 2002), and regret for having missed the forgone alternative of paying a lower price (e.g., Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2007). In line with Ramanathan and Williams (2007), who studied consumers' negative self-conscious emotions as a composite of regret, guilt and shame (similar see e.g., Butt & Choi, 2006; Louro et al., 2005; Rothman, 2011), the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H1:** In the self-caused/disadvantaged unfairness condition, negative self-conscious emotions will be strongest compared to the other conditions.

**Disadvantaged/service provider-caused condition (H2).** In line with early propositions in social justice research (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961), Xia et al. (2004) and Cox (2001) posit that disadvantaged price unfairness may elicit anger. Similarly, Roseman et al. (1994) found anger to be associated with thoughts of how unfair something was (see also Averill, 1983; Bougie et al., 2003). Appraisal frameworks further specify the associated agency condition. Several theorists propose that anger is particularly likely to occur when another person is
perceived as the causal agent (i.e., other-agency) for a motive-inconsistent event (Roseman et al., 1990; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985; Smith et al., 1993). Ruth et al. (2002) empirically confirmed this appraisal pattern for anger in a consumption context. Anger was found to be associated with unpleasant and highly unfair circumstances for which perceived other-agency was high and self-agency very low (Ruth et al., 2002). Transferred to price discrimination, if a focal consumer perceives that s/he paid considerably more for the same plane ticket than a co-consumer due to the service provider (e.g., s/he was not offered a discount rate while the co-consumer was), that consumer is proposed to become angry at the service provider.

H2: In the service provider-caused/disadvantaged unfairness condition, anger will be strongest compared to the other conditions.

Advantaged price unfairness. In a next step, hypotheses on the discrete emotional response to a perceived price advantage are developed. Social justice literature suggests that a person who is advantaged compared to someone else may not only feel positive emotions given the relatively better outcome (which is consistent with self-interest motives), but may also feel negative emotions due to the unfair outcome distribution (which is inconsistent with social fairness motives) (Loseman et al., 2009; van den Bos et al., 2006). Again, agency appraisals help to further differentiate between the specific emotions elicited.

Advantaged/self-caused condition (H3). A potentially relevant positive discrete emotion when paying a lower price due to self-agency is pride. Schindler (1998) found evidence that perceiving oneself as responsible for obtaining a price promotion elicits "smart-shopper feelings" in the form of pride rather than gratitude. Similarly, according to appraisal theories, pride is elicited by a motive-consistent event for which oneself is held accountable (Roseman et al., 1990; similar see Lazarus, 1991; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). This appraisal pattern has been confirmed in the consumer context, where pride was found to be elicited by a pleasant event associated with very high self-agency and modest other-agency (Ruth et al., 2002; see also Soscia, 2007). Hence, pride is experienced when individuals attribute a success or accomplishment to internal ability and effort (Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Lazarus, 1991). In line with this, a recent study found that attributing a price advantage to internal causes (rather than external or situational causes) increases pride (Gelbrich, 2011).

However, deviations from equity in either direction trigger emotional distress (Baumeister et al., 1994). Hence, building on early justice research (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961), several scholars have proposed that an advantaged price inequity may induce negative emotions such as guilt and unease (Cox, 2001; Xia et al., 2004) or shame (Tsai & Lee, 2007). Similarly, Feather and McKee (2009) suggest that self-caused actions which promote unjust or undeserved but personally pleasurable outcomes elicit negative emotions in the form of guilt and
regret/shame. In a similar vein, Baumeister et al. (1994) posit that guilt may be elicited when getting more than one would deserve or when being overrewarded. Accordingly, Gelbrich (2011) found that a price difference between consumers in a mutually positive relationship makes the advantaged party feel guilty if s/he attributes the price difference to have occurred due to internal causes rather than the seller or circumstances. In sum, this implies that when a customer pays a lower price than a co-consumer due to her/his own effort and ability (e.g., one's price search effort and experience), s/he might feel highly proud of her-/himself, but may also feel some level of negative self-conscious emotions in the form of guilt and regret (e.g., for not having helped the other), or shame (e.g., for not having been able to help the other).

However, it is suggested herein that these negative emotions, triggered in the advantaged conditions, are less intense than in the disadvantaged conditions. Considering the impact of prices on consumers' relative purchasing power (Peine et al., 2009), it is expected that paying more than someone else is more relevant for a customer than paying less by the same amount. The more relevant an event is appraised regarding one's personal well-being, the more intense the emotions are likely to be (Lazarus, 1991). Moreover, being disadvantaged opposes both self-interest and fairness motives, while being advantaged runs counter to fairness motives only (e.g., van den Bos et al., 2006). People will show strong negative reactions to disadvantaged inequity in virtually all situations, while feelings toward advantaged inequity are more complex and depend on the circumstances (van den Bos et al., 2006). Accordingly, the study by Xia and Monroe (2010) confirms that disadvantaged price inequity elicits significantly higher negative emotions than advantaged inequity. Moreover, within price advantaged conditions, substantial positive emotions and moderate negative emotions were present (Xia & Monroe, 2010). Similarly, Gelbrich (2011) reported that being price advantaged fostered on average rather high levels of pride and gratitude, while rather low to medium levels of guilt and outrage were present, which may be explained by predominant self-interest. As a result, the proposition that negative self-conscious emotions and anger are strongest in the respective disadvantaged conditions still holds (see H1 and H2). However, it is further suggested that some low level of negative self-conscious emotions may also be elicited in the advantaged/self-caused condition compared to the advantaged/service provider-caused condition, where some degree of anger is expected (see discussion below).

**H3:** In the self-caused/advantaged unfairness condition, (a) pride will be strongest compared to the other conditions; and (b) some degree of negative self-conscious emotions will be present compared to the service provider-caused/advantaged condition.

**Advantaged/service provider-caused condition (H4).** A positive outcome that is attributed to the help of another person (e.g., a service provider that goes the "extra mile" to satisfy the
customer) has been proposed to elicit gratitude (Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Weiner, 2000). In the consumer context, the study by Soscia (2007) confirmed that gratitude is elicited by motive-consistent events that are attributed to the seller (similar see Ruth et al., 2002). Similarly, Gelbrich (2011) reported that seller-related attributions for a price advantage (rather than internal or circumstance-agency) increase consumers' gratitude. Building on these indications, it is hypothesized that, if paying less than another customer is credited to the service provider, customers may feel grateful to the service provider for the favorable price outcome. Still, the expected results of this emotion may be less clear than of others. Considering people's self-serving (or hedonic) bias to attribute success to internal aspects (Weiner, 1985), gratitude may often be derived from social norms or politeness, rather than true beliefs about the role of others (Hareli & Weiner, 2002). Again, inequity in either direction may trigger emotional distress (Baumeister et al., 1994). Gelbrich (2011) found that a price difference among consumers who maintain a positive relationship makes the advantaged party feel outraged if s/he perceives the seller as responsible for it. Hence, being price advantaged due to the service provider may not only elicit gratitude, but also some level of anger at the service provider for having caused the unfair outcome distribution.

**H4:** In the service provider-caused/advantaged unfairness condition, (a) gratitude will be strongest compared to the other conditions; and (b) some degree of anger will be present compared to the self-caused/advantaged condition.

### 2.2.3 Hypotheses on mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged

The previous chapter outlined the key appraisal-emotion hypotheses of this thesis. Given the conflict between egocentric preferences and social fairness concerns when being advantaged, two subsidiary issues remain which are further explored.

*Triggers of positive vs. negative emotional responses to being price advantaged (H5).* The first question concerns when and/or for whom positive versus negative emotions are triggered. While social justice literature proposes the occurrence of positive and negative emotions when one is advantaged (e.g., Loseman et al., 2009; van den Bos et al., 2006), appraisal theory suggests under what situational conditions one emotional valence is more likely to occur over the other. Building on Roseman's (2001) motive consistency appraisal, positive emotions are likely to occur when paying less is perceived as consistent with one's motives (e.g., when self-interest motives are salient) and negative emotions when it is regarded as motive-inconsistent (e.g., when fairness motives are salient).

Further, appraisal research suggests that people's appraisal of an event can depend on individual differences – an area of research which has to date received little empirical attention (e.g.,
Kuppens, 2009; Kuppens & Tong, 2010). Roseman (2001) suggests that there are individual differences in appraisals that predispose some people to interpret a certain event, for example, as motive-inconsistent, whereas others view the same event as motive-consistent and experience positive rather than negative emotions. Following social justice research (Peters & van den Bos, 2008; van den Bos et al., 2006), the dominant emotional valence to advantaged price inequity might depend on whether individuals are predisposed to be more concerned with their own relatively favorable outcome (i.e., self-interest motives) or with the other person's relatively disadvantaged outcome (i.e., fairness motives). For indications on specific individual dispositions which could affect the salience of egocentric versus fairness concerns, this thesis draws on social psychological research on the self. This line of research suggests that how individuals view themselves (e.g., independent of their relationships with others, collective-interdependent with their in-group relationships, or relational-interdependent with their close relationships) affects cognitive, emotional, motivational, and social processes (Cross, 2009; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Specifically, the role assigned to others in one's self-definition can frame how events are appraised (Cross & Madson, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Hence, people with different self-construals may express different emotional responses, given that they follow divergent goals in social situations (Cross & Madson, 1997). While interdependent self-views are said to be particularly sensitive to social cues and responses of self-defining others, individuals with an independent self-construal are especially attentive to their own personal experiences and wishes and will more frequently express ego-focused emotions such as pride (Cross & Madson, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

As this thesis focuses on relational self/other price comparisons where the other is a friend, it is suggested that an individual's disposition in terms of relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) may affect to what extent the unfair outcome of the comparative other person is salient over egocentric concerns when being price advantaged. The concept of relational-interdependent self-construal refers to "the extent to which a person defines the self in terms of close relationships" (Cross, 2009, p. 949; see also Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000). People high in RISC are motivated to develop, maintain, and protect close relationships and promote harmony (Cross, 2009). Accordingly, individuals high in RISC were found to be more likely to think about the consequences of their own decisions for close others and to consider the needs and opinions of people to whom they are close (Cross et al., 2000). Building on these effects of RISC on information processing in relational contexts (Cross, 2009), it is proposed that for people who take the needs of close others (e.g., friend) into consideration when paying less, fairness concerns may become more salient over egocentric concerns. Hence, when being price advantaged, people high in RISC are expected to feel more intense negative and less intense positive emotions compared to people low in RISC.
H5: In the advantaged conditions, positive emotions (negative emotions) will increase, (a) when being advantaged is perceived as motive-consistent (motive-inconsistent), and (b) for people low (high) in relational-interdependent self-construal.

Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged (H6). Irrespective of consumers' further situational appraisals or individual differences, a second issue remains to be explored when an individual is price advantaged. It has been hypothesized that, on average, positive and some level of negative emotions are present in price advantaged conditions. However, merely observing averaged intensity levels will obscure whether the positive and negative emotions were elicited as ambivalent emotional blends within the same person or whether rather some people felt high positive emotions while others felt intense negative emotions.

Consumer behavior and social justice literature provide support for the emotional ambivalence notion. Consumers often experience ambivalent emotional responses to marketing stimuli, that is, the simultaneous or sequential experience of positive and negative emotions (Otnes, Lowrey, & Shrum, 1997; Ruth et al., 2002). Ambivalent or mixed emotion episodes may arise due to goal conflicts or vacillating evaluations and hence are triggered by complex appraisal outcomes encompassing elements of the typical appraisal profiles for different emotions (Scherer, 2009b). For the case of advantaged inequity, van den Bos et al. (2006) suggest a two-phase model of people's responses: first, an egoism-based automatic gut reaction of pleasure is elicited ('great, I get to pay a lower price…'), while fairness-based reactions require cognitive resources to be discovered and understood ('…but that's not fair'). Given enough cognitive capacity, the latter corrective process kicks in, reducing one's satisfaction with being advantaged (van den Bos et al., 2006). Similarly, in view of people's egocentric bias in fairness evaluations (Messick & Sentis, 1979), it has been suggested that self-interest concerns persist when being price advantaged and that fairness concerns merely become an additional standpoint, which indicates that negative emotions may occur in addition to positive emotions, leading to blends of mixed emotions (Gelbrich, 2011). In a similar vein, Xia and Monroe (2010) show that being price advantaged compared to a friend elicits directionally higher positive emotions than the equal pricing condition, but also more intense negative emotions (although both are nonsignificant). Based on the answers to a related open-ended question, the authors conclude that the respondents see self-interest and fairness concerns as two different issues and that mixed emotions exist (Xia & Monroe, 2010). Summarizing these propositions, ambivalent feelings (i.e., positive and negative emotions) seem to be present within one person when being price advantaged, compared to the disadvantaged conditions, where only negative emotions are suggested to occur. Given the prior hypotheses, self-related emotional ambivalence (i.e., pride and negative self-conscious emotions) is expected to be
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highest in the self-agency condition and service provider-related emotional ambivalence (i.e., gratitude and anger) will be highest when the service provider is perceived as the agent.

\[ H6: \text{(a) Emotional ambivalence will be higher in the advantaged compared to the disadvantaged conditions. (b) Specifically, self-related emotional ambivalence will be highest in the self-caused/advantaged condition, and service provider-related emotional ambivalence will be highest in the service provider-caused/advantaged condition compared to the other conditions.} \]

2.2.4 Hypotheses on emotion-behavior relationships

Coping focuses on how people manage their emotions and is an integral part of the emotion process (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001). Notably, consumers' adaptive coping with different emotions has been shown to distinctively affect behavioral responses (e.g., Bougie et al., 2003; Nyer, 1997; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Hence, it is crucial to account for the specific behavioral tendencies inherent in each price-related emotion in order to accurately predict post-purchase behaviors. Nevertheless, the majority of appraisal research has focused on the specification of emotion-specific appraisals and few systematic studies have been conducted on the linkages between discrete emotions and particular coping strategies (Yi & Baumgartner, 2004). Moreover, the emotion literature has generated contradictory emotion-specific response hypotheses (Roseman et al., 1994). As a consequence, to develop hypotheses on each emotion's distinctive impact on the selected post-purchase behaviors (i.e., complaining, P-WOM, N-WOM, repurchase), this thesis draws on evidence from emotion psychology and consumer behavior, including behavioral pricing research. These hypotheses are summarized in Table 2 and further developed below.

Table 2: Hypothesized emotion-behavior relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMOTIONS</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL CONSEQUENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions</td>
<td>- H7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>+ H8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pride</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gratitude</td>
<td>- H10a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n.s. = no significant association expected.
Source: Own illustration based on literature review.

Negative self-conscious emotions (H7). Self-conscious emotions involve considerations about how one is evaluated and perceived by others (Leary, 2004). People tend to strive to be a good person because it provides them with the rewarding feeling of pride, whereas failing to be a
good person elicits punitive guilt and shame (Beer, Heerey, Keltner, Scabini, & Knight, 2003; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Negative self-conscious emotions point to one's characterological (shame) or behavioral (guilt, regret) flaws and mistakes (e.g., Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Horberg, Oveis, & Keltner, 2011; Roseman et al., 1994). Thus, self-conscious emotions are suggested to serve self-regulatory functions in interpersonal behavior (Beer & Keltner, 2004). They prompt socially appropriate behaviors by alerting a person to which behaviors are punished and which are rewarded in social interactions (Beer et al., 2003). They provide internal feedback and help people to recognize and correct social mistakes (Beer & Keltner, 2004). In line with this, Roseman et al. (1994) found regret and guilt to be associated with punitive and corrective action tendencies: Respondents recalling a past regret (guilt) experience reported that they have felt like kicking (punishing) themselves and correcting their mistake (undoing their previous action).

Transferred to the price discrimination context, consumers feeling negative self-conscious emotions take credit and perceive the price difference to have resulted from their own behavioral or characterological flaws. Hence, they are suggested to be less likely to complain to or spread negative word of mouth about the service provider. Accordingly, Soscia (2007) empirically found that the self-conscious emotion guilt decreases consumers' complaining and negative word of mouth intentions. Regarding the two positive behavioral actions toward the service provider, negative self-conscious emotions seem less predictive. Given their self-regulatory function (e.g., Beer & Keltner, 2004), one could argue that negative self-conscious emotions may induce people to repurchase in order to get another chance to learn from and correct their mistake as a means to become a 'good customer' and to self-enhance. Similarly, it has been suggested that in certain consumption contexts, negative self-conscious emotions may motivate purchase or spending intentions (Honea, 2005; similar Dahl, Honea, & Manchanda, 2005). However, it has also been proposed that negative self-conscious emotions are related to mentally accepting or reappraising an event (for regret; see Yi & Baumgartner, 2004), hiding/withdrawal (for shame; see Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Lazarus, 1991), or increasing the distance between the self and the respective stimuli event (for regret/shame; Roseman, 2011). Accordingly, in the consumer (price) context, nonsignificant associations between guilt and positive word of mouth referrals as well as repurchase intentions were found (Gelbrich, 2011; Soscia, 2007). Hence, negative self-conscious emotions are not expected to be related to the two positive consumer responses, namely, positive word of mouth and repurchase intentions.

\[ H7: \text{Negative self-conscious emotions are negatively associated with (a) complaining and (b) negative word of mouth.} \]
Anger (H8). Anger is regarded as one of the most powerful emotions, considering its profound effect on social relations and impact on the person experiencing it (Lazarus, 1991). Roseman et al. (1994) found that respondents recalling an experience involving anger felt as though blood were rushing through their body and as if they would explode. They also indicated that they felt like hitting someone or yelling at somebody and intended to hurt or to get back at someone (Roseman et al., 1994). Bougie et al. (2003) provide similar findings for the consumption context. Customers experiencing anger due to a service failure reported that they felt like letting go or behaving aggressively, that they wanted to get back at the organization or to hurt someone, and that they actually had complained and had said something nasty (Bougie et al., 2003). Similarly, Yi and Baumgartner (2004) found that angry customers are likely to engage in confrontive coping strategies, which refer to aggressive efforts to ameliorate the situation and typically include displaying displeasure to the person who is regarded as the causal agent. Moreover, angry customers may employ mental disengagement, presumably in a case where the situation could not be changed or the initial outburst of anger had faded away (Yi & Baumgartner, 2004). In line with these motivational tendencies of anger, Bougie et al. (2003) provide empirical evidence that anger is a significant predictor of complaining, negative word of mouth, switching, and third-party complaining. Similarly, Ny er (1997) showed that anger predicts negative word of mouth, whereas other negative emotions like sadness do not. The particular goals pursued when engaging in negative word of mouth in the case of anger were found to be associated with venting one's feelings and taking revenge (Wetzer et al., 2007). In the case of price unfairness, such post-purchase actions are proposed to occur to 'get even' psychologically, even if they are at the expense of the consumer (Xia et al., 2004). Hence, it is expected that anger at the service provider may foster complaining and negative word of mouth, while anger will further decrease positive word of mouth and repurchase intentions.

H8: Anger is positively associated with (a) complaining and (b) negative word of mouth and negatively associated with (c) positive word of mouth and (d) repurchase intentions.

Pride (H9). According to Lazarus (1991), pride may involve an urge to point publicly to one's resourcefulness by telling people and showing off. Hence, behaviors related to pride may serve the emotivational goal of seeking recognition and showing one's dominance (Roseman, 2001; 2011). Further, pride is suggested to be related to the response strategy of moving toward the self in order to access more of the positive experience (Roseman, 2001; 2011). In line with this, Folkes (1988) proposes that when a consumer feels proud, s/he will boast about the purchase, which may foster the diffusion of product information. Empirically, pride following a price advantage was found to be positively associated with word of mouth activity (i.e., telling others about the price advantage), but not to be significantly related to word of
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mouth referrals (Gelbrich, 2011). Nevertheless, given that spreading positive word of mouth offers a way of showing off one's resourcefulness and receiving recognition, the thesis at hand proposes that consumers who feel pride are likely to spread positive word of mouth. Regarding repurchase intentions, Louro et al. (2005) found that in a prevention context (as opposed to a promotion context), high levels of pride may reduce consumers' repurchase intentions. However, Butt and Choi (2006) empirically found that in negotiations, pride is positively associated with competitive motives, but shows no significant connection with collaborative motives. Similarly, Gelbrich (2011) reported no significant association between pride and repurchase intentions. Further, in a study by Soscia (2007), the associations between pride and complaining as well as negative word of mouth were also both nonsignificant. Given that pride comes with taking credit and a tendency to move toward oneself (Roseman, 2001; 2011) but is unrelated to collaborative motives (Butt & Choi, 2006), inherent coping tendencies of pride do not seem to be predictive of the three other behaviors involving the service provider, namely, complaining, negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions.

\[ H9: \text{Pride is positively associated with positive word of mouth.} \]

Gratitude (H10). Gratitude is an emotion related to rules of fairness and urges individuals to repay something received in equal measure to restore equity (Frijda, 2007). In the consumption context, Weiner (2000) proposes that gratitude toward a firm or sales person increases the likelihood of maintaining a relationship. The concept of gratitude has received limited attention in psychology (Emmons, 2009), and few studies on the impact of gratitude on consumer behavior have been conducted (Palmatier, Jarvis, Bechkoff, & Kardes, 2009). Morales (2005) empirically showed that consumers feeling gratitude following a firm's extra effort respond with reciprocity and reward the firm with an increased likelihood of visiting the store and a better overall evaluation, even if the quality of the product has not been improved. Similarly, in negotiations, gratitude was found to increase collaborative motives and decrease competitive motives (Butt & Choi, 2006). In line with these findings, Soscia (2007) found that gratitude increases repurchase intentions and positive word of mouth, which has also been confirmed in the pricing context (Gelbrich, 2011). Further, Soscia (2007) reported nonsignificant associations between gratitude and complaining as well as negative word of mouth. However, given that gratitude fosters reciprocity toward those individuals from whom one has received a benefit (Emmons, 2009) and increases collaborative motives (Butt & Choi, 2006), the thesis at hand proposes that grateful consumers are less likely to complain or spread negative word of mouth about the service provider who promoted their benefit. This is in line with a study reporting gratitude to be positively associated with prosocial behaviors (e.g., fostering positive responses, approach tendencies) and negatively associated with antisocial behaviors (e.g., inhibiting rejection or avoidance behavior) (Watkins, Scheer, Ovnicek, & Kolts, 2006).
**H10:** Gratitude is negatively associated with (a) complaining and (b) negative word of mouth and positively associated with (c) positive word of mouth and (d) repurchase intentions.

To sum up, Table 2 depicts the key prediction of this thesis, namely, that price-related emotions of the same valence such as anger and negative self-conscious emotions, or gratitude and pride, may lead to different post-purchase behaviors. This indicates the need to apply a discrete emotions approach. Moreover, not only coping with service provider-related emotions (i.e., gratitude and anger) may have consequences for firms. Selected post-purchase behaviors may also serve as coping mechanisms for self-related emotions (e.g., pride and negative self-conscious emotions). Nonetheless, the coping tendencies inherent in self-related emotions seem less predictive of variations across the four post-purchase behaviors involving the service provider as the latter is not blamed nor credited for the price difference.

### 2.2.5 Hypotheses on the interplay between appraisals, emotions, and behavior

Building on the assumptions of appraisal theories, changes in behavior are supposed to reflect consumers' coping with emotions which are elicited by the appraisals of a certain event (Lazarus, 1991; Peine et al., 2009; cf. Chapter 2.1.2). Thus, in line with this proposition, emotions were found to mediate the relationship between cognitive appraisals and behavioral consequences in consumer behavior (e.g., Nyer, 1997; Soscia, 2007), including behavioral pricing research (e.g., Gelbrich, 2011; Lii & Sy, 2009; Peine et al., 2009). Several studies reported partial mediation, indicating that the conditional indirect affective and direct cognitive paths have both predictive validity and independently influence consumer behavior (e.g., Peine et al., 2009; Soscia, 2007). The direct link between price cognitions such as the impact of price fairness on consumer behavior has been well documented (see e.g., Campbell, 1999a; Homburg & Koschate, 2005a; Xia et al., 2004 for a review). Moreover, existing research shows that attribution- and fairness-related price cognitions interact in producing behavioral intentions (e.g., Maxwell, 2002).

Hence, this thesis suggests that the interactive effect of fairness by agency appraisals on each of the four post-purchase behaviors is mediated by the respective discrete emotions proposed (cf. Figure 2). This proposition promotes a *mediated moderation model*, which investigates whether a moderation effect (here, the agency x fairness interaction effect on each behavior) is mediated by one or more mediator variables (here, the proposed emotions) (for mediated moderation and moderated mediation see e.g., Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007; Muller, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2005; see also Baron & Kenny, 1986).

**H11:** The interactive effect of agency x fairness appraisals on each post-purchase behavior is mediated by the discrete emotions proposed.
3 Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodological approach (cf. Chapter 3.1) and analytical strategy (cf. Chapter 3.2) to test the hypotheses and provides an overview of the studies (cf. Chapter 3.3).

3.1 Methodological approach

To empirically test the hypotheses, this thesis uses scenario experiments, which represent a common subjective measurement approach in psychological appraisal research (for a review on methodological approaches in appraisal research, see Scherer & Ceschi, 1997; Schorr, 2001). Scenario experiments have been widely applied in appraisal (e.g., Smith et al., 1993; Weiner, 1980) and consumer behavior research (e.g., Nyer, 1997; Soscia, 2007) to study appraisal-emotion sequences, but also in behavioral pricing research, including studies on price affect (e.g., Campbell, 2007; Peine et al., 2009; Schindler, 1998; Appendix I) or on price discrimination (e.g., Darke & Dahl, 2003; Haws & Bearden, 2006; Xia & Monroe, 2010).

In appraisal research, scenario experiments aim to induce mentally simulated emotions via situational scenarios that systematically differ in the appraisal pattern described. More specifically, the respondents are exposed to a written scenario (vignette) about an identical emotional event. To test the hypothesized appraisal-emotion sequences, different versions of the scenarios are constructed which consistently vary in the description of the situational aspects related to the proposed appraisal combinations. The participants are asked to vividly visualize themselves in a specific scenario and to indicate how they would feel in that situation, usually by asking them to rate the intensity of a set of emotion descriptors (see e.g., Scherer & Ceschi, 1997; Schorr, 2001). To ensure that the scenarios have been appraised as intended by the manipulation, appraisals are often assessed by manipulation checks (see e.g., Roseman & Evdokas, 2004). In the present context, each respondent was confronted with basically the same price discrimination scenario. In this scenario, fairness appraisals were manipulated between the experimental conditions by describing whether the focal customer was advantaged or disadvantaged, and agency appraisals by indicating whether the focal customer her-/himself or the service provider was responsible for the price difference. Subsequently, the participants were asked to respond to a set of emotion items, further dependent variables, appraisal manipulation checks, and person variables (for the details on the procedure and scenario construction cf. Chapter 4.2 and 4.3).

Previous emotion psychology and consumer behavior research have provided evidence that this procedure constitutes a reliable induction method for discrete emotions without major ethical concern (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Schorr, 2001). Compared to recall surveys, which is another common subjective measurement approach in appraisal research (Schorr, 2001), the use of
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scenarios allows high experimental control over the context considered (Smith et al., 1993; Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Recall surveys ask individuals to vividly recall a specific past autobiographical emotion experience (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Schorr, 2001) (e.g., 'gratitude' felt during receipt of a gift; Ruth et al., 2002), which comes with the drawback that every respondent recalls a different past personal incident that is not comparable across individuals (Scherer & Ceschi, 1997; Weiner, 2000). Also, the scenario technique diminishes issues related to memory distortion and retrospective rationalization tendencies, which are problematic with recall studies (Grewal, Hardesty, & Iyer, 2004; Roseman et al., 1996). Hence, according to Weiner (2000), scenario experiments often permit the best theory testing by allowing the investigation of the variables of most concern. However, the increased control via hypothetical scenarios may suffer from poor descriptions of events compared to real-life situations, which may result in a lack of personal relevance and relatively low ecological validity (Roseman et al., 1996; Scherer & Ceschi, 1997; Yi & Baumgartner, 2004). To effectively prevent against these shortcomings, two vital measures were implemented in the present studies. First, care was given to the construction of the price discrimination scenario, which was designed to be highly realistic, familiar, and relevant to the participants (details cf. Chapter 4.3). Second, an introductory imaginary task was established in Study 2 to 4 to increase personal involvement (details cf. Chapter 5.3).

Experiments were chosen as the main methodological approach because they are regarded as the most preferable method to establish causal relationships (Schorr, 2001). Scenario experiments are particularly suitable to test the present hypotheses because they serve to properly investigate the antecedent appraisal causes of specific emotions (Roseman et al., 1996; Ruth et al., 2002; Schorr, 2001; Smith et al., 1993) and assist in focusing on the appraisal variables that are proposed to most directly determine the differentiation of the discrete emotions of interest (Smith et al., 1993).

3.2 Analytical strategy

This chapter provides an overview of the key analytical strategies applied to test H1 to H11. All analyses were conducted with SPSS Statistics Version 18.0.1.

Appraisal-emotion relationships (H1-H4). First, to generally test whether the appraisal dimensions 'fairness' and 'agency' act as significant predictors of the proposed discrete emotions, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted and the omnibus $F$-test was reported.

Second, the specific fairness (advantaged vs. disadvantaged) by agency (self vs. service provider) patterns proposed to determine the different primary emotions ($H1$, $H2$, $H3a$, $H4a$) were tested using a-priori planned complex comparisons. Analytical comparisons (or single-degree-
of-freedom comparisons) investigate whether two means between single or combined treatment groups differ and provide a method of testing focused hypotheses. They can be divided into (i) a-priori 'planned comparisons', which are those of substantive or theoretical interest to a researcher and planned before collecting data; and (ii) a-posteriori or 'post-hoc comparisons', which the researcher may decide to run only after s/he has inspected the sample means. Further distinctions are made between (i) 'simple or pairwise comparisons', which contrast the mean of one group against the mean of another group; and (ii) 'complex comparisons', which involve more than two group means by averaging means across certain treatment groups (see e.g., Cohen, 2008; Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Davis, 2010; Judd, McClelland, & Ryan, 2009; Keppel & Wickens, 2004). In the present project, \( H_1 \), \( H_2 \), \( H_3a \), and \( H_4a \) posit a complex pattern of group means in which the mean of a certain emotion is a-priori expected to be strongest in the theoretically predicted appraisal cell compared to its mean across the three remaining cells. Hence, these hypotheses postulate mean patterns that represent non-crossing, ordinal interactions (for ordinal interactions, see e.g., Strube & Bobko, 1989). To test these mean patterns, a linear contrast vector was determined for each formal hypothesis and was included in a univariate general linear model (GLM) command on the respective emotion. Each vector represented the theoretically predicted weighted combination of group means. For example, the contrast vector \( C = [1 -1/3 -1/3 -1/3] \) compared whether the expected emotion is strongest in the first group compared to the average of its means in the three remaining groups (for the construction of linear contrasts, see Cohen, 2008; Cohen et al., 2003; Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Planned complex comparisons have commonly been applied to test appraisal-emotion hypotheses in psychology (e.g., Feather et al., 2011; Roseman & Evdokas, 2004; Roseman et al., 1994) and have also been used in price affect research (e.g., Gelbrich, 2011).

For the sake of completeness, besides the \( F \)-tests of the hypotheses-testing planned complex comparisons, the \( F \)-tests of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) are reported. However, the outcome of the latter significance test needs to be interpreted cautiously, considering the proposed conceptual pattern of non-crossing interactions. The traditional ANOVA approach to test for the presence of interactions in multi-factorial experimental designs is based on specific assumptions about the pattern of the data. As a consequence, the standard ANOVA template is powerful in detecting complete cross-over (or disordinal) interactions, but it lacks the power to detect non-crossing (or ordinal) interactions (Strube & Bobko, 1989). Hence, Strube and Bobko (1989) found that the ANOVA usually discovers significant main effects but not necessarily significant interaction effects when, in fact, an ordinal interaction is present in the population. This issue of careful interpretation of the ANOVA results not only applies to multi-factor experimental designs with ordinal interaction hypotheses (e.g., the 2x2 design in Study 1 and 3, cf. Chapter 4 and 6) but also to single-factor designs with more than two groups (as applied in Study 2 and 4,
cf. Chapter 5 and 7). When a dependent variable is expected to be high in one specific condition but low (and hence, close together) in the other three conditions, the omnibus $F$-test of an ANOVA may remain nonsignificant, even if the planned contrast is significant. The numerator of the $F$-ratio of each planned contrast holds only one degree-of-freedom ($df$) (like in a two-group experiment), while the $F$-ratio of the omnibus $F$-test of the ANOVA is associated with $k-1$ $df$ ($k$ representing the number of groups). Hence, the variance in the ANOVA is based on multiple means and needs to be divided by $k-1$ $df$, while the variance of the contrast is only divided by a single $df$, allowing the calculated and critical $F$-values to differ between the two analyses. Consequently, if the planned contrast matches the observed pattern of means, its $F$-test can be significant, even if the omnibus ANOVA is not. Inversely, if the pattern of the observed means runs counter to expectations, the $F$-test of the contrast can become nonsignificant, even if the omnibus ANOVA was significant (Cohen, 2008).

Third, for descriptive purposes and to complement the complex contrasts, the results of the specific planned simple contrasts of substantive interest are reported. They were designed to test in a pairwise manner whether a certain emotion is highest in the predicted appraisal cell compared to each other cell individually. Simple contrasts were further used to test $H3b$ and $H4b$, that is, whether the predicted negative emotion when being advantaged is higher in the expected agency cell compared to the other agency cell.

Fourth, where the inspection of sample means called for further comparisons, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted to investigate a-posteriori detected mean differences between groups. The number of all possible pairwise comparisons equals $k*(k-1)/2$ (e.g., six comparisons in a four-group-experiment). Performing such a family of multiple $t$-tests will increase the familywise error rate ($\alpha_{FW}$). A recommended procedure to control for the inherent inflation in Type I error and to keep $\alpha_{FW}$ under control when experiments have more than three groups is Tukey's procedure (Cohen, 2008; Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Because sample sizes were unequal in the following studies, the Tukey-Kramer procedure was applied, which accounts for unequal sample sizes by using the harmonic mean between groups to calculate the respective critical differences against which a particular observed pairwise mean difference is pitted (for the exact formula and detailed procedure, see Keppel & Wickens, 2004; Ramsey & Ramsey, 2008). Tukey's procedure has also been applied in previous appraisal studies (see e.g., Feather et al., 2011; Roseman & Evdokas, 2004).

Triggers of positive vs. negative emotional responses to being price advantaged ($H5$). $H5$ suggests that motive consistency and relational-interdependent self-construal predict whether positive or negative emotions increase when being price advantaged. To test this, separate linear regressions were run.
Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged (H6). In H6 it is proposed that the positive and negative emotions elicited when being price advantaged occur as ambivalent emotional blend within the same person rather than that some people feel more positive while others feel more negative emotions. Building on Fong and Tiedens (2002), emotional ambivalence was measured based on the similarity-intensity model (SIM) (see Priester & Petty, 1996; Thompson, Zanna, & Griffin, 1995). Hence, overall and agency-specific ambivalence indexes were calculated as specified by the SIM (for the detailed procedure, see Chapter 4.5.3). Planned complex comparisons as well as ANOVAs were run to test for the expected mean differences in emotional ambivalence between groups.

Emotion-behavior relationships (H7-H10). In order to test whether the emotions map onto the post-purchase behaviors in the predicted way, a multivariate multiple regression with the discrete emotions as independent variables and the four behaviors as dependent variables was conducted (similar see e.g., Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). If the dependent variables are correlated, which can be expected with the behaviors in the present study (see e.g., Gelbrich, 2011, who reports $r = .47/.35$ between repurchase and WOM referral), their simultaneous incorporation in one regression model is a more efficient approach to the construction of the confidence intervals than calculating separate regression models for each dependent variable (Hartung & Knapp, 2005). More importantly, the multivariate approach estimates the between-equation covariances and provides a formal test for each emotion's coefficients across the four equations (Hartung & Knapp, 2005; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Hence, compared to a series of separate multiple linear regressions per behavior, their simultaneous inclusion provides additional information on whether a particular emotion is significantly related to the four post-purchase behaviors assessed.

Mediating role of emotions in appraisal-behavior relationships (H11). H11 posits that the interactive effect of fairness and agency on post-purchase behaviors is mediated by the multiple emotions proposed in this thesis. To assess the predicted mediated moderation hypothesis, for each behavior, a multiple mediator model with the fairness x agency interaction as predictor variable and the emotions as mediators was run using OLS regression to calculate the indirect paths. The significance of the emotions' total indirect effect and each emotion's specific indirect effect on the respective behavior was assessed by constructing bootstrap confidence intervals using the SPSS macro of Preacher and Hayes (2008) (for details, see Chapter 6.5.5).

The hypothesized comparisons propose directional relationships. Hence, one-tailed $t$-tests could be applied (Keppel & Wickens, 2004) (for an application in appraisal research, see e.g., Roseman et al., 1994). However, the more conservative and more generally accepted $F$-test statistic (which is equivalent to a two-tailed $t$-test in the two-group case) was subsequently used (Cohen,
Methodology (for an application in appraisal research, see e.g., Feather et al., 2011). Considering that marginal significant results \( (p < .10) \) from the \( F \)-test statistic would become significant at \( p < .05 \) when using a one-tailed \( t \)-test statistic (Cohen, 2008), marginal results are subsequently reported and regarded as acceptable to confirm a directional hypothesis.

### 3.3 Overview of the empirical studies and key results

This chapter provides an overview of the empirical studies conducted to test the hypotheses. Figure 4 visualizes the specific experimental conditions tested by each study and portrays the link between the four studies. Table 3 provides a detailed overview of the objective, design, and key findings of each study.

Figure 4: Overview of the experimental conditions tested and link between studies

*Study 1 (Pretest) and 3 (Main study): 2 agency x 2 fairness

*Study 2 (Preceding study): 4 agency conditions when advantaged

*Study 4 (Follow-up study): 4 types of relationship when self/advantaged

Source: Own illustration.

*Study 1* served as a pretest. It aimed to probe the appraisal manipulations and the 2 fairness (advantaged vs. disadvantaged) x 2 agency (self vs. service provider) framework with its main appraisal-emotion-behavior hypotheses (\( H1-H4, H7-H10 \)). The emotional responses to the two
disadvantaged conditions were as expected, while the results on the two advantaged conditions were less consistent. Moreover, self-serving bias tendencies were present in agency attributions when being price advantaged. These preliminary results called for an in-depth investigation of agency appraisals and emotional responses to being price advantaged.

As a result, before conducting the large-scale 2 agency x 2 fairness study (cf. Study 3), Study 2 was conducted to first soundly investigate consumers' emotional responses to varying agency conditions when being price advantaged (H3-H10, H12-H14). To gain comprehensive insights on the nature of consumers' attributions and respective emotional responses, the tested agency conditions were enlarged. A circumstance-agency condition was added as was, more importantly, a control condition in order to assess consumers' default attributions and emotions when no agency information is available. To account for these new conditions, a set of additional hypotheses was developed. Study 2 provides support for the central agency appraisal-emotion relationships. The results further suggest that the co-consumer-related emotions of pity and malicious pleasure are relevant when being price advantaged and should subsequently be incorporated into the main framework.

Building on the insights from Study 2, Study 3 was conducted (focus H1-H4, H7-H11). This large-scale investigation builds the core empirical study and tests the conceptual framework and key hypotheses of this thesis. The results provided support for most of the hypothesized appraisal-emotion relationships, and the findings on the emotion-behavior relationships indicate the need to study price-related emotions using a discrete emotions approach. However, different than expected, the self-caused price advantaged condition elicited only low levels of pride. This finding raised the question of when the display of 'smart-shopper'-related pride feelings (Schindler, 1998) is socially accepted versus attenuated when prices are compared.

Hence, the follow-up, Study 4, investigated under what conditions consumers feel pride when they themselves manage to pay less (H15). The results showed that considerations about the type of relationship with the co-consumer need to be included alongside fairness and agency considerations to predict when pride is displayed in social price comparison settings.

The primary focus of all the studies and the respective experimental conditions tested was to gain insights into the causal appraisal antecedents of relevant emotional responses to price differences and into their subsequent coping responses in terms of post-purchase behavior. Hence, the focus of the present project was on testing the appraisal-emotion-behavior framework and hypotheses (focus H1-H4, H7-H11). Subsidiary, correlational data was consulted across Study 2 to 4 to gain preliminary insights into the triggers of positive and negative emotional responses to price advantaged conditions and ambivalent emotional blends (H5, H6). These latter analyses have a supplementary character and serve explorative purposes.
### Table 3: Overview of the scenario experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 1: Framework evaluation I</strong> (Pretest)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the proposed conceptual framework with its key appraisal-emotion (H1-H4) and emotion-behavior relationships (H7-H10). Assessing appraisal manipulations of scenarios that were constructed based on think-aloud pretests.</td>
<td>Investigation of the agency antecedents of relevant emotions in advantaged price unfairness conditions (H3-H10, H12-H14) Understanding the nature of agency attributions when being price advantaged.</td>
<td>Evaluation of the proposed appraisal-emotion-behavior framework (H1-H4, H7-H11, H13-H14) Investigation of differentiators between positive and negative emotions (H5) and emotional ambivalence (H6) when being price advantaged.</td>
<td>Exploration of conditions where pride is more vs. less likely to occur (i.e., socially displayed vs. attenuated) in self-caused/advantaged conditions. Investigating the role of the type of relationship with the comparative co-consumer (H15).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td>2 (Agency: self- vs. service provider-caused) x 2 (Fairness: advantaged vs. disadvantaged unfair)</td>
<td>4 (Agency: self-, service provider-, circumstance-caused, or control)</td>
<td>2 (Agency: self- vs. service provider-caused) x 2 (Fairness: advantaged vs. disadvantaged unfair)</td>
<td>4 (Type of relationship: harmonious vs. competitive and upward vs. downward comparative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variables</strong></td>
<td>4 Emotions: negative self-conscious emotions, anger, pride, gratitude</td>
<td>8 Emotions: negative self-conscious emotions, anger, pride, gratitude, pity, malicious pleasure, surprise, relief</td>
<td>6 Emotions: negative self-conscious emotions, anger, pride, gratitude, pity, malicious pleasure</td>
<td>6 Emotions: negative self-conscious emotions, anger, pride, gratitude, pity, malicious pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional variables</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Situational appraisal (i.e., motive consistency) Individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC)</td>
<td>Situational appraisal (i.e., motive consistency) Individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC)</td>
<td>Situational appraisal (i.e., motive consistency) individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price stimuli</strong></td>
<td>Price discrimination (self/other (i.e., friend)-comparison)</td>
<td>Price discrimination (self/other (i.e., friend)-comparison)</td>
<td>Price discrimination (self/other (i.e., friend)-comparison)</td>
<td>Price discrimination (self/other (i.e., friend)-comparison)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td>Tour operator industry</td>
<td>Tour operator industry</td>
<td>Tour operator industry</td>
<td>Cablecar industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td>78 US undergraduate students</td>
<td>83 US undergraduate students</td>
<td>191 US undergraduate and Swiss master’s students</td>
<td>100 US undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continued on next page)
**Key results**

The directional results suggest that emotional responses to price differences are elicited and differentiated by fairness and agency appraisals and that these emotions distinctively impact post-purchase behavior.

As expected, SP-related anger and gratitude most strongly impacted behaviors in a direction consistent with their valence, while positive and negative self-conscious emotions both tended to positively impact post-purchase behaviors.

Self-serving bias tendencies were found when respondents make agency attributions for paying less. This called for an in-depth investigation of the nature of agency attributions when consumers are price advantaged (cf. Study 2).

Self-serving bias tendencies were present in agency appraisals when being advantaged: per default (i.e., no agency cue present), paying less was credited to the self rather than the service provider.

The expected positive (or neutral) emotions were found to vary by agency: Pride was highest in the self-, gratitude in the service provider-, surprise in the circumstance-, and relief in the no-agency condition.

These emotions were found to distinctively affect post-purchase behaviors. For example, feeling pride was associated with positive word of mouth, while gratitude additionally increased repurchase intentions.

The fairness and agency patterns proposed in the framework predicted which emotion was elicited over another. Negative self-conscious emotions were highest in the self/disadvantaged, anger in the SP/disadvantaged, and gratitude in the SP/advantaged condition. Unexpectedly, pride did not appear in the self/advantaged condition. Potential explanations were investigated in Study 4.

As in Study 1 and 2, SP-related anger and gratitude most strongly impacted behaviors in a valence-consistent manner, while pride and negative self-conscious emotions both exerted a positive impact on behaviors, which promotes a discrete emotions approach to study price affect.

Mediation analyses support the vital role of price-related emotions. They showed that the interactive effect of agency and fairness cognitions on consumers’ post-purchase behaviors is transmitted by the set of six emotions tested.

---

**Note.** N-/P-WOM = negative/positive word of mouth; SP = service provider.
4 Study 1: Probing the role of fairness and agency appraisals in predicting emotional responses to price inequity (Pretest)

4.1 Overview and design

Study 1 served the purpose of a pretest. It sought to test (i) the appraisal manipulations in the scenarios and (ii) the conceptual framework with its main hypotheses on the appraisal-emotion ($H1-H4$) and emotion-behavior relationships ($H7-H10$) in order to gain initial insights on the key propositions of this thesis. Additionally, the issue of ambivalent emotions when being price advantaged was explored ($H6$). Study 1 was designed as a 2 (agency: self-vs. service provider-caused) x 2 (fairness: advantaged unfair vs. disadvantaged unfair) full-factorial between-subjects design.

4.2 Procedure

Seventy-eight undergraduate students from a US university participated in Study 1 for course credit. As part of a laboratory session of one hour, the students completed this experiment among other, unrelated studies while seated in separate cubicles. In the present study, the participants were randomly assigned to one of four paper-pencil questionnaires in English with different scenarios about the purchase of a holiday package. First, the respondents were instructed to carefully read and vividly visualize the price situation described to them. Essentially, the instructions asked the participants to place themselves in the situation of the story's protagonist (imagine-self instructions) as a means to induce self-oriented, mentally simulated emotions (Schorr, 2001). The wording of the instructions was closely adopted from the directed imagery study by Smith and Lazarus (1993, p. 243):

Please carefully read through the following description of a price situation, and picture the situation that is described to you in your mind as best you can. Pretend that you are actually living through this experience. Try to mentally create the thoughts and feelings you would have if you were actually in this situation. Please now read the price situation in the grey box below and answer the following questions.

Second, after reading the scenario, the participants were asked to write about how they would feel in this price situation in their own words in an open-ended format. This served to ensure engagement in the imagery task (see also Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Part of the instructions given were similar to those used by Suri et al. (2002). Further, the instructions explicitly requested the respondents to indicate their emotional response to this price situation and not their feelings related to going on vacation later. The instructions are given below:
How do you feel in the described price situation? Please describe your feeling(s) in your own words as precisely as possible on the space below. There are no right or wrong responses to this question. We would merely like to understand how you would feel if you had experienced the described price situation in real life. Please do not indicate your feelings related to going on holidays later. We are only interested in your emotional response to this price situation.

Finally, the respondents were presented with different item batteries related to their emotions and post-purchase behavioral intentions as well as the manipulation check (cf. Chapter 4.4).

The subsequent studies followed this general procedure; potential adaptations are indicated with each study.

### 4.3 Scenarios

**Content and structure of scenarios.** The scenarios of this and the following studies unfolded in four parts (if not indicated otherwise): First, the participants learned that they had booked an accommodation and airline package for $550. This part was identical for all participants. In the second part, the fairness manipulation set in. The participants learned that they met a friend who was on a budget and had paid a different price for exactly the same package. In the advantaged price unfairness scenario their friend had paid $660 and in the disadvantaged price unfairness scenario their friend had paid $440. The budgetary constraints of the friend were included in this pretest to foster and investigate the elicitiation of mixed emotions in the advantaged price inequality scenario (this context information will be relaxed in the following studies). In the third part, the agency manipulation was introduced. Depending on the experimental condition, the story provided a reason why the disadvantaged or advantaged price difference occurred: either it was within the responsibility of the self (i.e., you missed out on the special offer because you forgot about it vs. you negotiated a better price) or of the service provider (i.e., you missed out on the special offer because the company's homepage and phone lines were down vs. the company offered you an anniversary special). Part four ended the scenarios with a final statement recapitulating whether the focal customer paid a higher or lower price than the friend. The wording of the scenarios is given below:

You plan to go to California this summer. You book an offer at www.travelexpedit.com (a new travel agency) for $550 for the flight and accommodation. Two days later, you are sitting in the cafeteria and bump into a good friend from university. You start to chat. After a while you find out that he is going to California on exactly the same date than you. This friend is on a tight budget and you know that he has been working really hard to save the money to afford this trip. He also booked at www.travelexpedit.com, but paid $440 [$660] (i.e., 20% less [more] than you) for exactly the same flight and accommodation package. You remember that you came across the same price during your search.

*[Scenario 1: Disadvantaged/self]* This was a special offer valid only for one day. However, you forgot about the booking and missed out this special offer.
[Scenario 2: Disadvantaged/service provider] This was a special offer valid only for one day. However, when you started to book an error message popped up. Although you tried to call Travelexpedit repeatedly during the day no one took the call. A day later you visited www.travelexpedit.com again and the price had increased.

[Scenario 3: Advantaged/self] However, you went on to browse the internet to find a better offer. You found one, took this to negotiate with Travelexpedit and finally managed to get a better price from Travelexpedit.

[Scenario 4: Advantaged/service provider] While you were about to book you got an email newsletter from Travelexpedit. To celebrate their first anniversary, Travelexpedit offered a special price to their subscribers.

So you finally booked and paid exactly the same flight and accommodation package at a higher [lower] price than your friend.

Construction of scenarios. The construction of the scenarios was based on previous scenario experiments conducted in appraisal, behavioral pricing, and equity theory research: First, the scenarios were designed to represent situations that could easily be encountered by the participants of the study (similar, see Kuppens & van Mechelen, 2007) and that are of relevance with regard to their motives and needs (Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Goal relevance is crucial because an event that is irrelevant to one's well-being is unlikely to trigger emotional responses (Lazarus, 1991). Booking holidays and encountering price differences were anticipated to be a familiar and budgetary relevant purchase situation for students. Second, any indication of the protagonist's emotional responses to the described situation was avoided to ensure that the participants' responses were solely guided by the contextual and cognitive appraisal cues provided (see Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Third, potential confounding variables such as the quality (i.e., the reward side of the transaction) were explicitly held constant across the scenarios by pointing out that the different prices applied to "exactly the same flight and accommodation package". Also, the actual price paid by the focal consumer was held constant at $550, while only the price of the comparative party varied. This corresponds to how advantaged versus disadvantaged (price) inequity is typically manipulated in equity research (similar see e.g., Haws & Bearden, 2006; van den Bos et al., 2006; Xia & Monroe, 2010 in Study 2). Additionally, further appraisal conditions can be regarded as implicitly held constant across the scenarios as they were not mentioned (e.g., certainty and stability of the outcome, coping potential, etc.). The only aspects that changed between the scenarios were the price information (fairness manipulation) and the specific contextual information on the reason for the price difference (agency manipulation) (similar see Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Fourth, the stories were written in the second person singular (see also Smith & Lazarus, 1993) to help the respondents to immerse themselves in the situation and to simulate the associated emotional experiences first-hand (Schorr, 2001).

Early versions of the scenarios and questionnaire were tested with a set of 'think-aloud pre-tests' (see Singleton & Straits, 2005) in order to (i) refine the manipulation, and (ii) to assess the realism of the scenarios as well as the understandability of the questionnaire. A conveni-
ence sample of 13 undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral students as well as consumers in Switzerland was randomly given one of the initial versions of the scenarios. Participants were instructed to say their thoughts out loud while completing an extended German version of the paper-pencil questionnaire. The primary aim was to test the manipulation. Therefore, the procedure differed from the experimental procedure described above in that the manipulation check was presented directly after the scenarios and prior to the assessment of the dependent variables (see suggestion by Perdue & Summers, 1986). Based on the results of these think-aloud pretests, the scenarios and particularly their appraisal manipulation as well as the questionnaire were adapted and refined.

4.4 Measures

Emotions. Anger, gratitude, and pride were measured with the items 'angry', 'grateful', and 'proud', respectively. The class of negative self-conscious emotions was measured using the mean of a composite scale including the items 'guilty', 'ashamed', and 'regretful' ($\alpha = .729$) (see Ramanathan & Williams, 2007 for the identical index; see Butt & Choi, 2006; Louro et al., 2005; Rothman, 2011 for similar composite indexes to assess negative self-conscious emotions). Additionally, the general emotion items 'happy', 'sad', and 'dislike' were included as fillers to reduce demand effects (see similar Weiss et al., 1999). The participants were asked to rate the intensity with which they felt these emotion items on a 7-point scale ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6).

As proposed by Bagozzi et al. (1999) and outlined by Nyer (1997), unipolar scales were used over bipolar scales as people often face difficulty in clearly distinguishing opposite emotional responses. Moreover, single-item measures were applied to measure anger, gratitude, and pride in order to capture the proper meaning of each emotion. Existing scales have been criticized for their content validity (e.g., Power, 2006), and many recent appraisal studies in psychology have applied single-item measures for emotions in the sense of using proper emotion terms (e.g., Kuppens, Van Mechelen, Smits, De Boeck, & Ceulemans, 2007; Siemer et al., 2007; Siemer & Reisenzein, 2007; Tong, 2010) and also for appraisals (e.g., Kuppens et al., 2007; Siemer et al., 2007; Tong, 2010). Hence, single-items are regarded as standard practice in appraisal studies (Tong, 2010), whose researchers have commonly applied a minimalistic questioning strategy to ensure for nonbiasing instruments (Schorr, 2001). The present study generally used single items to measure emotions combined with a multi-item measure to assess the class of negative self-conscious emotions (for other appraisal-based studies that combine single- and multi-item scales to measure different emotions given conceptual reasons, see e.g., Feather & McKee, 2009; Soscia, 2007).
Post-purchase behavior. To measure complaining, positive and negative word of mouth (P-/N-WOM), and repurchase intention, single-item measures were used (see also e.g., Peine et al., 2009; Soscia, 2007). Respondents were asked to indicate how likely they were to 'complain to', 'recommend', 'say negative things about', and 'repurchase from' this service provider (for similar items on P-WOM, see e.g., Peine et al., 2009; Soscia, 2007; on N-WOM and complaining, see e.g., Bougie et al., 2003; on repurchase, see similar e.g., Tsiros & Mittal, 2000). All were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 'definitely not' (0) to 'definitely' (6).

Manipulation check. To check the manipulations, the respondents were asked whether the reason for the price difference was due to the service provider (-3) or due to themselves (3) (agency rating) and whether the price they paid was 'a lot lower' (-3) or 'a lot higher' (3) than their friend's price (fairness rating) using 7-point bipolar scales.

4.5 Analysis and results

This chapter provides the results of the manipulation check (cf. Chapter 4.5.1) and tests the hypotheses on the appraisal-emotion relationships (H1-H4) (cf. Chapter 4.5.2), on the emotional ambivalence of paying less (H6) (cf. Chapter 4.5.3), and on the emotion-behavior relationships (H7-H10) (cf. Chapter 4.5.4).

4.5.1 Manipulation check

To assess whether the manipulations worked as intended, separate 2x2 ANOVAs with agency and fairness as factors and the agency rating or fairness rating as dependent variable were conducted (for the cell means, see Table 4). As expected, a significant main effect of the factor agency on the agency rating was present ($F(1, 74) = 20.257, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .215$), while the factor fairness ($F(1, 74) = 1.982, p = .163$) and the agency x fairness interaction did not significantly affect the agency ratings ($F(1, 74) = 1.082, p = .302$). Hence, in the service provider-agency conditions, the reason for the price difference was attributed to the service provider ($M = -.82$), while oneself was regarded as the reason in the self-agency conditions ($M = 1.13$). Similarly, the main effect of the factor fairness on the distributive fairness rating was significant ($F(1, 74) = 45.748, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .382$), while the factor agency ($F(1, 74) = .388, p = .535$) as well as the interaction produced no significant effect on the fairness rating ($F(1, 74) = .783, p = .379$). As anticipated, in the two advantaged conditions the respondents indicated that they paid less than their friend ($M = -1.05$), while they perceived that they paid more in the two disadvantaged conditions ($M = 1.26$). Based on these results, the manipulations can be deemed effective (similar see e.g., Weiss et al., 1999).

Still, a close inspection of the cell means (cf. Table 4) indicates hedonic, or self-serving, bias tendencies in perceived agency for positive price outcomes (for hedonic biases in attributions,
see Weiner, 1985). A self-caused price advantage was substantially attributed to the self \((M = 1.21)\), whereas being price advantaged due to the service provider was scarcely credited to the service provider \((M = -.30)\). Put differently, when paying more due to the service provider, the service provider was given considerable blame \((M = -1.37)\), while when paying less due to the service provider, the latter was given little credit for it \((M = -.30)\). A simple effect one-way ANOVA revealed that the latter mean difference was marginally significant \((F(1, 37) = 3.057, p = .089, \eta^2_p = .076)\). When the self was the agent, the price advantaged \((M = 1.21)\) and price disadvantaged condition \((M = 1.05)\) were both attributed to the self, as was expected \((F(1, 37) = .066, p = .798)\). In sum, based on the descriptive results, attributions for positive price outcomes tended to be biased in the direction of internal causes (Weiner, 1985), while attributions of negative price outcomes were not found to be biased in a self-serving way. Still, simple effect one-way ANOVAs confirmed that the agency mean ratings differed significantly between the two disadvantaged price situations \((F(1, 37) = 14.308, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .279)\) as well as between the two advantaged price situations \((F(1, 37) = 6.459, p = .015, \eta^2_p = .149)\) as this was intended by the agency manipulation.

Table 4: Cell means for the manipulation check ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>service-provider</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>service-provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agency rating</td>
<td>fairness rating</td>
<td>agency rating</td>
<td>fairness rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1 (n=20)</td>
<td>1.05\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.30\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.21\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2 (n=19)</td>
<td>-1.37\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1.21\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.32\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3 (n=19)</td>
<td>1.21\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-30\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4 (n=20)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 78\). Means within a row that do not share a common superscript differ significantly \((p < .05)\) based on post-hoc pairwise comparisons using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test\(^2\).

The descriptive statistic and bivariate correlations between the main variables of this study are presented in Appendix II.

\(^2\) Using the Tukey-Kramer procedure to control for the familywise Type I error rate of multiple significance tests (cf. discussion in Chapter 3.2) was regarded as too conservative strategy for the pretest, given its small sample size and exploratory character. Hence, in order to prevent an otherwise likely increase in Type II error rate, least significant difference (LSD) pairwise comparisons (or simple effect ANOVAs) were reported in this study (for details, see e.g., Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Nevertheless, the subsequent studies use Tukey-Kramer adjusted comparisons, which is why these results are also given in footnotes. For the manipulation check ratings, the Tukey-Kramer and LSD results were largely the same at \(p < .05\), except for the difference in the agency rating between the two advantaged conditions, which was marginally significant \((p = .077)\), and between the disadvantaged/self- and advantaged/service provider-caused condition which became just not marginally significant \((p = .128)\).
Table 5: Cell means, 2x2 ANOVAs, and planned comparisons on the emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>disadvantaged</th>
<th>advantaged</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Planned comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>4.05*</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.68*</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 78 (except for proud and grateful N = 77 and df_{error} = 73); *italics* indicates the condition in which the respective emotion was hypothesized to have the highest mean compared to the other conditions (cf. means within a row); *underline* indicates the emotion with the descriptively highest mean observed within a scenario (cf. means within a column).

Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6).

†p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
4.5.2 Hypotheses on appraisal-emotion relationships

A-priori planned complex comparisons (to test H1, H2, H3a, H4a) and simple comparisons (to test H3b, H4b) were conducted to analyze the hypotheses on the discrete emotions that are expected to be elicited by the four different fairness x agency conditions. Building on the ordinal interaction pattern suggested in H1, H2, H3a, and H4a, the complex comparisons test whether the mean of the respective emotion is significantly higher in the proposed experimental condition compared to its overall mean across the three remaining conditions. Ideally, the result of this hypothesis-testing complex comparison is complemented by simple comparisons, showing significantly higher mean values in the proposed scenario compared to every other scenario individually. Additionally, besides the results of the hypothesis-testing complex comparisons, the 2x2 ANOVA results are also reported (for a summary of the cell means and \( F \)-statistic, see Table 5). However, given the lack in power of the standard factorial ANOVA to detect ordinal interactions (because they are laid out to fit disordinal, cross-over interaction means pattern; see e.g., Strube & Bobko, 1989), the results of the complex comparison are ideally, but not necessarily, qualified by a significant fairness x agency interaction (cf. discussion in Chapter 3.2).

Negative self-conscious emotions. The result of the hypothesis-testing complex contrast corroborated that negative self-conscious emotions were most intense when the self was responsible for being disadvantaged (\( M = 2.80 \)) compared to its overall mean across the other three conditions (\( M = 1.63, F(1, 74) = 9.162, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .110 \)), confirming H1. Based on the simple contrasts, negative self-conscious emotions were significantly higher in the self/disadvantaged condition compared to the service provider/disadvantaged (\( M = 1.81, F(1, 74) = 4.352, p = .040, \eta^2_p = .056 \)), or the two advantaged conditions (\( M_{adv/self} = 1.54, F(1, 74) = 6.964, p = .010, \eta^2_p = .086, \) and \( M_{adv/SP} = 1.55, F(1, 74) = 7.077, p = .010, \eta^2_p = .087 \)). However, other than expected, the descriptively most intense emotion within the self/disadvantaged condition was anger (\( M = 3.45 \)). A potential explanation for this unexpected result is that the item 'angry' was not only associated with feeling angry at another person (as anticipated), but also with feeling angry at oneself, which is conceptually related to negative self-conscious emotions. To disentangle this issue, the consecutive studies will add a referent to the item 'angry' to distinguish between feeling angry at oneself versus at the service provider (see similar Barrett, 1998; Watson & Clark, 1999). Further, a simple contrast between the two advantaged conditions suggests that negative self-conscious emotions are not higher when being advantaged due to the self (\( M = 1.54 \)) than when due to the service provider (\( M = 1.55, F(1, 74) = .000, p = .990 \)). Some low level of negative self-conscious emotions was present when being price advantaged independent of agency, which disconfirmed H3b.
Anger. As predicted, feelings of anger were most intense when the service provider is to blame for paying a higher price than the friend (\(M = 4.05\)) compared to the mean anger level of the three remaining conditions (\(M = 2.12, F(1, 74) = 18.883, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .203\)), which corroborated \(H2\). Accordingly, anger was felt most intensely in the service provider/disadvantaged condition compared to the self/advantaged (\(M = 1.42, F(1, 74) = 23.235, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .239\)) and service provider/advantaged condition (\(M = 1.50, F(1, 74) = 22.422, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .233\)), but not significantly so if compared to the self-caused disadvantaged condition (\(M = 3.45, F(1, 74) = 1.250, p = .267\)). Again, feeling angry might not only have been associated with anger at another person (in Scenario 2) but also at oneself (in Scenario 1), which might have added to the latter nonsignificant difference between the two disadvantaged conditions. Further, contrasting the two advantaged conditions suggests that the respondents are not angrier when being advantaged due to the service provider (\(M = 1.50\)) than due to the self (\(M = 1.42, F(1, 74) = .021, p = .884\)), disconfirming \(H4b\).

Pride. Feelings of pride were highest within the self/advantaged condition (\(M = 3.68\)) compared to its mean across the three remaining conditions (\(M = 1.30, F(1, 73) = 32.933, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .311\)), confirming \(H3a\). The respondents were significantly prouder in the self/advantaged condition compared to the self/disadvantaged (\(M = .75, F(1, 73) = 33.927, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .317\)), the service provider/disadvantaged condition (\(M = .44, F(1, 73) = 39.237, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .350\)), and marginally compared to the service provider/advantaged condition (\(M = 2.70, F(1, 73) = 3.817, p = .055, \eta_p^2 = .050\)). This latter still relatively high level of pride even when being advantaged due to the service provider can be regarded as a manifestation of self-serving bias tendencies in agency appraisals detected in the manipulation check. Investigating the descriptive means of the four emotions within the advantaged self-caused condition indicates that pride is closely followed by gratitude (\(M = 3.63\)). A potential reason for this might again lie in the referent specification of the item 'grateful', as is discussed in the subsequent paragraph.

Gratitude. Gratitude scored highest among all emotions in the service provider/advantaged condition (\(M = 2.90\)) and was significantly higher in this condition compared to the self/disadvantaged (\(M = 1.05, F(1, 73) = 12.177, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .143\)) and service provider/disadvantaged condition (\(M = 1.00, F(1, 73) = 12.168, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .143\)). However, although the hypothesis-testing complex contrast was significant (\(M = 2.90\) vs. \(M = 1.89, F(1, 73) = 5.330, p = .024, \eta_p^2 = .068\)), gratitude was directionally higher in the self/advantaged (\(M = 3.63\)) than in the predicted service provider/advantaged condition, although not significantly so (\(F(1, 73) = 1.855, p = .177\)). Hence, \(H4a\) was only partially supported. A potential explanation for the latter nonsignificant difference in gratitude between the two advantaged conditions is that the respondents might have associated different referents with the item 'grateful': A person can feel grateful to another person (i.e., the service provider
in Scenario 4), but also grateful for a particular situation which might have acted as the referent in the self-caused advantaged condition (i.e., the situation of getting a better price in Scenario 3).

In sum, the hypothesis-testing complex contrasts revealed that negative self-conscious emotions (H1), anger (H2) and pride (H3a) were highest in the expected agency by fairness condition. The results on gratitude were less clear (H4a). Further, both negative emotions were to some extent present when paying a lower price than someone else, but they do not seem to differ as a function of agency between the two advantaged conditions (disconfirming H3b and H4b). The ANOVA results supplement the contrast analyses. For all the emotions a significant main effect of fairness emerged (all four \( p \leq .028 \)), while the only marginally significant main effect of agency occurred for pride (\( p = .076 \)), and no significant interaction effects were present. However, overall, the omnibus F-test of the 2x2 MANOVA indicated that both, fairness and agency, act as a significant predictor of the four emotions (\( F(4, 70) = 23.220, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .570 \) and \( F(4, 70) = 2.951, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .144 \), respectively), while their interaction was nonsignificant at conventional levels (\( F(4, 70) = 1.413, p = .239 \)). It is expected that in addressing the potential explanations for the unexpected results in the subsequent studies (that is, (1) the referent specification of the items 'angry' and 'grateful'; and (2) the self-serving bias tendencies in attributing agency when being price advantaged), the interactive effects of fairness and agency on the hypothesized emotions will emerge in a more pronounced manner and clarify the picture.

4.5.3 Hypotheses on mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged

Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged. Building on Fong and Tiedens (2002), who draw on the literature of attitudinal ambivalence to operationalize emotional ambivalence, the similarity-intensity model (SIM) (Priester & Petty, 1996; Thompson et al., 1995) is used in this study to assess a person’s degree of emotional ambivalence. Thompson et al. (1995; see also Thompson & Zanna, 1995) suggest that ambivalence (A) is a function of how similar two opposing forces are (i.e., equivalent magnitude) and how intense they are. Their full equation of \( A = F \left( \frac{[C+D]}{2} - (D - C) \right) \) builds upon the difference between the dominant response (D) and the conflicting response (C) to measure similarity (that is, \( D - C \)) and on the average of the two to capture intensity (that is, \( \frac{[C + D]}{2} \)) (see also Fong & Tiedens, 2002; Priester & Petty, 1996). Priester and Petty (1996) simplified this earlier conceptualization to a linear function for ambivalence of three times the conflicting reaction (i.e., the response with the lower score) minus the dominant reaction (i.e., the response with the higher score) to \( A = F(3C - D) \) (see Priester & Petty, 1996 for an elaboration of their formula; see e.g., Williams & Aaker, 2002 for an application of this formula to assess emotional ambiva-
lence in marketing). Study 1 used scales ranging from 0 to 6 to measure the intensity of the discrete emotions. Thus, the calculated ambivalence index can possibly range from plus 12 ($A_{\text{max}} = [3*6] - 6 = 12$) to minus 6 ($A_{\text{min}} = [3*0] - 6 = -6$). Three different ambivalence indexes were calculated: (1) An overall ambivalence index based on a positive emotion index (i.e., mean across pride and gratitude) versus a negative emotion index (i.e., mean across anger, guilt, regret, shame); (2) a self-related ambivalence index using pride and negative self-conscious emotions as the opposing forces; and (3) a service provider-related ambivalence index building on gratitude versus anger. The calculation of each ambivalence index followed the same steps: First, positive and negative emotion indexes were computed (where necessary). Second, in observations where the negative emotion was higher than or equal to the positive emotion, the negative emotion was defined as the dominant response and the positive emotion as the conflicting response. For the remaining observations, the positive emotion was referred to as the dominant response and the negative emotion as the conflicting response. Third, the ambivalence indexes were calculated using the simplified formula above (for the cell means, see Table 6).

### Table 6: Cell means for ambivalence indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>disadvantaged</th>
<th></th>
<th>advantaged</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (overall)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (self)</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (SP)</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 77. Overall ambivalence is calculated based on a positive emotion index (i.e., mean across pride and gratitude, $\alpha = .791$) and a negative emotion index (i.e., mean across anger, guilt, regret, shame, $\alpha = .738$); Self-related ambivalence is calculated based on pride and negative self-conscious emotions (i.e., mean across guilt, shame, regret, $\alpha = .729$); Service provider (SP)-related ambivalence is calculated based on gratitude and anger.*

First, it was predicted that some level of mixed positive and negative feelings co-occur when being price advantaged compared to a co-consumer than when being disadvantaged ($H_{6a}$). Hence, as a formal test, overall emotional ambivalence is expected to be higher in the advantaged compared to the non-ambiavlent disadvantaged conditions. However, the respective 2x2 ANOVA with fairness and agency as factors and the overall ambivalence index as dependent variable showed no support for a significant main effect of fairness ($F(1, 73) = .607, p = .439$). None of the main or higher-order effects were significant (all three $p > .10$). Hence, these results suggest rather low emotional ambivalence when paying less, which disconfirms $H_{6a}$. Similarly, the correlation analysis revealed that the positive and negative emotion indexes are negatively correlated in the subsample of the two advantaged conditions ($r = -.441$, $p = .005$). This means that different people experience either positive or negative emotions
when paying less, rather than that the same person simultaneously experiences blends of positive and negative emotions.

Second, it was hypothesized that self-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of pride and negative self-conscious emotions) is strongest if being advantaged is due to the self and that service provider-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of gratitude and anger) is highest if the service provider is responsible for the price difference ($H6b$). However, the respective planned complex comparison for self-related ambivalence was not significant ($M = -1.44$ vs. $M = -.75$, $F(1, 73) = .857$, $p = .358$). Directionally, self-related ambivalence was even lower in the self/advantaged ($M = -1.44$) compared to the service provider/advantaged condition ($M = -.32$, although n.s. at $p > .2$). The strong negative correlation between 'pride' and 'negative self-conscious emotions' in the self/advantaged condition ($r = -.724$, $p < .001$) confirmed low levels of self-related ambivalence when paying less due to the self. Further, the respective planned complex comparison on the service provider-related ambivalence index was also not significant ($M = .40$ vs. $M = -1.03$, $F(1, 73) = 1.740$, $p = .191$). Nevertheless, service provider-related emotional ambivalence was directionally higher in the service provider/advantaged ($M = .40$) compared to the self/advantaged condition ($M = -.21$, although n.s. at $p > .6$). Based on the nonsignificant correlation between 'gratitude' and 'anger' in the service provider/advantaged condition ($r = -.052$, $p = .829$), service provider-related ambivalence might be present for some people but not for others.

In sum, these results suggest that emotional ambivalence is rather low when being advantaged, contradicting $H6a$. Further, they do not suggest that agency-related ambivalence is highest in the respective agency condition as predicted by $H6b$. Rather, the results imply an inverse pattern for self-agency-related ambivalence. In the self/advantaged condition, one seems clear about the emotional outcome toward the self (and hence the agent): either one feels proud or has negative self-conscious feelings toward the self. However, this pattern of low agency-related ambivalence was not found for service provider-related ambivalence. A potential explanation for the latter might lie in the absent referent specification of the items 'grateful' and 'angry', which needs to be tested in the subsequent studies.
4.5.4 Hypotheses on emotion-behavior relationships

A multivariate multiple regression with the four discrete emotions as independent variables and the four behaviors as dependent variables was conducted in order to test how the emotions map onto the post-purchase behaviors (H7-H10) (detailed results see Table 7). The partial eta-squared ($\eta^2_p$) measure of association of the across-equation F-tests indicated that anger and gratitude – the two service provider-related emotions – showed the strongest effect on the four post-purchase behaviors (although just nonsignificant for gratitude, $F(4, 69) = 1.894, p = .121, \eta^2_p = .099$; but significant for anger, $F(4, 69) = 5.767, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .251$).

Table 7: Multivariate multiple regression of post-purchase behaviors on emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>complain</th>
<th>P-WOM</th>
<th>N-WOM</th>
<th>repurchase</th>
<th>across-equation test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-NE</td>
<td>-1.176</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(4, 72)$</td>
<td><strong>5.463</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.853</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.800</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 77$; $b$ values indicate unstandardized regression coefficients; **bold** indicates $p < .10$; self-NE = negative self-conscious emotions. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Specifically, being angry was found to increase complaining ($b = .544, t(72) = 4.215, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .198$) and negative word of mouth ($b = .438, t(72) = 4.045, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .185$), confirming $H8a$ and $H8b$. However, the expected negative effects of anger on positive word of mouth ($b = -1.152, t(72) = -1.480, p = .143$) and repurchase ($b = -.094, t(72) = -.875, p = .385$) were only directionally but not significantly present, disconfirming $H8c$ and $H8d$. Inversely, gratitude seemed to foster repurchase intentions ($b = .278, t(72) = 2.251, p = .027, \eta^2_p = .066$) and marginally significantly positive word of mouth ($b = .227, t(72) = 1.924, p = .058, \eta^2_p = .049$) while preventing negative word of mouth ($b = -.238, t(72) = -1.913, p = .060, \eta^2_p = .048$). These results confirmed $H10d, H10c$, and $H10b$, respectively. However, gratitude was not found to also significantly decrease complaining ($b = -.092, t(72) = -.619, p = .538$), as was expected by $H10a$. Negative self-conscious emotions marginally significantly decreased the intention to spread negative word of mouth ($b = -.246, t(72) = -1.811, p = .074, \eta^2_p = .044$), which corroborated $H7b$. However, the predicted negative effect of negative self-conscious emotions on complaining was only directional but not significant ($b = -.176, t(72) = -1.084, p = .282$), disconfirming $H7a$. As anticipated, negative self-conscious emotions were unrelated to positive word of mouth and repurchase intentions at $p < .10$. Although the latter nonsignificant associations were as ex-
pected, it is interesting to note that the direction of the regression coefficients suggests that negative self-conscious emotions are rather positively associated with positive word of mouth ($b = .109$, $t(72) = .845$, $p = .401$) and even with repurchase intentions ($b = .197$, $t(72) = 1.459$, $p = .149$). Furthermore, the predicted positive effect of pride on positive word of mouth was directionally but not significantly present ($b = .116$, $t(72) = 1.002$, $p = .320$), providing only directional support for $H9$. As anticipated, no significant associations were found between pride and complaining, negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions (all three $p > .3$). Interestingly, although they were not significant, all regression coefficients for pride were directionally positive, both for positive but also negative post-purchase behaviors. No further effects were significant at $p < .10$.

Integrating these individual results suggests that the negative self-conscious emotions as well as gratitude positively impact post-purchase behaviors, while anger has a negative impact. Put differently, the two service provider-related emotions gratitude and anger impact post-purchase behavior in a way congruent with their mere valence, whereas the negative self-conscious emotions positively affect post-purchase behavior via reducing negative word of mouth, which (although hypothesized) is inverse to what would be predicted by their mere valence. Further, the regression coefficients of pride indicate that (although nonsignificant), directionally, pride is positively related to positive word of mouth. In sum, these results are in line with the general notion that discrete emotions of the same valence have a different impact on behavioral intentions (e.g., pride and gratitude) and sometimes even an inverse effect (e.g., anger and negative self-conscious emotions). However, only part of the specific hypotheses on the emotion-behavior relationships were significantly supported and several effects remained subtle. Further clarifying the pattern in the following studies by (1) disentangling the referent for specific discrete emotions, (2) including further potentially relevant emotions, and (3) increasing power via higher sample sizes might help to provide a more nuanced picture of the relationships between discrete emotions and post-purchase behavior.

Ambivalence-behavior relationship. Although no a-priori hypothesis had been stated, a multivariate regression was run on the subsample of the two advantaged conditions to explore how overall emotional ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of positive and negative emotions) affects post-purchase behavior. The results indicate that overall emotional ambivalence has a negative effect on post-purchase behavior. Overall emotional ambivalence was found to significantly increase complaining ($b = .275$, $t(37) = 3.784$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .279$) and negative word of mouth intentions ($b = .206$, $t(37) = 2.773$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2_p = .172$) and marginally significantly decrease positive word of mouth ($b = -.126$, $t(37) = -1.760$, $p = .087$, $\eta^2_p = .077$) as well as repurchase intentions ($b = -.162$, $t(37) = -1.974$, $p = .056$, $\eta^2_p = .095$).
### 4.6 Summary and discussion

The aim of Study 1 was to investigate the key appraisal-emotion and emotion-behavior relationships proposed and to test the appraisal manipulations. Overall, the directional results of the pretest are in line with the fundamental proposition of this thesis that emotional responses to price inequity vary as a function of fairness and agency appraisals and that these emotions distinctively impact post-purchase behavior. Nevertheless, some of the effects are subtle and indicate a need for further specifications in the subsequent studies.

First, regarding the appraisal-emotion relationships, the planned complex comparisons confirm that when paying more due to oneself, negative self-conscious emotions are highest compared to the remaining conditions. In contrast, when the focal customer blames the service provider for paying more than a co-consumer, anger is most intense. Still, anger did not significantly differ between the two disadvantaged conditions and was also high in the self/disadvantaged condition. A potential explanation for this unexpected finding is that the item 'angry' could have been associated with feeling 'angry at oneself' for respondents in the self/disadvantaged condition, and 'angry at the service provider' in the service provider/disadvantaged condition. Regarding the positive emotions, pride was found to be intensely elicited when the self is regarded as responsible for paying less. Pride was marginally significantly higher in the self/advantaged than the service provider/advantaged condition. Gratitude, which was expected when the focal customer credits the service provider for paying less than a co-consumer, did not significantly differ between the two advantaged conditions. The marginal significant difference for pride and the nonsignificant difference for gratitude between the two advantaged conditions could be explained by self-serving bias tendencies. The results of the manipulation check indicate that perceived agency was distorted toward the self in the service provider/advantaged condition. This might have led to higher levels of pride and lower levels of gratitude in the service provider/advantaged condition than expected. The nonsignificant difference for gratitude between the two advantaged conditions could additionally have resulted from different referents that the respondents might have subsumed under the item 'grateful' (i.e., 'grateful toward the service provider' in the service provider/advantaged condition versus 'grateful for the situation' in the self/advantaged condition). Together, these results indicate a need (1) to specify the emotion item measurement by adding referents to the items 'angry' and 'grateful', and, more importantly, (2) to further clarify the nature of the agency attribution process and self-serving bias tendencies when being price advantaged, which is the main focus of Study 2.

Second, the present results indicate that negative emotions are to a certain extent present in advantaged price conditions, such as anger and negative self-conscious emotions. However, in contrast to what was expected, they were not found to vary as a function of agency. Again, for
anger the nonsignificant result could be due to the vague item specification, which needs to be
tested in the following studies. Moreover, the mean values of these two self- and service
provider-related negative emotions were relatively low, considering that the friend was
described as having budgetary constraints. This demonstrates a need to explore other relevant
emotional responses to advantaged inequity. Particularly, emotions that are related to the
undesirable outcome for the co-consumer such as pity and malicious pleasure (e.g., Ortony et
al., 1988) should be considered (cf. Chapter 5.1). Thus, these two co-consumer-related emo-
tions are subsequently added to the self- and service provider-related emotions in order to
ensure that the framework comprehensively captures the relevant emotional responses to
being price advantaged.

Third, the ambivalence analyses indicate that people hardly feel ambivalent blends of emo-
tions when paying less than another customer. The results rather suggest that some customer
segments experience positive emotions, while others feel negative emotions. This notion
needs to be tested in further studies as it has important implications on the intensity of the
observed emotion means in the advantaged conditions. If the notion holds that customers feel
either positive or negative emotions when being advantaged, the calculated mean values of
the respective positive and negative emotions are attenuated across these two customer
groups. In contrast, if ambivalence was high, the mean values of the emotions observed in a
specific condition are not attenuated by averaging the intensity of the respective positive and
negative emotions across the respondents. To shed further light on the issue of mixed emo-
tions, additional variables need to be included such as further situational appraisals (i.e.,
motive consistency) and individual difference variables (i.e., relational-interdependent self-
construal) that are proposed to distinguish between positive and negative emotions in advan-
taged price conditions.

Fourth, condensing the individual significant results on the emotion-behavior relationships
suggests that the service provider-related emotions, gratitude and anger, exert the expected
valence-congruent effect on post-purchase behavior. Inversely, negative self-conscious emo-
tions were found to positively affect post-purchase behavior by decreasing negative word of
mouth activities, as was predicted. Directionally, pride seems to be positively associated with
positive word of mouth (although n.s.). These overall results support the notion that it is
crucial to use a discrete emotions approach to study price-related emotions in order to more
accurately predict post-purchase behaviors. Nonetheless, the several rather subtle effects call
for replication in subsequent studies.
5 Study 2: Role of agency appraisals in predicting emotional responses to advantaged price inequity

Study 1 raised several issues regarding the appraisal-emotion relationships in the two advantaged price conditions that call for further specifications: First, self-serving bias tendencies seem to have distorted people's agency appraisals and the respective emotion patterns. This indicates a need to elucidate the nature and role of consumers' agency attributions when paying less. Hence, Study 2 focuses on examining the agency antecedents of consumers' emotions in advantaged price situations. To study agency appraisals in more detail, the self- and service provider-agency conditions of Study 1 will be complemented by a circumstance-agency condition. Importantly, a control condition will also be added. The latter allows the observation of consumers' default agency perception if no agency information is present. Second, specifying the referent for the items grateful (i.e., grateful toward service provider vs. for situation) and angry (i.e., angry at oneself vs. service provider) might further help to foster clean and undiluted appraisal-emotion associations. Third, further emotion descriptors need to be included in order for the proposed framework to capture consumers' relevant emotional responses to advantaged price conditions. This particularly involves emotions related to the co-consumer's unfavorable outcome (i.e., pity, malicious pleasure). Fourth, the finding that paying less than someone else elicits positive or negative emotions rather than ambivalent emotional blends needs further testing. Fifth, the hypothesized role of situational appraisals (i.e., motive consistency) and individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC) in distinguishing between positive versus negative emotions in advantaged inequity will be explored.

Figure 5: Scope of Study 2: 1 fairness x 4 agency conditions
As a result, the main objectives of Study 2 are (i) to understand the nature of consumers' agency attributions when paying less, (ii) to investigate and disentangle the role of these agency appraisals in predicting and differentiating between consumers' discrete emotional responses to being price advantaged, and (iii) to assess how consumers' coping with these emotions affects post-purchase behaviors. Therefore, before testing the main conceptual framework on self- or service provider-agency in advantaged or disadvantaged price inequity conditions (cf. Study 3), the present study explicitly concentrates on elucidating the nature and role of agency appraisals in advantaged price situations (cf. Figure 5). To this end, Study 2 extends the focus to two additional agency conditions (i.e., circumstances- and no-agency) as well as emotions (i.e., co-consumer-related emotions). This conceptual extension calls for new hypotheses, which are developed next.

5.1 Additional hypotheses

5.1.1 Additional hypotheses on appraisal-emotion relationships

*Expected discrete emotions in the circumstance-agency and no-agency price advantaged condition (H12).* Regarding relevant emotions in the advantaged/circumstance-caused condition, an early critical incident study by Weiner, Russell, and Lerman (1979) on successful or failed exams indicates that successful outcomes that are attributed to luck (i.e., circumstances) are related to surprise and relief but also to the negative self-conscious emotion guilt. Guilt emerged not only under self-caused failure, but also when success was ascribed to luck, implying an intertwining of self-interest and moral concerns (Weiner et al., 1979). Similarly, the study by Tong et al. (2007) confirms that negative self-conscious emotions, namely, guilt and shame, are positively related to circumstance-agency. While considerable empirical support has been provided for the relationships between self- or other person-agency with specific discrete emotions, evidence for the associations between circumstance-agency and predicted emotions has been rather weak (Roseman, 2009; Roseman et al., 1996). Roseman et al. (1990) posit that events that are appraised as circumstance-caused may elicit surprise, relief, joy, hope, frustration, sadness, distress, disgust, and fear. However, their empirical recall study showed that only relief and sadness events were ascribed high circumstance-causation, while events eliciting joy, surprise, disgust, and frustration were consistently appraised as having higher other- or self-causation (Roseman et al., 1990). Manifesting somewhat different results, in a later recall study, circumstances-agency was found to be generally higher in situations eliciting surprise, joy, relief, fear, sadness, distress, and disgust, but not for situations inducing hope and frustration (Roseman et al., 1996).

Aligning these mixed results, this thesis builds on the achievement study by Weiner et al. (1979) as it connects well to advantaged inequity, which involves comparable conflicting self-
interest and moral concerns. Hence, the present project posits that paying less due to the circumstances is likely to elicit intense *surprise, relief* and to some extent also *negative self-conscious emotions*. The positive emotion relief is related to situations where an expected negative event has not materialized (Zeelenberg, 2009) and the hedonically neutral emotion surprise to the occurrence of an unexpected event (Reisenzein & Meyer, 2009). Hence, surprise and relief seem particularly likely emotions in the present service purchase context, which is typically characterized by a high degree of intangibility, heterogeneity, and risk/uncertainty (Bieger, 2007; Shoemaker & Mattila, 2009; Zeelenberg, 2009).

Regarding the no-agency (control) condition, Roseman et al. (1990) suggest that the same discrete emotions elicited by circumstance-agency are expected to occur for conditions in which the cause of an event is disregarded or unspecified. Consequently, the present thesis proposes that the emotional response elicited when no agency information is present for being advantaged is identical to the circumstance-agency condition. However, given self-serving bias tendencies in attributions of success to internal causes (Weiner, 1985), the emotional response profile to a price advantage when no agency cue is present could alternatively resemble the self-agency condition.

_H12: In the circumstance-caused/advantaged and the no-agency/advantaged unfairness conditions, (a) surprise and (b) relief will be strongest compared to the other conditions; and (c) some degree of negative self-conscious emotions will be present compared to the service provider-caused/advantaged condition._

*Expected discrete emotional responses to another person's disadvantage (H13).* Regarding relevant emotions elicited by the co-consumer's disadvantage, the appraisal literature suggests that an event implying negative consequences for another person might elicit feelings of *pity* or *malicious pleasure* (e.g., Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Ortony et al., 1988). Malicious pleasure (or Schadenfreude, gloating) refers to the pleasure of a focal person at another person's misfortune and emphasizes the self's advantaged, superior comparative position (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009). Pity reflects a focal person's sorrow at another person's suffering (Smith, 2000) and implies an empathic and caring relationship (Feather & Sherman, 2002). The study by Harth, Kessler, and Leach (2008) promotes the notion that other-focused emotions are relevant in inequity conditions by showing that groups facing an advantage felt pity at the misfortune of the disadvantaged group. According to the appraisal literature, the elicitation of pity over malicious pleasure depends on whether the other person's misfortune is perceived as undesirable or desirable for the self but is suggested to occur independent of agency attributions (Ortony et al., 1988). In line with this, Gelbrich (2011) found pity and malicious pleasure following a price advantage to be invariant across agency conditions. Further, open-ended responses in the study by Sundie, Ward, Beal, Chin, and Geiger-Oneto (2009) revealed that in
a consumption context, malicious pleasure might co-occur alongside empathic concerns. Hence, it is proposed that being price advantaged might elicit some degree of pity and malicious pleasure across all four agency conditions. Put differently, they are expected to vary by fairness but not by agency.

*H13: In the advantaged unfairness conditions, some degree of (a) pity and (b) malicious pleasure will be present compared to the disadvantaged unfairness conditions, independent of agency.*

In sum, these hypotheses on emotions elicited by the circumstance- and no-agency price advantaged condition (*H12*), as well as on pity and malicious pleasure (*H13*), complement the proposed emotional responses to self- and service provider-agency advantaged conditions (*H3, H4*) as outlined in Chapter 2.2.2. The full set of appraisal-emotion relationships that are tested in Study 2 are displayed in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Full set of appraisal-emotion hypotheses tested in Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAIRNESS</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service provider-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced price unfairness</td>
<td>circumstance-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no agency cue (control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pride (H3a)</td>
<td>[self-conscious NE (H3b)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gratitude (H4a)</td>
<td>[anger (H4b)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relief (H12b)</td>
<td>[self-conscious NE (H12c)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise (H12a)</td>
<td>[self-conscious NE (H12c)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Figure displays the hypothesized primary, most intensely elicited emotions per condition; potential secondary, less intense emotions are given in brackets.

Source: Own illustration based on literature review.

5.1.2 **Qualifying the hypotheses on mixed emotions when being price advantaged**

*Triggers of positive vs. negative emotions when being price advantaged (qualifying H5).* Hypothesis 5, suggesting that motive consistency and relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) predict when and for whom positive or negative emotions increase when being price advantaged (cf. Chapter 2.2.3), equally applies for the newly included emotions *relief, malicious pleasure,* and *pity.* Specifically, given their positive valence, relief and malicious pleasure are expected to increase the more motive-consistent a price advantage is perceived to be and the less one's self-concept is defined through close relationships (i.e., for people low in RISC; e.g., Cross, 2009), while the directionally inverse effect is anticipated for the negative emotion pity. In contrast, surprise is regarded as a hedonically neutral emotion that can be elicited in response to unexpected events (Reisenzein & Meyer, 2009) whether they are con-
sistent or inconsistent with personal motives (Roseman et al., 1990) and independent of a person's disposition in RISC. Hence, differently than all other discrete emotions tested in Study 2, surprise is expected to be unrelated to motive consistency or RISC.

*Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged (qualifying H6).* Hypothesis 6 on emotional ambivalence posits that self-related emotional ambivalence is highest in the self/advantaged condition and service provider-related emotional ambivalence in the service provider/advantaged condition (cf. Chapter 2.2.3). In contrast, pity and malicious pleasure are not suggested to vary by agency but rather as a function of advantaged versus disadvantaged unfairness (cf. H13). Therefore, *co-consumer-related emotional ambivalence* (i.e., co-occurrence of pity and malicious pleasure) is expected to be present in all advantaged price conditions tested and hence to be unrelated to the different agency conditions.

### 5.1.3 Additional hypotheses on emotion-behavior relationships

*Expected behavioral consequences of surprise, relief, pity, and malicious pleasure (H14).* *Surprise* is a hedonically neutral feeling to unexpected events (Reisenzein & Meyer, 2009) that is suggested to enact behaviors that serve to understand what is happening and to foster a tendency to suspend any action until the event is comprehended (Roseman, 2001; 2011). *Relief* is related to having avoided a potential negative outcome (Zeelenberg, 2009). It is proposed to serve response strategies with the goal of returning to normal and hence endorse action tendencies such as to stop moving away from something (Roseman, 2001; 2011). In sum, both emotions are suggested to suspend movements rather than to promote active behavioral tendencies. Hence, relief and surprise are not expected to be predictive of any active post-purchase behavior related to the service provider. As a result, surprise and relief are subsequently anticipated to be unrelated to complaining, positive and negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions.

Further, *pity* toward a disadvantaged group was found to increase prosocial behavior targeted at providing equal opportunity to the disadvantaged group (Harth et al., 2008). Hence, pity might induce redistributive giving behavior toward the disadvantaged co-consumer rather than affecting post-purchase actions related to the service provider. As a consequence, pity is expected to be unrelated to the four post-purchase behaviors. In line with this proposition, Gelbrich (2011) found no significant associations between pity and word of mouth referrals or repurchase intentions. Regarding *malicious pleasure*, Sundie et al. (2009) report that this emotion is prompted by hostile feelings and was found to increase negative word of mouth in their study. The authors speculate that spreading negative word of mouth might be promoted by a motive to relive the joy, to share it with others, or to spread a cautionary tale (Sundie et al., 2009). Beyond that, malicious pleasure has been found to be unrelated to word of mouth
referrals or repurchase intentions (Gelbrich, 2011). Hence, malicious pleasure is expected to affect negative word of mouth activities only.

**H14: Malicious pleasure is positively associated with negative word of mouth.**

The above hypothesis (H14) complements the proposed emotion-behavior hypotheses for pride, gratitude, negative self-conscious emotions, and anger (H7-H10) delineated in Chapter 2.2.4. The full set of emotion-behavior relationships that are tested in Study 2 are displayed in Table 8. This table illustrates two important aspects. First, consumers' coping responses associated with the newly added emotions surprise, relief, and pity seem at a first glance less relevant for the service provider, compared to the self- and service provider-related emotions focused on in the main framework. However, finding support for the expected behavioral pattern would provide marketers with important information on missed opportunities (i) when agency cues are absent (which presumably is a highly likely case in real life) or (ii) when the circumstances are credited for paying less – the two conditions which are suggested to primarily give rise to relief and surprise. Second, the table illustrates the key notion of this thesis, namely, that the different primary discrete positive and neutral emotions elicited when being advantaged distinctively affect post-purchase behaviors to varying degrees (i.e., gratitude vs. pride vs. relief/surprise).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMOTIONS</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complaining</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>repurchase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>word of</td>
<td>word of</td>
<td>intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions</td>
<td>H7a</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>H7b</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>H8a</td>
<td>H8c</td>
<td>H8b</td>
<td>H8d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pride</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gratitude</td>
<td>H10a</td>
<td>H10c</td>
<td>H10b</td>
<td>H10d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>H14</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n.s. = no significant association expected.*  
Source: Own illustration based on literature review.

### 5.2 Overview and design

To test these hypotheses on the formation and impact of consumers' emotions elicited when paying less, Study 2 is designed as a single-factor between-subjects experiment studying four factor levels for agency (self vs. service provider vs. circumstances vs. no agency/control) while focusing on advantaged price unfairness conditions only.
5.3 Procedure

Eighty-five undergraduate students from a US university participated in Study 2 for course credit. The students were seated in separate cubicles and participated in this paper-pencil experiment while completing other, unrelated studies as part of a laboratory session of one hour. Due to incomplete questionnaires the final sample consisted of 83 respondents. In this and the subsequent studies incomplete questionnaires were treated as follows: If the participants stopped before completing the main dependent variables and manipulation checks, their questionnaire was excluded from the sample. However, if only a few values were left blank and were missing, the data was used for the analyses. Also, participants who completed the main dependent variables and manipulation check but stopped while completing the individual difference questions were retained. In the present study, two respondents stopped long before finishing the main dependent variables. Accordingly, they were excluded, providing a set of 83 completed questionnaires for analysis (42% male, 54% female, and n=3 of unspecified gender).

The procedure was largely identical to the procedure applied in Study 1 with the following exceptions: First, an introductory imagery task was introduced before reading the scenarios. Specifically, the participants were asked to imagine that they were going on holidays and to write down catchwords about how it would be and what they would probably do. This served as a means to increase the respondents' task involvement and personal relevance (cf. discussion in Chapter 3.1). Second, an extended questionnaire was used with an enlarged emotion item battery, modified manipulation checks to account for the present manipulation, as well as additional measures for price-related appraisals and individual differences (for the measures, cf. Chapter 5.5).

5.4 Scenarios

The scenarios used in Study 2 differed in several instances from the scenarios of Study 1: First, given the focus on price advantaged conditions, only two of the previously used scenarios were applicable. Hence, new scenarios on the circumstance- and no-agency (control) advantaged condition were developed. Second, the self- versus service provider-agency information of the two previously used scenarios was expanded and made more salient in an attempt to minimize the self-serving bias tendencies that were detected in Study 1. This served as an attempt to indirectly 'de-bias' via providing further information in the respondents' task environment to facilitate the respective cognitive agency processing operations (see Kahn, Luce, & Nowlis, 2006 on 'de-biasing'). Third, the friend's budgetary constraint situation was relaxed and both the friend and the focal customer were now described as having worked equally hard to save the money to afford the trip. With that adjustment, the mone-
tary outcome of the price situation was made identically relevant for both. The initial versions of the two adapted and two new scenarios were pretested with 60 undergraduate students from a US university. Based on these pretest results, the agency information in the scenarios was calibrated and refined. The final versions of the scenarios are presented below:

You plan to go to California this fall. You book an offer at www.travelexpedit.com (a new travel agency) for $550 for the flight and accommodation. Two days later, you are sitting in the cafeteria and bump into a good friend from university. You start to chat. After a while you find out that he is going to California on exactly the same date as you. Both of you have been working hard during the last few months to save the money to afford this trip. He also booked at www.travelexpedit.com, but paid $660 (i.e., 20% more than you) for exactly the same flight and accommodation package. You remember that you came across the same price during your search.

[Scenario 1: self] However, you invested a lot of time and energy to get a better offer. As your extensive online research was unsuccessful you called Travelexpedit and started to negotiate. Thanks to your great negotiation skills you managed to get a promotional code to buy the package at a lower price online.

[Scenario 2: service provider] However, before booking you sent an online request for a print brochure. As you missed indicating your full shipping address you got a call from Travelexpedit. After a pleasant chat with the travel agent, he on his own offered you a promotional code to buy the package at a lower price online - this, without you having asked for it.

[Scenario 3: circumstance] However, when you were about to send your online booking request the connection broke down. After a while, you tried it again and the price of the package had decreased.

[Scenario 4: control] However, ...

[So] you finally booked and purchased exactly the same flight and accommodation package at a lower price than your friend.

5.5 Measures

*Emotions.* As in Study 1, all emotions were measured using single-items (i.e., 'angry at the service provider', 'proud', 'grateful to the service provider', 'surprised', 'relieved', 'pity', 'malicious pleasure'), except for the class of negative self-conscious emotions, which was measured using the mean of a composite scale, including the items 'guilty', 'ashamed', 'regretful', and 'angry at myself' ($\alpha = .687$). The respondents were asked to indicate the intensity with which they felt these eleven as well as other emotion items in the described price situation on a 7-point scale from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6).

The emotion item battery employed in Study 2 differed from Study 1 in two ways. First, the results in Study 1 suggested that the validity of the items 'angry' and 'grateful' might increase when adding a referent. Thus, Study 2 distinguished between 'angry at the service provider' and 'angry at myself' (see Barrett, 1998; Watson & Clark, 1999 for a similar approach). The anger-self item was included in the composite scale measuring negative self-conscious emotions (see similar Butt & Choi, 2006). The present emotion item list further distinguished between 'grateful to the service provider' and 'grateful for the situation'.
Second, further emotion items were incorporated to account for the new hypotheses on the circumstance- and no agency condition (i.e., 'surprised', 'relieved', 'pity', 'malicious pleasure'). Moreover, additional emotion items were included as further potentially relevant emotions (see also Roseman & Evdokas, 2004) and filler emotions to reduce demand effects (see also Weiss et al., 1999). For this project, common dimensional approaches (e.g., the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule of Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) or discrete/basic emotions approaches (e.g., Izard's (1991) Differential Emotions Scale; or Richins' (1997) Consumption Emotions Set) do not provide appropriate item lists. This is either due to their focus on valence or their disregard of some of the hypothesized emotions (e.g., gratitude). According to Hareli and Parkinson (2008), agency and fairness judgments represent the most important social appraisals. They are related to other people and incorporate social concerns and hence confine the range of social emotions. Their inventory of social emotions draws on widely cited appraisal frameworks and the discrete emotions that these frameworks suggest will be elicited by agency- and/or fairness-related appraisals (Hareli & Parkinson, 2008). Hence, to delimit the range of potentially relevant (filler) emotions for the present contextual framework, this thesis builds on Hareli and Parkinson's (2008) list of social emotions as well as other scholars' inventories of social, moral, or attributional emotions (Hareli & Parkinson, 2009; Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Weiner, 1985; 2009). The initial list of the social emotions that was derived based on these inventories was further adapted. Some items were eliminated because they are (i) highly unlikely when being advantaged (e.g., loving), (ii) relevant in the disadvantaged but not advantaged condition (e.g., envious, jealous), or (iii) due to their conceptual closeness to already included emotions (i.e., hopeless to hopeful, sympathetic to pity, admiring to gratitude, and embarrassed to ashamed). Together with the referent specification for some of the items, this procedure yielded a battery of 24 emotion items (happy, sad, angry at myself, angry at the service provider, guilty, ashamed, regretful, grateful to the service provider, grateful for the situation, proud, relieved, surprised, contemptuous, hopeful, malicious pleasure, pity, disgusted, disappointed, frustrated, distressed, dislike of the service provider, dislike for the situation, fearful, satisfied).

Post-purchase behavior. The identical single-item questions as in Study 1 were used to assess complaining, positive word of mouth, negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions using 7-point scales ranging from 'definitely not' (0) to 'definitely' (6).

Appraisals/situational price cognitions. Three price-related cognitive appraisal dimensions were assessed: (1) motive consistency to test H5a as well as (2) motive relevance and

---

3 Different terms have been used in previous research to refer to the pleasure at another person's misfortune such as 'Schadenfreude' (e.g., Hareli & Parkinson, 2008), 'gloating' (e.g., Ortony et al., 1988), 'malicious joy' (e.g., Gelbrich, 2011), or 'malicious pleasure' (e.g., Leach, Spears, Branscombe, & Doosje, 2003). Due to anticipated comprehensibility issues with the term 'Schadenfreude' used by Hareli and Parkinson (2008), the term 'malicious pleasure' was used.
(3) fairness/justice for the purpose of preliminary analyses. Each appraisal was measured using two bipolar semantic differential scale items (for appraisal studies also using bipolar scales, see e.g., Roseman et al., 1990; Tong et al., 2007; and one or two to more items, see e.g., Roseman et al., 1990; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). (1) Motive consistency was measured with the two items 'desirable' and 'favorable' ($\alpha = .803$). The first item was derived from previous appraisal research in psychology (see single-item questions from e.g., Siemer & Reisenzein, 2007; Tong et al., 2007; Tong, Ellsworth, & Bishop, 2009) and marketing (e.g., Nyer, 1997; Watson, 2005) to measure motive (goal) congruence/conduciveness. The second item was also derived from Watson (2005) and was used by Lazarus (2001, p. 56) in his conceptual description of goal congruence appraisals. (2) Motive relevance was assessed with two items 'important to me' and 'relevant to me' ($\alpha = .836$). The first item is adapted from Frijda et al. (1989), Nyer (1997), and Siemer et al. (2007) and the second item from Robinson and Clore (2001) and Smith and Lazarus (1990). These two items are also included in the importance dimension of the personal involvement construct (McQuarrie & Munson, 1992), which is similar to motive relevance (Nyer, 1997). (3) Fairness/justice was assessed via the two items 'fair' and 'just' ($\alpha = .847$). They were derived from appraisal literature (see Mikula et al., 1998). The same items were also used to measure perceived fairness in social justice (e.g., Loseman et al., 2009; van den Bos et al., 2006) and behavioral pricing research (e.g., Bolton et al., 2010; Darke & Dahl, 2003). Additionally, the realism of the given price scenario was assessed using the item 'realistic'. All adjectives were assessed on 7-point bipolar scales ranging from 'not at all' to 'very much' (6). To control whether the respondents understood that they were price advantaged, they were asked to indicate whether the price they paid was higher or lower than their friend's price on a 7-point scale ranging from 'a lot lower' to 'a lot higher' (identical to Study 1).

**Manipulation check.** To check the agency manipulation the respondents were asked to indicate to what extent the reason they paid a different price than their friend was due to their own initiative (self-agency rating), the service provider's initiative (service provider-agency rating), or pure circumstances (circumstance-agency rating). All three questions were measured on 7-point scales with the end points labeled 'not at all' (0) to 'very much' (6). To control whether the respondents understood that they were price advantaged, they were asked to indicate whether the price they paid was higher or lower than their friend's price on a 7-point scale ranging from 'a lot lower' to 'a lot higher' (identical to Study 1).

**Individual difference variables.** After the manipulation check, the 11-item relational-interdependent self-construal scale (RISC) (Cross et al., 2000) ($\alpha = .853$) was assessed using 7-point bipolar scales ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. RISC measures to what extent close relationships are incorporated into a person's self-concept (Cross, 2009), with sample items such as "My close relationships are an important reflection of who I am", or "If a person hurts someone close to me, I feel personally hurt as well" (Cross...
et al., 2000, p. 795). A respondent’s RISC level was calculated by averaging the scores across the 11 items. Lastly, the respondents reported their gender.

## 5.6 Analysis and results

This chapter provides the results of the manipulation check (cf. Chapter 5.6.1). More importantly, it outlines the tests for the central hypotheses on the appraisal-emotion relationships (H3, H4, H12, H13) (cf. Chapter 5.6.2) and the emotion-behavior relationships (H7-H10, H14) (cf. Chapter 5.6.4). Additionally, the subordinate hypotheses on consumers’ mixed emotions when paying less are tested (H5, H6) (cf. Chapter 5.6.3).

### 5.6.1 Manipulation check and further preliminary analyses

**Manipulation check.** Planned complex comparisons were run to assess whether the agency manipulation worked as intended (for the cell means, see Table 9). They confirmed that self-agency was rated highest in the self-agency condition ($M = 5.15$ vs. $M = 2.13$, $F(1, 79) = 60.383$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .433$), service provider-agency in the service provider-agency condition ($M = 4.29$ vs. $M = 1.68$, $F(1, 79) = 43.491$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .355$), and circumstance-agency in the circumstance-agency condition ($M = 5.29$ vs. $M = 3.81$, $F(1, 79) = 17.351$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .180$), each compared to their mean across the remaining three conditions. In accordance, simple pairwise contrasts confirmed that in the **self-agency condition**, self-initiative was rated higher ($M = 5.15$) compared to the service provider-agency ($M = 2.14$), circumstance-agency ($M = 1.10$), and no-agency condition ($M = 3.14$) (all three contrasts $p < .001$). Similarly, in the **service provider-agency condition**, the service provider's initiative was rated higher ($M = 4.29$) compared to the self-agency ($M = 1.75$), the circumstance-agency ($M = .95$), and no-agency condition ($M = 2.33$) (all three contrasts $p < .001$). However, within Scenario 2 circumstance-causation was descriptively perceived higher ($M = 5.00$) than the service provider's initiative ($M = 4.29$) (but n.s. based on a repeated measure GLM on the subsample of Scenario 2, $F(1, 20) = 2.226$, $p = .151$). This means that, although receiving a better price due to the service provider was most strongly attributed to the service provider across conditions, the respondents also qualified this situation as having occurred due to the circumstances. Accordingly, the respondents perceived the circumstances as the most likely reason in the **circumstance-agency condition** ($M = 5.29$) compared to the self-agency condition ($M = 2.15$, $p < .001$) and no-agency condition ($M = 4.29$, $p = .023$), but not significantly so compared to the service provider-agency condition ($M = 5.00$, $p = .511$).
Table 9: Cell means for the manipulation check ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>self</th>
<th>service-provider</th>
<th>circumstance</th>
<th>no-agency (control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 1 (n=20)</td>
<td>Scenario 2 (n=21)</td>
<td>Scenario 3 (n=21)</td>
<td>Scenario 4 (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my initiative</td>
<td>$M = 5.15$, $SD = .88$</td>
<td>$M = 2.14$, $SD = 1.56$</td>
<td>$M = 1.10$, $SD = 1.67$</td>
<td>$M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.77$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP's initiative</td>
<td>$M = 1.75$, $SD = 1.59$</td>
<td>$M = 4.29$, $SD = 1.42$</td>
<td>$M = .95$, $SD = 1.43$</td>
<td>$M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.80$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstances</td>
<td>$M = 2.15$, $SD = 1.84$</td>
<td>$M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.34$</td>
<td>$M = 5.29$, $SD = .90$</td>
<td>$M = 4.29$, $SD = 1.38$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 83.*

Most interesting are the results in the *control condition* (cf. Figure 7). They shed light on the default responsibility attributions that are typically formed in the absence of agency cues. When no agency information was provided, the reason for being advantaged was primarily attributed to the circumstances ($M = 4.29$), followed by the self ($M = 3.14$), while the service provider was perceived as the least likely agent ($M = 2.33$). First, this finding underscores a certain self-serving bias tendency when being price advantaged. When no agency information is present, the self is credited as the more likely agent for the better price than the service provider (marginally sig. based on a repeated measure GLM on the subsample of Scenario 4, $F(1, 20) = 3.388, p = .081$). Second, this finding implies that circumstance-causation seems to come up as the most natural explanation for getting a better price. Overall, all conditions were acknowledged as having a substantial share of circumstance-agency, except for the self-agency condition. It seems that if consumers do not perceive internal reasons to be the cause for getting a better price, they tend to over-generalize external agency as circumstance-caused. The strong significant negative correlation between self- and circumstance agency ratings support this notion ($r = -.650$, $p < .001$; no further sig. correlations between the three manipulation check ratings were present). As a result, perceiving oneself as the reason for getting a better price comes with low circumstance-agency attributions (as in Scenario 1), while perceiving the service provider as agent does not prevent the natural circumstance-causation attribution to co-occur (as in Scenario 2). Nevertheless, service provider-agency was perceived considerably and significantly higher in Scenario 2 compared to the remaining conditions overall and based on the pairwise contrasts. Thus, overall, the agency manipulation can be regarded as effective.
Figure 7: Agency attribution in the no-agency condition (control)

Note. Self = perceived self-agency; SP = perceived service provider-agency; Circ. = perceived circumstance-agency. Agency ratings were measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very much' (6).

Further preliminary analyses. Before testing the hypotheses, the following analyses assess whether (i) the respondents understood that they were price advantaged. Moreover, the (ii) realism of the scenarios and further appraisal dimensions such as (iii) motive consistency, (iv) motive relevance and (v) fairness/justice were analyzed. As expected, separate one-way ANOVAs on each of these five variables revealed no significant mean differences between the four experimental agency conditions. Specifically, the one-way ANOVA on the price difference rating indicated that, across all agency conditions, the respondents correctly classified that they were advantaged compared to their friend ($M_{Overall} = -1.70$, $F(3, 79) = 1.081$, $p = .362$). Further, the scenarios were regarded as rather realistic across the four conditions on the bipolar realism scale ($M_{Overall} = .82$, $F(3, 79) = .398$, $p = .755$). Similarly, the conditions were appraised as relevant for the self ($M_{Overall} = .58$, $F(3, 79) = 2.053$, $p = .113$) and slightly consistent with one's motives ($M_{Overall} = .36$, $F(3, 79) = .931$, $p = .430$). As expected, the four advantaged price inequity conditions were perceived as unfair ($M_{Overall} = -.62$, $F(3, 79) = .324$, $p = .808$). The latter result replicates previous findings in social justice research (e.g., Loseman et al., 2009 in Study 2; Peters & van den Bos, 2008), which have also reported that being advantaged is perceived as unfair. Although not significant, it is interesting to note that paying less due to the self was judged slightly less unfair than due to the service provider ($M = -.40$ vs. $M = -.55$) but somewhat less consistent with one's motives ($M = .18$ vs. $M = .71$).

The descriptive statistic and bivariate correlations between the main variables of this study are presented in Appendix II.
Table 10: Cell means, ANOVAs, and planned comparisons on the emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>self (n=20)</th>
<th>service-provider (n=21)</th>
<th>circumstance (n=21)</th>
<th>no-agency (control) (n=21)</th>
<th>ANOVAs&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Planned comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to the service provider</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relieved</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at the service provider</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 83 (except for gratitude N = 82 and df<sub>err</sub> = 78); italics indicates the condition in which the respective emotion was hypothesized to have the highest mean compared to the other conditions (cf. means within a row); underline indicates the emotion with the descriptively highest mean observed within a scenario (cf. means within a column). Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6).

<sup>1</sup>contrast remains sig. at p < .05 if the control condition (no-agency) is excluded from the analysis; <sup>2</sup>contrast remains n.s. with p > .6 if the control condition is excluded; <sup>3</sup>all ANOVA F-tests remain sig. (or n.s.) if the control condition is excluded, except for relief, which is highest in the control condition and hence becomes n.s. at p = .125.

<sup>* p < .05. ** p < .01.</sup>
5.6.2 Hypotheses on agency-emotion relationships

A-priori planned complex comparisons (to test \( H3a, H4a, H12 \)) and simple pairwise comparisons (to test \( H3b, H4b \)) were conducted to analyze the hypotheses on the respective discrete emotions that are expected to be elicited by each of the four different agency conditions (cf. Chapter 5.1.1). For each emotion, the hypothesis-testing analytical complex comparison is complemented by a one-way ANOVA (for a summary of the cell means and \( F \)-statistic, see Table 10). However, for the present hypotheses that predict a means pattern where the respective emotion is expected to be highest in one particular agency cell but low in all three other cells, the standard ANOVA results need to be interpreted carefully (cf. discussion in Chapter 3.2). Pity and malicious pleasure are not expected to vary by agency (\( H13 \)). To test this, one-way ANOVAs and, where necessary, Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted.

Overall, the \( F \)-tests of the one-way ANOVAs indicate significant varying mean differences across the four agency conditions at \( p < .05 \) for all eight emotions except for negative self-conscious emotions (\( p = .383 \)) and – as expected – for pity (\( p = .142 \)). The subsequent paragraphs discuss for each emotion whether the means vary in accordance with the predicted pattern.

Figure 8: Cell means and planned comparisons on the primary emotions

![Figure 8](image)

Note. SA = self-agency; SPA = service provider-agency; CA = circumstance-agency; NA = no-agency. Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). * \( p < .05 \). ** \( p < .01 \).

**Pride.** As expected, the hypothesis-testing planned complex comparison supports the expectation that pride was most intense in the self-agency condition compared to its mean across the other three conditions (\( M = 3.90 \) vs. \( M = 2.27 \), \( F(1, 79) = 10.915, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .121 \)), confirming \( H3a \) (cf. Figure 8). The simple contrasts indicate that pride was significantly higher in the self-agency condition (\( M = 3.90 \)) than in the service provider-agency (\( M = 1.76 \),
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\[ F(1, 79) = 12.670, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .138 \] and circumstance-agency condition \((M = 1.90, F(1, 79) = 11.033, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .123)\), but not compared to the control condition \((M = 3.14, F(1, 79) = 1.589, p = .211)\). The latter nonsignificant result reflects the relatively high level of perceived self-agency in the control condition and provides another manifestation of self-serving bias tendencies.

Gratitude toward the service provider. Gratitude toward the service provider was the most intense emotion in the service provider-agency condition compared to its mean across the other cells \((M = 4.19 vs. M = 2.71, F(1, 78) = 10.254, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .116)\), which corroborated H4a (cf. Figure 8). In accordance, gratitude was rated significantly higher in the service provider-agency compared to the circumstance-agency \((M = 2.50, F(1, 78) = 8.763, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .101)\) and control condition \((M = 2.43, F(1, 78) = 9.757, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .111)\), and marginally so compared to the self-agency condition \(^4 (M = 3.20, F(1, 78) = 3.008, p = .087, \eta^2_p = .037)\).

Surprise/Relief. A price advantage due to the circumstances or unspecified agency was hypothesized to elicit high levels of surprise and relief. However, inspecting the observed means suggests that circumstance-agency elicited intense surprise (but not relief) and no-agency high levels of relief (but not surprise) (cf. Figure 8). Building on the respective complex comparison, surprise was most intense in the circumstance-agency condition compared to its mean across the remaining cells \((M = 4.33 vs. M = 3.15, F(1, 79) = 6.633, p = .012, \eta^2_p = .077)\) (the same contrast vector is n.s. at \(p > .3\) for relief). Accordingly, surprise was significantly higher in the circumstance-agency condition compared to the self-agency \((M = 2.75, F(1, 79) = 7.819, p = .006, \eta^2_p = .090)\) and marginally higher compared to the control condition \((M = 3.24, F(1, 79) = 3.835, p = .054, \eta^2_p = .046)\), but just not significant compared to the service provider-agency condition \((M = 3.48, F(1, 79) = 2.349, p = .129)\). The latter two marginal and nonsignificant results may be due to the relatively prominent circumstance attributions that seem to arise as the natural agency appraisal in the absence of self-agency (cf. manipulation check). Relief was most intensely elicited in the control condition compared to its mean across the three other conditions \((M = 3.71 vs. M = 2.66, F(1, 79) = 4.155, p = .045, \eta^2_p = .050)\) (the same contrast is n.s. at \(p > .5\) for surprise). Simple contrasts were significant compared to service provider-agency \((M = 2.05, F(1, 79) = 6.914, p = .010, \eta^2_p = .080)\) and marginally to circumstance-agency \((M = 2.52, F(1, 79) = 3.527, p = .064, \eta^2_p = .043)\), but not compared to self-agency \((M = 3.40, F(1, 79) = .240, p = .626)\). Given the self-serving bias tendencies detected in agency appraisals (cf. the manipulation check), the

\(^4\) Given that directional hypotheses are tested here, one-tailed \(t\)-tests, often applied in appraisal research (e.g., Roseman et al., 1994), could be used (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). However, the more conservative \(F\)-test statistic is consistently used in this study (cf. discussion in Chapter 3.2). Hence, marginal sig. results at \(p < .10\) from the \(F\)-test statistic would become sig. at \(p < .05\) using the one-tailed \(t\)-test statistic and can be regarded as acceptable.
latter nonsignificant result again indicates that unspecified agency resembles the self-agency condition in its emotional outcome. In sum, \(H12a\) and \(H12b\) were partially confirmed as circumstance-agency was found to foster intense surprise (but not relief), and no-agency high levels of relief (but not surprise).

Figure 9: Cell means, planned comparisons, and ANOVAs on the secondary emotions
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Note. SA = self-agency; SPA = service provider-agency; CA = circumstance-agency; NA = no-agency. Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). * \(p < .05\). ** \(p < .01\).

Negative self-conscious emotions. When the misfortune of the friend was caused by the self, the circumstances, or by unspecified agency (i.e., Scenario 1, 3 and 4), some degree of negative self-conscious emotions was expected. Put differently, they were predicted to be lowest in the service provider-agency condition. However, the means and the respective complex comparison (\(M = .64\) vs. \(M = .60\), \(F(1, 79) = .052, p = .820\)) found no support for \(H12c\) (cf. Figure 9). Further, the specific simple comparison contrasting the level of negative self-conscious emotions in the self- versus the service provider-agency condition showed no significant difference (\(M = .41\) vs. \(M = .60\), \(F(1, 79) = .563, p = .455\)), disconfirming \(H3b\). In line with the nonsignificant ANOVA \(F\)-test (cf. Table 10), these results support the findings of Study 1: that negative self-conscious emotions do not seem to vary by agency when being price advantaged. In Study 2, they showed fairly low mean values across all agency conditions.

Anger at the service provider. When the misfortune of the friend was caused by the service provider, some degree of anger at the service provider was expected compared to the other three conditions. Although the respective planned complex comparison for anger was significant (\(M = .48\) vs. \(M = 1.77\), \(F(1, 79) = 8.627, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .098\)), the observed means pattern is inverse to what was expected (cf. Figure 9). When the misfortune of the friend was caused by the service provider, anger at the service provider was not higher than across the other conditions, but lower (\(M = .48\)). Thus, the means between self- vs. service provider-agency were directionally inverse to what was expected by \(H4b\). Nevertheless, the respective simple contrast indicated that anger was only marginally lower in the service provider-agency condi-
tion compared to the self-agency condition ($M = .48$ vs. $M = 1.55$, $F(1, 79) = 3.877$, $p = .052$, \(\eta_p^2 = .047\)).

**Pity/Malicious pleasure.** Pity and malicious pleasure were expected to be present when being advantaged rather than disadvantaged, independent of the agency conditions. Given that Study 2 comprised price advantaged conditions only, no formal test could be conducted examining whether they were significantly higher in the advantaged versus disadvantaged conditions. Nonetheless, inspecting the descriptive means indicated that some degree of pity was present when being price advantaged ($M_{\text{overall}} = 2.55$). Further, the one-way ANOVA on pity revealed that the mean levels of pity did, as expected, not significantly vary across the four agency conditions ($F(1, 79) = 1.866$, $p = .142$) (cf. Figure 9). Overall, these results lend support to H13a. Similarly, the respondents reported feeling somewhat maliciously pleased when paying less than a co-consumer ($M_{\text{overall}} = 1.70$). However, the one-way ANOVA on malicious pleasure showed a significant main effect of agency ($F(1, 79) = 3.985$, $p = .011$, \(\eta_p^2 = .131\)), which was not expected by H13b. Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons revealed that malicious pleasure was lowest in the service provider-agency condition ($M = .62$) compared to the control condition ($M = 2.52$, $p = .008$) and marginally compared to the circumstance condition ($M = 2.10$, $p = .062$). Thus, although malicious pleasure seems to vary across the four agency conditions, if solely focusing on self vs. service provider agency (as focused on by this thesis's main framework), Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons suggest that both pity ($M = 2.30$ vs. $M = 1.90$) and malicious pleasure ($M = 1.55$ vs. $M = .62$) do not differ at $p < .10$.

In sum, first, these results indicate that the quality of the positive and neutral emotions primarily elicited when paying less varies as a function of agency. Pride was highest in the self-agency (confirming H3a), gratitude in the service provider-agency (confirming H4a), surprise in the circumstance-agency (partially confirming H12a) and relief in the unspecified agency condition (partially confirming H12b), compared to their mean across the remaining scenarios. Second, regarding the emotions fostered by the friend's misfortune, the results imply that pity is the most intense emotion across all four scenarios ($M = 2.55$), followed by malicious pleasure ($M = 1.70$), anger at the service provider ($M = 1.45$), and rather low levels of negative self-conscious emotions ($M = .63$). With regard to the main conceptual framework proposed in this thesis, which contrasts self- vs. service provider-agency, it should be noted that none of these latter four emotions elicited by the friend's disadvantage varied significantly between the self- and service provider-agency condition at $p < .05$ (disconfirming H3b, H4b, and H12c). This replicates the results of Study 1 by suggesting that a certain degree of all these negative emotions is present across the self- versus service provider-agency condition.
5.6.3 Hypotheses on mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged

Considering that a certain extent of negative emotions was present when paying less, two subsidiary issues on the mixed emotional responses to advantaged price inequity are explored. Specifically, the following analyses test (1) under what conditions and for whom positive emotions increase over negative (H5) and (2) whether positive and negative emotions co-occur as ambivalent blends (H6).

Triggers of positive vs. negative emotional responses to being price advantaged (H5).

It was hypothesized that whether positive or negative emotions increase when being advantaged depends on situational appraisals (i.e., motive consistency) (H5a) and individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC) (H5b) – except for surprise, which is expected to be unrelated to both.

Role of motive consistency on emotions’ valence. To assess whether perceived motive consistency predicts whether positive or negative emotions increase when being advantaged, a multivariate regression of the eight emotions on motive consistency was conducted. As expected, and in line with the correlation results (cf. Appendix II), motive consistency was significantly positively related to pride (b = .352, t(80) = 2.620, p = .011) and gratitude (b = .511, t(80) = 4.393, p < .001), and significantly negatively related to negative self-conscious emotions (b = -.157, t(80) = -3.165, p = .002), anger (b = -.470, t(80) = -4.270, p < .001), and pity (b = -.373, t(80) = -3.110, p = .003). As expected, the effect on surprise was nonsignificant (b = -.011, t(80) = -.087, p = .931). The regression coefficient for relief was positive but just not significant at conventional levels (b = .193, t(80) = 1.373, p = .174). A potential reason why motive consistency might not consistently predict relief is that the positively toned emotion relief often occurs when an anticipated negative event does not take place (Lazarus, 2001; Roseman et al., 1990). Hence, such situations involve a positive and negative valence. Similarly, Roseman et al. (1990) found that relief was associated with lower motive consistency than other positive emotions. Further, motive consistency was found to be un-predictive of malicious pleasure (b = -.052, p = .695). In a similar line of reasoning, malicious pleasure, which is referred to as a pleasure about the misfortune or negative fate of another person (Ben-Ze’ev, 2009; Roseman et al., 1996), integrates both valences. For illustrative purposes, Figure 10 displays the effect of motive consistency on the eight emotions at the arbitrary levels of one standard deviation above the mean (high motive consistency) and one standard deviation below the mean (low motive consistency).5

5 To further explore whether motive consistency moderates the agency-emotion effects found in Chapter 5.6.2, multiple linear regressions were run. Contrast coding was used in order to accommodate the interaction effects between the continuous and categorical variable in the form of specific single-df complex contrasts. In order to partition the total k-1
Role of relational-interdependent self-construal on emotions' valence. To test whether a person’s RISC disposition directly affects whether s/he feels more positively or negatively about being advantaged, a multivariate regression of the eight emotions on RISC was conducted. In line with the correlation results (see Appendix II), RISC only significantly predicted malicious pleasure \((b = -0.817, t(80) = -3.260, p = .002)\). In other words, the more people view themselves as separate or independent from close relationships with other people (i.e., low RISC; e.g., Cross, 2009), the more they feel maliciously pleased about the disadvantage of the co-consumer. No further regression coefficient was significant at \(p < .10\). \(^6\)

In sum, the preceding results confirm that the more personally desirable paying less is perceived, the more intense the positive emotions pride and gratitude and the less intense the negative emotions anger, pity, and negative self-conscious emotions. However, the regression coefficients of relief and malicious pleasure on motive consistency were not significant. Hence, \(H5a\) is only partially supported. Further, the individual difference variable RISC was not found to have the expected valence-dividing effect on all types of emotion. The results suggest that people who tend to incorporate others’ concerns into their own self-concept feel

\(^6\) Again, to further explore whether RISC moderates the agency-emotion effects found in Chapter 5.6.2, multiple linear regressions were run. Again, only a marginally significant interaction effect between the complex contrast of substantive interest and RISC occurred, namely, for pride \((b = 1.228, t(75) = 1.763, p = .082)\).
less *maliciously pleased* when paying less. Thus, *H5b* is also only partially supported regarding the co-consumer-related emotion malicious pleasure. As expected, the neutral emotion surprise was unrelated to motive consistency and RISC.

According to appraisal scholars, individual differences – which have as of yet received little empirical attention – can affect the appraisal-emotion elicitation process in multiple ways. People can differ in (i) how they *appraise* certain situations, (ii) how strongly or how often they *feel* certain emotions, or (iii) how strongly an individual's appraisals are *related* to the proposed emotions. While the first two paths focus on the direct effects of individual differences on appraisals or emotions, the third investigates how they moderate appraisal-emotion relationships (see e.g., Kuppens, 2009; Kuppens & Tong, 2010; Kuppens et al., 2007; Scherer & Brosch, 2009; Silvia, 2008; Smits & Kuppens, 2005; Tong, 2010). As discussed above, RISC did not show a direct effect on emotions except for malicious pleasure. Also, the correlations do not indicate a direct effect of RISC on motive consistency appraisals (*r* = .002, *p* = .983). Hence, although not hypothesized, it was further explored whether RISC moderates the motive consistency appraisal-emotion relationships. High RISC people tend to incorporate the concerns and opinions of close others into their self-concept (Cross, 2009; Cross et al., 2000). Hence, it is expected that the valence-dividing effect of motive consistency on the emotions found above is more indicative (i.e., stronger) for high compared to low RISC people. To test this exploratory notion, each of the eight emotions was regressed on motive consistency, RISC, and their product term. Motive consistency and RISC were both mean-centered.

These results indicate that RISC significantly moderates the effect of motive consistency on *anger* (*b* = -.249, *t*(79) = -2.041, *p* = .045), *negative self-conscious emotions* (*b* = -.129, *t*(79) = -2.349, *p* = .021), *surprise* (*b* = -.402, *t*(79) = -2.958, *p* = .004), and marginally so on *gratitude* (*b* = .244, *t*(78) = 1.859, *p* = .067). To probe these interactions and to calculate the Johnson-Neyman (J-N) significance regions, the MODPROBE macro of Hayes and Matthes (2009) was used. The Johnson-Neyman (J-N) technique detects the point(s) of transition along the RISC scale, where the effect of motive consistency on the respective emotion turns from significant to nonsignificant (or vice versa) based on the chosen alpha-level (here *α* = .05) (Hayes & Matthes, 2009). To further display the interaction graphically, simple slopes at the mean of RISC as well as one standard deviation above and below the mean were calculated using the MODPROBE macro (Hayes & Matthes, 2009) (cf. Figure 11).

In sum, the results imply that the more personally undesirable (i.e., less motive consistent) paying less than a friend was perceived, the higher the negative emotions, particularly among people who incorporate close others' concerns into their self-concept. For low RISC people, perceived motive consistency did not affect negative emotions. Although this pattern only
significantly applied for anger (J-N beyond .84) and negative self-conscious emotions (J-N beyond 1.21), the direction of the nonsignificant regression coefficient of pity ($b = .164$, $t(79) = -1.202$, $p = .233$) pointed to the same general pattern. The inverse pattern occurred for positive emotions. High perceived motive consistency increased gratitude particularly among high RISC persons (J-N beyond .79) but had no effect for people low in RISC. Although the motive consistency x RISC interaction was not significant for pride ($b = .091$, $t(79) = .589$, $p = .558$) and relief ($b = .045$, $t(79) = .277$, $p = .782$), their coefficients pointed in the same direction. For malicious pleasure the interaction effect was not significant ($p > .6$) and the main-effect-only model promotes a direct effect of RISC on malicious pleasure as was discussed above.

Figure 11: Probing the motive consistency x RISC interactions

Note. high RISC = mean plus 1 SD = 2.26; average RISC = mean = 1.42; low RISC = mean minus 1 SD = .59. The Johnson-Neyman points of transitions are at a level of RISC beyond .84 for anger, beyond 1.21 for negative self-conscious emotions, beyond 2.42 as well as below .82 for surprise, and beyond .79 for gratitude.

An interesting pattern occurred for surprise. For people high in RISC (J-N beyond 2.42), low motive consistency transformed into surprise (i.e., unpleasant surprise), while the effect was the opposite for people low in RISC. For low RISC people (J-N below .82), high motive consistency increased surprise (i.e., pleasant surprise). It seems that for people high in RISC, the undesirable situation of the other being disadvantaged elicits (unpleasant) surprise, while for people low in RISC, the more desirable paying less is perceived, the higher the (pleasant) surprise. Overall, motive consistency had no direct effect on surprise. However, incorporating
the interactive effect with individual differences can help to disentangle for whom low motive consistency predicts unpleasant surprise and for whom high motive consistency elicits pleasant surprise. These results suggest that surprise is not simply a hedonically neutral state of mind (Reisenzein & Meyer, 2009), but rather a hedonically colored emotion for some people in the positive direction and for others in the negative direction (see e.g., Roseman et al., 1990).

**Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged (H6).**

The following analyses assessed whether consumers felt positive and negative emotions together as mixed emotional blends or whether one valence dominated the other when paying less. To this end, ambivalence indexes identical to Study 1 were calculated (see Chapter 4.5.3 for details on the procedure), while adding a co-consumer-related ambivalence index, which measured the co-occurrence of pity and malicious pleasure (see Table 11).

Table 11: Cell means for ambivalence indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>self-agency (n=20)</th>
<th>service provider-agency (n=21)</th>
<th>circumstance-agency (n=21)</th>
<th>no agency (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (overall)</td>
<td>-1.9 2.46</td>
<td>-3.5 2.22</td>
<td>-1.8 2.31</td>
<td>0.79 2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (self)</td>
<td>-2.86 3.00</td>
<td>-1.26 1.96</td>
<td>-0.07 2.21</td>
<td>-1.69 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (SP)</td>
<td>-0.15 4.52</td>
<td>-3.14 2.92</td>
<td>0.35 3.91</td>
<td>-0.14 3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (co-consumer)</td>
<td>1.15 4.65</td>
<td>-1.19 2.27</td>
<td>0.76 4.84</td>
<td>1.38 4.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 83 (except for service provider (SP)-related ambivalence N = 82). Overall ambivalence is calculated based on a positive emotion index (i.e., mean of grateful to the service provider, proud, surprised, relieved, malicious pleasure, $\alpha = .553$) and a negative emotion index (i.e., mean of guilty, ashamed, regretful, angry at myself, angry at the service provider, pity, $\alpha = .724$); Self-related ambivalence is calculated based on pride and negative self-conscious emotions (i.e., mean of guilty, ashamed, regretful, angry at myself, $\alpha = .687$); SP-related ambivalence is calculated based on gratitude and anger; Co-consumer-related ambivalence is calculated based on malicious pleasure and pity.

First, it was expected that a certain degree of mixed feelings are present across conditions when being price advantaged compared to a friend (H6a). Given that Study 2 includes price advantaged conditions only, no formal test could be conducted examining whether overall ambivalence was higher in the advantaged versus disadvantaged condition. Nevertheless, the mean of the overall ambivalence index suggests some level of ambivalence ($M_{overall} = .23$) given that possible values range from -6 to 12 (cf. Chapter 4.5.3). Also, the just not significant but positive correlation coefficient between the positive and negative emotion index ($r = .158$, $p = .153$) suggests a certain extent of co-occurrence of the two. The nonsignificant $F$-test of the one-way ANOVA on the overall ambivalence index further confirmed that the co-occurrence of positive and negative emotions is independent of agency ($F(3, 79) = 1.695$, $p = .175$). Hence, the descriptive and ANOVA results lend support to H6a.
Second, it was hypothesized that self-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of pride and negative self-conscious emotions) is most likely to be high when being advantaged is due to the self and that service provider-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of gratitude and anger) is highest when the service provider is responsible for why one pays less. Although both respective planned complex comparisons were significant, the pattern of the observed means was directionally inverse to what was expected. Self-related ambivalence was significantly lowest (not highest) in the self-agency condition, compared to the three remaining conditions ($M = -2.86$ vs. $M = -1.01$, $F(1, 79) = 9.554, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .108$). Similarly, the mixed emotions toward the service provider were significantly lowest (not highest) in the service provider-agency condition ($M = -3.14$ vs. $M = .02$, $F(1, 78) = 11.360, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .127$). Hence, $H6b$ was disconfirmed. However, these directionally inverse results replicated the findings of Study 1. They suggest that people experience concisely valenced feelings toward the agent of an event: either one feels positive or negative toward the agent.

Third, co-consumer-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of malicious pleasure and pity) was expected to be present independent of agency. Accordingly, the overall $F$-test of the one-way ANOVA on co-consumer-related ambivalence suggests that the means do not significantly differ ($F(3, 79) = 1.539, p = .211$).

### 5.6.4 Hypotheses on emotion-behavior relationships

In order to assess how the emotions map onto the post-purchase behavioral intentions ($H7$, $H10$, $H14$), a multivariate multiple regression was conducted with the eight emotions as independent, and the four behaviors as dependent variables (cf. Table 12). The partial eta-squared ($\eta^2_p$) effect size measure of the across-equation $F$-tests corroborate the findings of Study 1: it was particularly anger ($F(4, 69) = 9.037, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .344$) and gratitude ($F(4, 69) = 4.818, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .218$) – the two service provider-related emotions – that were most strongly associated with the four post-purchase behavior intentions. Overall, the eight emotions explained from 18% to 41% of the variance (see adjusted $R^2$) in the respective post-purchase behavioral intentions. This is comparable to other studies on the impact of multiple emotions on different post-purchase behaviors (see e.g., Gelbrich, 2011 with $Adj. R^2$ of .16 to .37; Sosca, 2007 with $Adj. R^2$ of .27 to .69; or Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004 with $R^2$ of .13 to .71).
Table 12: Multivariate multiple regression of post-purchase behaviors on emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>complain</th>
<th>P-WOM</th>
<th>N-WOM</th>
<th>repurchase</th>
<th>across-equation test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>F (4, 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>4.818***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relieved</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-NE</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>3.970***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>9.037***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>2.244†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal. pleasure</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>3.153*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F (8, 72)$</td>
<td>3.236**</td>
<td>6.253***</td>
<td>7.833***</td>
<td>6.356***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81; b values indicate the unstandardized regression coefficients; bold indicate significant results at $p < .10$; self-NE = negative self-conscious emotions; SP = service provider; † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Regarding the specific emotion-behavior hypotheses, respondents feeling negative self-conscious emotions when being price advantaged were, as expected, significantly less likely to spread negative word of mouth ($b = -.514$, $t(72) = -2.373$, $p = .020$, $\eta^2_p = .073$), confirming $H7b$. However, they were not also less likely to complain ($b = .252$, $t(72) = 1.178$, $p = .243$), disconfirming $H7a$. Although no further associations were predicted, interestingly, negative self-conscious emotions were additionally found to significantly increase positive word of mouth activities ($b = .802$, $t(72) = 2.921$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2_p = .106$). In contrast, feeling angry at the service provider was found to significantly increase the likelihood to complain ($b = .355$, $t(72) = 3.912$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .175$) and spread negative word of mouth ($b = .481$, $t(72) = 5.222$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .275$), while anger decreased the intention to repurchase ($b = -.194$, $t(72) = -2.134$, $p = .036$, $\eta^2_p = .060$) and engage in positive word of mouth activities ($b = -.325$, $t(72) = -2.792$, $p = .007$, $\eta^2_p = .098$). This is in line with $H8a$ to $H8d$. Inversely, gratitude toward the service provider increased positive word of mouth ($b = .343$, $t(72) = 3.407$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .139$) and repurchase intentions ($b = .347$, $t(72) = 4.414$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .213$), confirming $H10c$ and $H10d$. However, other than expected, grateful respondents were not found to be less likely to complain ($b = .026$, $t(72) = .332$, $p = .741$) or spread negative word of mouth ($b = -.080$, $t(72) = -1.003$, $p = .319$), disconfirming $H10a$ and $H10b$. As expected, pride was marginally significantly positively related to positive word of mouth ($b = .225$, $t(72) = 1.970$, $p = .053$, $\eta^2_p = .051$), which confirms $H9$, while showing no effect on the other three behaviors (all three $p > .4$). Furthermore, the results lend support to the notion that feeling malicious pleasure increases the likelihood of spreading negative word.

$^7$ Given the directional hypothesis, a one-tailed formal test could have been used (Cohen, 2008; Keppel & Wickens, 2004), rendering this marginal significant result acceptable for confirming $H9$. 
of mouth ($b = .217$, $t(72) = 2.786$, $p = .007$, $\eta^2_p = .097$), confirming $H14$. Pity was not expected to be associated with post-purchase behaviors. However, feeling pity for the disadvantaged co-consumer was found to decrease positive behaviors, such as spreading positive word of mouth ($b = -.300$, $t(72) = -2.679$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2_p = .091$) or repurchasing ($b = -.187$, $t(72) = -2.135$, $p = .036$, $\eta^2_p = .060$). Further, pity was marginally related to negative word of mouth ($b = .153$, $t(72) = 1.733$, $p = .087$, $\eta^2_p = .040$). Moreover, relief and surprise were, as anticipated, unrelated to active behaviors toward the service provider at $p < .05$. Relief produced no significant effect (all $p > .3$) and surprise showed only a marginal positive association with negative word of mouth ($b = .138$, $t(72) = 1.711$, $p = .091$, $\eta^2_p = .039$). No further effects were present at $p < .10$.

In sum, these results on the specific emotion-behavior relationships provide support for the general pattern predicted. Specifically, gratitude was found to increase positive behaviors toward the service provider, while anger fostered negative behaviors. As expected, negative self-conscious emotions had an inverse effect as compared to anger and positively affected word of mouth intentions. Similarly, the results revealed that pride increases positive word of mouth but not repurchase intentions, while gratitude fostered both. These distinct effects of different positive and negative emotions clearly indicate the need to study discrete price-related emotions beyond mere valence. The general behavioral pattern of these four emotions was already detected in Study 1, where some of the effects remained as yet subtle. Hence, Study 2 replicated the global findings of Study 1 while providing significant support for most of the individual emotion-behavior relationships proposed. Given the conceptually extended design of Study 2, the present results also provide information on consumers' coping with the circumstances- and no-agency-related emotions surprise and relief, which, as expected, did not affect behaviors related to the service provider. Further, the emotions related to the co-consumer's misfortune were found to negatively impact post-purchase behavior. Pity decreased positive behaviors, such as spreading positive word of mouth or repurchase and malicious pleasure fostered negative word of mouth behavior.

**Ambivalence-behavior relationship.** Although no a-priori hypothesis was stated, the study subsequently explored how overall emotional ambivalence affects post-purchase behavior. The results of a multivariate regression showed that overall emotional ambivalence negatively affects post-purchase behavior, which replicates the findings of Study 1. Overall emotional ambivalence was found to significantly foster complaining ($b = .200$, $t(80) = 3.329$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .122$) and negative word of mouth intentions ($b = .221$, $t(80) = 3.038$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2_p = .103$) and to reduce positive word of mouth ($b = -.238$, $t(80) = -2.672$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2_p = .082$) as well as repurchase intentions ($b = -.224$, $t(80) = -3.325$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .121$).
5.7 Summary and discussion

Study 2 aimed at better understanding the nature of consumers' agency attributions and their role in predicting and differentiating between consumers' discrete emotional responses to being price advantaged. Moreover, it investigated how consumers' coping with these emotions affects post-purchase behaviors. The results of Study 2 support several key findings:

First, the results on the agency manipulation ratings provide relevant insights into consumers' agency appraisal formation when being price advantaged. Primarily, they suggest self-serving bias tendencies. Per default, when no agency cue was present, the focal consumer regarded her/himself as the more likely agent for the favorable price than the service provider. The service provider was regarded as the least likely agent, which bears important implications for firms, given that agency cues are rarely readily present in many real-life price comparison settings. Additionally, the circumstances were regarded as the most natural and likely explanation for getting a better price when no agency cue was present. Moreover, if the focal consumer did not credit the price advantage to her/himself, a substantial share of circumstance-agency was ascribed to all types of external causes.

Second, regarding the hypothesized appraisal-emotion relationships, Study 2 confirms that the quality of the positive and neutral emotions that are primarily elicited when paying less varies as a function of agency appraisals. Specifically, pride was highest in the self-agency, gratitude in the service provider-agency, surprise in the circumstance-agency, and relief in the unspecified agency condition, compared to their mean across the remaining conditions. The latter results on surprise and relief bear important implications. Based on the literature, it was expected that the unspecified agency condition would resemble the circumstance condition (building on Roseman et al., 1990) or, alternatively, the self-agency condition given self-serving bias tendencies (Weiner, 1985). However, neither of these two notions was supported. The results instead suggest that unspecified agency reflects a unique condition – characterized by high circumstance- and some self-agency appraisals – eliciting the discrete emotion relief rather than surprise (circumstance-agency) or pride (self-agency). Hence, studying this no-agency condition separately from the circumstance-agency condition in future research might help to disentangle the rather weak links between circumstance-agency and predicted emotions found in previous appraisal research (cf. discussion in Chapter 5.1.1) – in particular concerning the emotions surprise and relief. However, to the knowledge of the author of this thesis, neither of the currently active appraisal frameworks explicitly accounts for unspecified agency. Further, interesting results occurred regarding the (negative) emotions elicited by the co-consumers' disadvantage. In view of the main conceptual framework proposed in the present thesis (cf. Chapter 2.2.1), which contrasts self- versus service provider-agency, it should be noted that none of the four emotions elicited by the friend’s misfortune were found
to significantly vary between the self- and service provider agency condition at $p < .05$. While this was expected for the two agency-independent emotions pity and malicious pleasure, the two agency-related emotions anger and negative self-conscious emotions were expected to vary by agency. Nevertheless, this finding replicates the results of Study 1 by suggesting that a certain degree of all negative emotions are present across self- versus service provider-agency conditions when being price advantaged.

Third, incorporating situational and personal variables helped to gain insights into when and for whom positive or negative emotions increase when being advantaged. In sum, the more personally desirable (i.e., motive-consistent) paying less than someone else was perceived, the more intense the discrete positive emotions pride and gratitude and the less intense the negative emotions pity, anger, and negative self-conscious emotions. As expected, motive consistency did not predict surprise. However, it also did not significantly predict relief and malicious pleasure. It is speculated that the latter is due to the valence-wise mixed situations: Relief reflects the positive feeling when a negative event does not materialize (Lazarus, 2001; Roseman et al., 1990; Zeelenberg, 2009), and malicious pleasure mirrors positive feelings at another person's negative outcome (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009). Further, the individual difference variable relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) was not found to exert the expected valence-dividing effect on all types of emotion except on the co-consumer-related emotion malicious pleasure. People who tend to incorporate close others' concerns into their self-concept felt less maliciously pleased about their friend paying a higher price. Hence, while motive consistency was not found to predict malicious pleasure, a person's RISC level seems to act as a potential predictor. Moreover, additional explorative analyses provide preliminary evidence that RISC has a moderating effect on many of the motive consistency-emotion relationships. In particular, incorporating RISC was found to assist in disentangling for whom low motive consistency predicts (unpleasant) surprise and for whom high motive consistency elicits (pleasant) surprise.

Fourth, the results of the ambivalence analyses suggest that rather low levels of mixed feelings are present across conditions when being price advantaged compared to a friend. Regarding the specific ambivalence indexes, the means patterns were directionally inverse to those expected. Specifically, self-related ambivalence (i.e., pride and negative self-conscious emotions) was found to be lowest (not highest) when the self is regarded as responsible for the price difference. Similarly, the mixed emotions toward the service provider (i.e., gratitude and anger) were lowest (not highest) in the service provider-agency condition. Although this pattern is inverse to what was expected, it replicates the findings of Study 1. Together, these results suggest that people seem to know perfectly how they feel about the agent: they feel either positive or negative emotions toward the agent. Regarding behavioral implications,
people who experience mixed positive and negative feelings when being advantaged were found to respond negatively in terms of post-purchase behaviors, identical to Study 1.

Finally, the results on the emotion-behavior relationships provide support for the general pattern anticipated. Study 2 replicates the overall findings of Study 1 while expanding evidence on consumers' coping responses to a broader scope of emotions. Specifically, the service provider-related emotions gratitude and anger were found to most strongly affect behavioral intentions. In line with their valence, gratitude fostered positive consumer behaviors, while anger promoted negative behaviors related to the service provider. Differently from anger, negative self-conscious emotions were found to positively affect post-purchase behaviors. As expected, they prevented negative word of mouth activities and were even found to actively foster positive word of mouth. As hypothesized, pride increased positive word of mouth but not repurchase intentions, while gratitude was found to foster both. In line with expectations, surprise and relief were unrelated to post-purchase behaviors, while malicious pleasure increased negative word of mouth intentions. Differently from what was anticipated, pity was found to decrease positive behaviors such as spreading positive word of mouth or repurchasing. Taken together, these distinctive effects of the different positive and negative emotions on post-purchase behavioral intentions imply that it is crucial to study consumers' discrete price-related emotions and respective behavioral coping responses beyond mere valence.

In sum, the results of Study 2 support the key notion of this thesis that emotions of the same valence may have different (e.g., pride vs. gratitude vs. relief/surprise) and even valence-incongruent impacts on behavior (e.g., anger vs. negative self-conscious emotions). With agency appraisal, Study 2 provides a crucial antecedent to predicting which emotion arises most intensely when being price advantaged. If the service provider is credited, consumers feel grateful, which fosters customer retention, while self-attributed pride was only found to increase positive word of mouth. When a price advantage is attributed to the circumstances, customers are likely to feel surprised, and when no agency cue is available, they will feel relieved, neither of which was found to affect post-purchase behaviors. The latter result implies that when firms only post prices without providing agency information for lower prices, consumers will most likely feel relieved and a service provider's potential effort to reduce prices for certain customer segments will pass unnoticed, leading to missed opportunities. Hence, it is vital to understand the eliciting antecedents of different emotional responses to price discrimination beyond valence, to accurately predict consumers' responses and eventually to effectively design and communicate price discrimination systems. As a key step to achieving this, the proposed comprehensive conceptual framework, which focuses on the emotions of both the advantaged as well as disadvantaged customer, will be empirically tested in Study 3.
6 Study 3: Role of fairness and agency appraisals in predicting emotional responses to price inequity

The findings of Study 2 laid the foundation to now assess the full conceptual agency by fairness framework proposed in this thesis (cf. Chapter 2.2.1). Specifically, by focusing on price advantaged inequity, first, Study 2 provided valuable insights into consumers' cognitive agency appraisals when paying less. Second, Study 2 established the central role of agency in predicting consumers' specific emotions elicited when being price advantaged and provided evidence on related behavioral coping responses. The results further suggested that emotions elicited by the friend's misfortune (i.e., pity, malicious pleasure) should subsequently be included in the conceptual framework to capture consumers' relevant emotional responses to being price advantaged. Third, the role of situational and personal variables to predict whether positive over negative emotions increase when being price advantaged were preliminarily explored.

Figure 12: Scope of Study 3: 2 fairness x 2 agency conditions

Study 3 constitutes the main study of this thesis. Its primary objective is to evaluate the full proposed agency (self vs. service provider) by fairness (advantaged vs. disadvantaged) appraisal-emotion-behavior framework (cf. Figure 12). Specifically, the focus is on (1) testing the hypotheses on the cognitive appraisal antecedents of the six emotions that are proposed to be relevant when prices differ between customers (i.e., anger, negative self-conscious emotions, pride, gratitude, pity, and malicious pleasure) \((H1-H4, H13)\). (2) Further, the hypotheses on consumers' behavioral coping responses with these six emotions are analyzed \((H7-H10, H14)\). Figure 13 and Table 13 display the full set of appraisal-emotion and emotion-behavior
hypotheses tested in Study 3. These hypotheses were initially developed in Chapter 2.2 and 5.1. (3) Moreover, the anticipated mediating role of the price-related emotions, which are expected to transmit the interactive effect of cognitive agency and fairness appraisals on post-purchase behaviors, is assessed (H11). The secondary objective of Study 3 is to corroborate the results of Study 2 on the role of situational and personal differentiators between positive and negative emotions (H5a/b) as well as on emotional ambivalence (H6) when being price advantaged. Note that of the eight emotions focused on in Study 2, surprise and relief are not reconsidered. They have solely been anticipated and acknowledged as being relevant in the advantaged circumstance- and no-agency conditions, which are not part of the framework investigated in Study 3.

Figure 13: Full set of appraisal-emotion hypotheses tested in Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAIRNESS</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disadvantaged price unfairness</td>
<td>self-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions (H1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anger (H2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced price unfairness</td>
<td>pride (H3a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[negative self-conscious emotions (H3b)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gratitude (H4a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[anger (H4b)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[pity, malicious pleasure (H13)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figure displays the hypothesized primary, most intensely elicited emotions per condition; potential secondary, less intense emotions are given in brackets.
Source: Own illustration based on literature review.

Table 13: Full set of emotion-behavior hypotheses tested in Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMOTIONS</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL CONSEQUENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions</td>
<td>- H7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>+ H8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pride</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gratitude</td>
<td>- H10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n.s. = no significant association expected.
Source: Own illustration based on literature review.
6.1 Overview and design

To test the general conceptual framework with its main a-priori hypotheses, Study 3 was designed as a 2 (agency: self- vs. service provider-caused) x 2 (fairness: advantaged unfair vs. disadvantaged unfair) full-factorial between-subjects design (identical to the pretest/Study 1).

6.2 Procedure

Study 3 was conducted with two groups, a US and a Swiss student sample. In the US sample, 123 undergraduate students from a US university participated for course credit. The second sample involved 73 master's students from a Swiss university who participated in a classroom experiment. Five participants stopped before finishing the main dependent variables and manipulation check. Hence, their incomplete questionnaires were excluded, which resulted in a final sample of 191 respondents for analysis: 119 US students (mean age: 20 years; 65% male) and 72 Swiss students (mean age: 24 years; 57% male).

The procedure was identical to the procedure applied in Study 2: The respondents were randomly given a paper-pencil questionnaire containing one of the four scenarios. In the first section, the respondents were asked to imagine that they were going on holidays and to write down some catchwords about this (introductory imagery task). In the second section, they were asked to read and vividly imagine the respective scenario. They then completed an open-response question on how they would feel in this price situation, followed by standardized item-batteries on emotions, behavioral intentions, price-related appraisals, manipulation checks and individual differences (for the measures, see Chapter 6.4).

The procedure and questionnaire were essentially identical for the US and Swiss students. Both received the questionnaire in English. The two data collections only differed in four minor ways. First, the study with the US students was conducted in a laboratory setting, whereas the data from the Swiss students was collected in a classroom experiment prior to a lecture. Particularly, the US students completed this study among other unrelated studies for course credit in a session of one hour while seated in separate cubicles. The Swiss students were sitting in a classroom and completed only this study, and participation was not part of their course requirements. Second, the scenarios for the US students described a trip to 'California' in 'US Dollars', which was adapted to a trip to 'London' in 'Swiss Francs' for the Swiss students (the exchange rate was around 1 USD/CHF at that time). Third, in the Swiss classroom experiment a German translation of the emotion item battery was projected onto the classroom wall. Moreover, two research assistants were available in the classroom to respond to potential translation questions. Fourth, the questionnaire for the Swiss students
included an additional page at the end with questions in German concerning the respondents' English level and the understandability of the scenario and questionnaire.

6.3 Scenarios

The scenarios in Study 3 differed from the scenarios in Study 1 and 2 in few ways. Instead of introducing four different reasons for the price discrepancy, as in Study 1, the reasons in Study 3 were aligned and identical per agency-condition. This served to increase comparability and to avoid potential confounding effects. More specifically, it was either the focal customer or the friend who was advantaged, while the reason for the price inequity was identical for both self-agency conditions (i.e., either it was the focal customer who redeemed the coupon and the friend who forgot about it or vice versa) and for both service-provider agency conditions (i.e., either the service provider offered a discount to the focal customer but not to the friend or vice versa). To achieve this in a realistic way, the scenarios described a situation where the focal customer and the friend planned a trip together (joint consumption situation). This was favored instead of a situation in which the focal customer and a friend accidentally booked the same flight and accommodation package, as had been used in Study 1 and 2. Identical to Study 2, the salience of the friend's budgetary situation was relaxed. Both were described as having worked equally hard to save the money for the trip. Thus, the monetary outcome of the price situation was identically relevant for both. The scenarios for the US sample are reproduced below. For the Swiss sample 'California' was replaced with 'London' and '$' with 'CHF'.

You and your roommate (a good friend from university) plan to go to California over New Year. Both of you have been working hard during the last few months to save the money to afford this trip. You have already agreed upon a flight and accommodation package from Travelexpedit (a new student travel agency located close to the campus). You have decided that each of you is going to book separately in order to use your own credit cards. A day later you talk about the trip together, how great the weather will be and what you plan to do. You mention that you hope that the trip will be worth its $550 you spent. Your friend is wondering why you paid $550, because s/he paid $440 [$660] (i.e., 20% less [more] than you). You both booked at the agency and have been served by the same travel agent at Travelexpedit.

Scenario 1: disadvantaged/self] So your friend asks you whether you used one of the two discount coupons from Travelexpedit that have been hanging on the fridge for weeks now. Although you had noticed them, you totally forgot while booking and missed out on the discount.

Scenario 2: disadvantaged/service provider] Your friend tells you that s/he had a pleasant chat with the travel agent, during which the travel agent offered to give her/him a good price. Your friend had not asked, so s/he assumed that the travel agent would just say the same thing to any other customer. Your friend only realizes it now that the travel agent actually offered her/him a discount.

Scenario 3: advantaged/self] So you ask your friend whether s/he used one of the two discount coupons from Travelexpedit that have been hanging on the fridge for weeks now. Although your friend had noticed them, s/he totally forgot while booking and missed out on the discount.
Scenario 4: advantaged/service provider] You tell your friend that you had a pleasant chat with the travel agent, during which the travel agent offered to give you a good price. You had not asked, so you assumed that the travel agent would just say the same thing to any other customer. You only realize it now that the travel agent actually offered you a discount.

So you booked and purchased exactly the same flight and accommodation package at a higher [lower] price than your friend.

6.4 Measures

Emotions. As in Study 2, all emotions were measured using single-items (i.e., 'angry at the service provider', 'proud', 'grateful to the service provider', 'pity', 'malicious pleasure'), except for the class of negative self-conscious emotions, which was measured using the mean of the items 'guilty', 'ashamed', 'regretful', and 'angry at myself' to compute a composite scale ($\alpha = .767$). The participants were requested to indicate the intensity with which they felt these nine and further filler emotion items on a 7-point scale from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). Similarly to Study 2, the full emotion item list given included 30 emotions derived from inventories of social, moral, and attributional emotions (Hareli & Parkinson, 2008; 2009; Hareli & Weiner, 2002; Weiner, 1985; 2009) (happy, sad, angry at myself, angry at the service provider, guilty, ashamed, regretful, grateful to the service provider, grateful for the situation, proud, relieved, surprised, contemptuous, hopeful, malicious pleasure, pity, disgusted, disappointed, frustrated, distressed, dislike of the service provider, dislike for the situation, fearful, envious, hopeless, embarrassed, admiring, sympathetic, jealous, satisfied).

Post-purchase behavior. The identical single-item questions as in Study 1 and 2 were used to measure complaining, positive word of mouth, negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions using 7-point scales ranging from 'definitely not' (0) to 'definitely' (6).

Appraisals/situational price cognitions. The three price-related cognitive appraisal dimensions motive consistency ($\alpha = .860$), motive relevance ($\alpha = .841$), and perceived fairness/justice ($\alpha = .926$) were assessed, each with the same two bipolar item set used in Study 2. Also, a bipolar item set on the realism of the scenarios, identical to Study 2, was included. All adjectives were assessed on 7-point bipolar scales ranging from '-3' for the semantically negative pole to '+3' for the semantically positive pole.

Manipulation check. As in Study 1, the respondents were asked whether the reason for the price difference was due to the service provider (-3) or due to themselves (3) (agency rating) and whether the price they paid was 'a lot lower' (-3) or 'a lot higher' (3) than their friend's price (fairness rating) using 7-point bipolar scales.

Individual difference variables. As in Study 2, the 11-item relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) scale was included (Cross et al., 2000) ($\alpha = .861$) using 7-point bipolar
scales ranging from 'strongly disagree' (-3) to 'strongly agree' (3). To calculate a person's RISC level, their scores across the 11 items were averaged. Finally, the respondents indicated their gender and age.

Additional questions for the Swiss sample. The questionnaire for the Swiss sample was also in English. Therefore, their English skills and the study's understandability were assessed with two questions in German. First, the respondents were asked to rate their English skills using two bipolar 7-point scales from 'very poor' (-3) to 'very good' (3) and from 'basic knowledge' (-3) to 'advanced knowledge' (3) \((\alpha = .782)\). Second, they indicated whether they faced problems understanding (i) the survey overall, (ii) the price situation described, or (iii) the questions because they were in English \((\alpha = .720)\) using 7-point scales from 'not at all' (0) to 'very much' (6).

6.5 Analysis and results

This chapter reports the results of the manipulation check (cf. Chapter 6.5.1). More importantly, it outlines the tests for the central appraisal-emotion hypotheses \((H1-H4, H13)\) (cf. Chapter 6.5.2) and emotion-behavior hypotheses \((H7-H10, H14)\) (cf. Chapter 6.5.4). It further assesses the mediational role of the price-related emotions \((H11)\) (cf. Chapter 6.5.5). Subsidiarily, the hypotheses on consumers' mixed emotions when paying less are tested in an attempt to corroborate the findings of Study 2 \((H5, H6)\) (cf. Chapter 6.5.3).

6.5.1 Manipulation check and further preliminary analyses

Manipulation check. To assess whether the manipulation was successful, separate 2x2 ANOVAs with agency and fairness as factors and either the fairness or agency rating as dependent variable were conducted (for the cell means, see Table 14). As expected, the results revealed a significant main effect of the factor fairness on the price difference rating \((F(1, 187) = 283.119, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .602)\), while the main effect of the factor agency \((F(1, 187) = .002, p = .962)\) and the fairness x agency interaction effect were not significant \((F(1, 187) = .648, p = .422)\). This confirms that in the two advantaged conditions the respondents indicated paying less than their friend \((M = -1.66)\), while they understood that they paid more in the two disadvantaged conditions \((M = 1.70)\). Regarding the agency manipulation, the main effect of the factor agency on the agency rating was significant \((F(1, 187) = 95.689, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .338)\), while the main effect on the factor fairness was also marginally significant \((F(1, 187) = 3.139, p = .078, \eta^2_p = .017)\), qualified by a significant interaction effect \((F(1, 187) = 4.350, p = .038, \eta^2_p = .023)\). The descriptive results and Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons revealed that the latter significant interaction effect again points to self-serving bias tendencies for positive outcomes (see discussions in Study 1 and 2). When the
service provider was the agent, positive outcomes (i.e., being price advantaged) were barely attributed to the service provider \((M = -.27)\), while being disadvantaged due to the service provider was significantly more strongly attributed to the service provider \((M = -1.21, p = .034)\). Although the reason for the price difference was identical for both service provider-agency conditions, the virtually same scenario was perceived as barely service provider-caused when the outcome was positive for the self. However, as soon as the focal customer exchanged positions with the friend and became the disadvantaged party, the service provider was now regarded as the agent for the price difference. Under self-agency, being price advantaged was considerably credited to the self \((M = 1.63)\) as was being price disadvantaged \((M = 1.70, p = .96)\). In sum, the fairness and agency manipulation worked as expected, while the agency manipulation carried self-serving bias tendencies when being advantaged. As in Study 1, no self-serving tendency to attribute negative events to the service provider rather than the self was present.

Table 14: Cell means for the manipulation check ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>disadvantaged</th>
<th>advantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 1 (n=47)</td>
<td>Scenario 2 (n=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency rating</td>
<td>1.70\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness rating</td>
<td>1.62\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 191\). Means within a row that do not share a common superscript differ significantly \((p < .05)\) based on Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons. No further pairwise comparisons were significant at \(p < .10\).

To assess whether the manipulation differed between the US and Swiss samples, 2x2x2 ANOVAs with agency, fairness and culture as factors and either the fairness or agency rating as dependent variable were conducted. The results largely replicated the findings above. For the fairness rating, only a main effect of the factor fairness was present \((F(1, 183) = 267.198, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .591)\). Similarly, for the agency rating, again a main effect of agency \((F(1, 183) = 101.072, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .356)\) and a marginally significant main effect of fairness \((F(1, 183) = 2.753, p = .099, \eta_p^2 = .015)\) qualified by a marginally significant agency x fairness interaction \((F(1, 183) = 3.854, p = .051, \eta_p^2 = .021)\) occurred. In addition, a significant main effect of culture on the agency rating was present \((F(1, 183) = 9.432, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .049)\). Agency tended to be more strongly attributed toward the self among the US sample \((M = .75)\) compared to the Swiss sample \((M = -.01)\). No further effect was significant at \(p < .10\). Still, the two samples were pooled to test the hypotheses for two reasons. First, the 2x2 ANOVA effects of agency and fairness on the respective manipulation check ratings were fully replicated when controlling for the effect of culture. Second, intercultural research has shown that the nature of the appraisal process is largely universal across cultures, while there
might be slight differences at least for some appraisal dimensions or some emotions but not for others (Roseman & Smith, 2001; Scherer & Ellsworth, 2009), as was found here for agency but not for fairness appraisals. Hence, considering the general universal nature of emotion elicitation, culture will only be included as an additional factor for exploratory reasons in order to test whether such slight cultural differences occur in the appraisal-emotion elicitation process to price discrimination stimuli.

Further preliminary analyses. Before conducting the hypothesis tests, further preliminary analyses were run. Specifically, the realism and motive relevance of the scenarios were assessed. In general, the scenarios were regarded as realistic on the bipolar realism scale from -3 'unrealistic' to 3 'realistic' ($M_{overall} = 1.04$). A 2x2 ANOVA with fairness and agency as factors and realism as dependent variable revealed no significant main effects (both $p > .3$), but there was a marginally significant interaction effect ($F(1, 187) = 3.627, p = .058, \eta_p^2 = .019$). However, Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons showed no significant differences between the four conditions at $p < .10$. Furthermore, the scenarios were perceived as relevant for the self ($M_{overall} = .85$). The respective 2x2 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of fairness on motive relevance ($F(1, 187) = 7.447, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .038$). Being disadvantaged was appraised as somewhat more relevant for the self ($M = 1.11$) than being advantaged ($M = .60$).

Further, the motive consistency and perceived fairness/justice of the scenarios were investigated. The 2x2 ANOVA on perceived fairness/justice yielded a significant main effect of fairness ($F(1, 187) = 13.515, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .067$). The monetarily identical amount of inequity (here $S$ or CHF 110) was perceived as more unfair when one is the disadvantaged party ($M = -1.43$) than when one belongs to the advantaged party ($M = - .62$). This result replicates previous research, which shows that disadvantaged but also advantaged inequity are both perceived as unfair, the latter however to a lesser extent (see e.g., Loseman et al., 2009 in their Study 2; but for van den Bos et al., 2006 or Loseman et al., 2009 in their Study 1, who find no sig. differences between the two inequity conditions). Also, a main effect of agency on perceived fairness was present ($F(1, 187) = 14.189, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .071$). When the service provider was the reason for the price inequity, the situation was perceived as more unfair ($M = -1.43$) than when the self caused the price difference ($M = -.61$). The agency x fairness interaction effect was not significant at $p < .10$. Interestingly, the pattern of perceived fairness/justice flipped for perceived motive consistency. The 2x2 ANOVA on motive consistency provided a significant main effect of fairness ($F(1, 187) = 67.075, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .264$) and agency ($F(1, 187) = 4.035, p = .046, \eta_p^2 = .021$), that was qualified by a marginally significant interaction effect ($F(1, 187) = 2.995, p = .085, \eta_p^2 = .016$). Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons ($p < .05$) revealed that being disadvantaged was perceived as highly motive-inconsistent independent of agency ($M_{disadv/self} = -2.24; M_{disadv/SP} = -2.19$) and more so than the
two advantaged conditions. However, paying less due to self-agency was perceived as significantly more motive-inconsistent ($M_{adv./self} = -1.01$) than when the service provider offered the focal customer a better price ($M_{adv./SP} = -0.30$).

In sum, the scenarios were regarded as realistic. Moreover, being price disadvantaged was perceived as more self-relevant than being price advantaged. Also, facing a price disadvantage was judged as more unfair and more motive-inconsistent than facing a price advantage. These differences were anticipated based on existing research, as discussed above and in Chapter 2.2.3. Furthermore, paying a different price due to the service provider was perceived as more unfair compared to when it happens due to the self. The latter result again suggests self-serving bias tendencies in perceived fairness (similar to agency appraisals). Inversely, paying less due to self-agency was regarded as less consistent with one's motives than when the service provider was the reason for the advantage. This inverse pattern between fairness and motive-consistency was directionally present in Study 2. That these two appraisals do not entirely work in tandem implies that what is preferred for the self might not be the 'right' thing (see e.g., discussion in van den Bos et al., 2006).

Furthermore, conducting the experiment in English did not seem to have distorted the data for the Swiss sample. The Swiss respondents perceived their English skills as strong ($M_{Overall} = 1.91$) on a scale from -3 (very poor skills) to +3 (very good skills). They also indicated that it was unproblematic to understand the questionnaire although it was in English ($M_{Overall} = .63$), on a scale from 0 (not at all problematic) to 6 (very problematic). Separate one-way ANOVAs on the skill and understandability rating yielded no significant differences between the four conditions (both $p > .3$).

The descriptive statistic and bivariate correlations between the main variables of this study are presented in Appendix II.
Table 15: Cell means, 2x2 ANOVAs, and planned comparisons on the emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>disadvantaged</th>
<th>advantaged</th>
<th>F values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
<td>self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=47)</td>
<td>(n=47)</td>
<td>(n=48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-NE</td>
<td>3.59  1.03</td>
<td>2.36  1.28</td>
<td>1.67  1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry SP</td>
<td>3.23  1.94</td>
<td>5.15  1.32</td>
<td>1.72  1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.26  .64</td>
<td>.23  .63</td>
<td>1.67  1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful SP</td>
<td>.47  1.08</td>
<td>.48  1.05</td>
<td>1.44  1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>1.32  1.76</td>
<td>1.23  1.71</td>
<td>3.21  1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal. pleasure</td>
<td>.32  .84</td>
<td>.57  1.14</td>
<td>1.10  1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 191 (except for angry at SP and grateful to SP N = 190 and dferror = 186);
*italics* indicates the condition in which the respective emotion was hypothesized to have the highest mean compared to the other conditions (cf. means within a row);
*underline* indicates the emotion with the descriptively highest mean observed within a scenario (cf. means within a column);
self-NE = negative self-conscious emotions; SP = service provider.
Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6).
* p < .05. *** p < .001.
6.5.2 Hypotheses on appraisal-emotion relationships

Before assessing the specific appraisal-emotion hypotheses, a 2x2 MANOVA with the six emotions as dependent variables and agency, fairness, as well as their interaction as independent variables was conducted. The omnibus F-tests of the MANOVA confirmed that fairness ($F(6, 180) = 45.157, \eta_p^2 = .601$), agency ($F(6, 180) = 21.460, \eta_p^2 = .417$) and the fairness x agency interaction ($F(6, 180) = 6.759, \eta_p^2 = .184$) act as significant predictors of the six emotions (all three $p < .001$).

To recapitulate the specific appraisal-emotion hypotheses, it was expected that negative self-conscious emotions are highest in the self/disadvantaged ($H1$), anger in the service provider/disadvantaged ($H2$), pride in the self/advantaged ($H3a$), and gratitude in the service provider/advantaged condition ($H4a$). Further, it was anticipated that some degree of negative self-conscious emotions are present in the self/advantaged ($H3b$) compared to the service provider/advantaged condition, where some level of anger was expected ($H4b$). Lastly, pity and malicious pleasure were predicted to occur in the advantaged but not disadvantaged conditions, independent of agency ($H13$). The cell means and $F$-tests of the respective hypothesis-testing planned comparisons and separate 2x2 ANOVAs are displayed in Table 15 (for cell mean, see also Figure 14). The results of these analyses are subsequently discussed.

**Negative self-conscious emotions.** The hypothesis-testing planned complex comparison confirmed that negative self-conscious emotions were most intense when the self was held responsible for paying a higher price ($M = 3.59$) compared to its mean across the three remaining conditions ($M = 1.81, F(1, 187) = 65.838, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .260$). This corroborated $H1$. The simple pairwise comparisons further qualify that negative self-conscious emotions were higher in the self/disadvantaged condition compared to the service provider/disadvantaged ($M = 2.36, F(1, 187) = 21.015, \eta_p^2 = .101$), the self/advantaged ($M = 1.67, F(1, 187) = 51.421, \eta_p^2 = .216$), and service provider/advantaged condition ($M = 1.41, F(1, 187) = 67.086, \eta_p^2 = .264$) (all three $p < .001$). Subsidiarily, it was anticipated that negative emotions toward the self could also be elicited to some degree when the focal customer is responsible for paying less than a co-consumer compared to the service provider/advantaged condition (where some level of anger was expected). However, a planned simple comparison revealed that negative self-conscious emotions did not significantly differ between the two advantaged conditions ($M_{adv./self} = 1.67$ vs. $M_{adv./SP} = 1.41, F(1, 187) = .977, p = .324$), disconfirming $H3b$. As in Study 1 and 2, self-conscious emotions were present to some (rather low) extent when being advantaged and did not vary by agency. Supporting these results on negative self-conscious emotions, the 2x2 ANOVA depicts significant main effects of agency and fairness, which are qualified by a significant interaction effect (all three $p < .02$).
Anger at the service provider. Anger at the service provider was the most intense emotion when the service provider was regarded as responsible for the customer having paid a higher price ($M = 5.15$) compared to its mean across the three other conditions ($M = 2.48$, $F(1, 186) = 86.621, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .318$). This confirmed $H2$. Specifically, anger was higher in the service provider/disadvantaged condition compared to the self/disadvantaged ($M = 3.23$, $F(1, 186) = 29.679, \eta^2_p = .138$), the self/advantaged ($M = 1.72$, $F(1, 186) = 94.977, \eta^2_p = .338$), and the service provider/advantaged condition ($M = 2.49$, $F(1, 186) = 58.425, \eta^2_p = .239$) (all $p < .001$). Further, it was hypothesized that being advantaged compared to a friend could elicit some level of anger when the situation is due to the service provider rather than the self. A planned simple comparison reveals that anger at the service provider was slightly and significantly higher when being advantaged was due to the service provider ($M = 2.49$) rather than the self ($M = 1.72$, $F(1, 186) = 4.853, p = .029, \eta^2_p = .025$), confirming $H4b$. However, the size of the effect was rather low ($\eta^2_p = .025$) and Study 1 and 2 did not find support for $H4b$. In line with the general results, the 2x2 ANOVA depicted significant main effects of agency and fairness on anger qualified by a significant interaction effect (all three $p < .03$).

Pride. When oneself was credited for paying a lower price than a co-consumer, intense levels of pride were expected. However, the descriptive results depicted that pity was the most intense emotion in the self/advantaged condition ($M = 3.21$). Pride only occurred as intensely as negative self-conscious emotions (both $M = 1.67$). Hence, although the complex contrast was significant ($p < .001$), feelings of pride did not significantly differ between the two advantaged conditions. Pride was descriptively even slightly higher in the service provider/advantaged condition ($M = 1.98$, $F(1, 187) = 1.171, p = .280$). In line with these observed results, the 2x2 ANOVA for pride provided a significant main effect of fairness ($p < .001$), while no further effect was significant (both $p > .4$). Hence, the predicted appraisal-pride relationship $H3a$, which was confirmed in Study 1 and 2, could not be supported in Study 3 (for potential explanations, see discussion in Chapter 6.6).

Gratitude toward the service provider. As expected, paying a lower price than a friend due to the service provider elicited strong gratitude toward the service provider ($M = 3.57$) compared to its mean across the remaining three conditions ($M = .79$, $F(1, 186) = 136.158, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .423$). This confirmed $H4a$. Simple contrasts indicated that the respondents felt more grateful in the service provider/advantaged condition compared to the self/advantaged ($M = 1.44$, $F(1, 186) = 53.623, \eta^2_p = .224$), the self/disadvantaged ($M = .47$, $F(1, 186) = 112.203, \eta^2_p = .376$), and the service provider/disadvantaged condition ($M = .48$, $F(1, 186) = 110.245, \eta^2_p = .372$) (all three $p < .001$). Supplementing these results, the 2x2 ANOVA for gratitude depicted significant main effects of fairness and agency, which were qualified by a significant interaction effect (all three $p < .001$).
Pity/malicious pleasure. As expected, the results of the 2x2 ANOVAs for the two co-consumer-related emotions pity and malicious pleasure revealed that both vary as a function of fairness (\(F(1, 187) = 44.205, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .191\), and \(F(1, 187) = 17.285, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .085\), respectively), while no further effects were significant (all four \(p > .10\)). The respondents felt more pity (\(M = 2.97\)) and malicious pleasure (\(M = 1.25\)) when they were advantaged than when they were disadvantaged compared to a friend (\(M = 1.28\) and \(M = .45\), respectively), independent of agency. This confirmed \(H13\). Interestingly, a certain degree of pity was also present when oneself was price disadvantaged (\(M = 1.28\)). It seems that pity not only occurs when the friend is disadvantaged, but also when oneself is disadvantaged ("self-pity"), although at a significantly lower level. This replicates the results of Feather and McKee (2009), who also found people to feel sorry for themselves based on their own actions and outcomes, while the authors add that pity typically connects more strongly with feeling sorry for other persons' outcomes.

Figure 14: Emotions as a function of fairness by agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Intensity Rating</th>
<th>Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Advantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative self-conscious emotions</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grateful</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious pleasure</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). **Bold** indicates the cell mean(s) that were expected to be highest in the respective conditions(s).
In sum, the expected interactive effect of the fairness and agency appraisal antecedents was found to predict and differentiate between qualitatively different emotions: Negative self-conscious emotions were highest in the self/disadvantaged (H1), anger in the service provider/disadvantaged (H2), and gratitude in the service provider/advantaged condition (H4a) compared to the remaining conditions. Further, as anticipated, pity and malicious pleasure occurred to some extent when being price advantaged rather than disadvantaged, independent of agency (H13). However, unlike the results in Study 1 and 2, pride could not be confirmed as the most important emotion in the self/advantaged condition (H3a). Explanations for this unexpected result are reviewed in the discussion (cf. Chapter 6.6) and further investigated in Study 4.

**Effect of culture.** Although no hypothesis was stated, this study explored whether cultural differences in appraisal-emotion relationships occur. Hence, separate 2x2x2 ANOVAs were run with fairness, agency, and culture (US vs. Swiss) as factors and the six emotions as dependent variables. When controlling for culture, for all six emotions the same effects remained significant as in the 2x2 ANOVAs. In addition, a main effect of culture on gratitude emerged \(F(1, 182) = 7.597, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = .040\). The US respondents were found to feel more grateful \(M = 1.75\) than the Swiss respondents \(M = 1.13\). This is interesting because the Swiss respondents' agency perception was found to be directed toward the service provider, while the US respondents' agency perception was directed more toward the self (cf. manipulation check). Hence, it seems that perceived service provider-agency needs to be more intense for the Swiss sample to induce the same level of gratitude, while the US respondents feel grateful at lower levels of perceived service provider-agency. Moreover, pity displayed a main effect of culture \(F(1, 183) = 7.624, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = .040\) qualified by a significant fairness x culture interaction \(F(1, 183) = 7.527, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .040\). Simple effect analyses indicated that while pity did not differ between the two samples when being advantaged (both \(M = 2.97, F(1, 95) = .000, p = .989\)), the Swiss respondents felt more pity for themselves when they were disadvantaged \(M = 2.14\) compared to the US respondents who barely experienced self-pity \(M = .74; F(1, 92) = 17.098, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .157\). No further main or higher-order effects of culture emerged at \(p < .10\).

**6.5.3 Hypotheses on mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged**

Regarding advantaged price inequity conditions, the results so far indicate that positive (gratitude, pride, malicious pleasure) and some degree of negative emotions (anger, negative self-conscious emotions, pity) emerge when being advantaged. Hence, similarly to Study 2, the subsequent analyses investigate (1) when and for whom positive or negative emotions increase (H5), and (2) whether positive and negative emotions co-occur as ambivalent emotional blends (H6).
Triggers of positive vs. negative emotions when being price advantaged (H5).

It was predicted that whether positive or negative emotions increase when being advantaged depends on situational appraisals (i.e., motive consistency) \((H5a)\) and individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC) \((H5b)\). The respective analyses were subsequently conducted with the subsample of the two advantaged conditions only \((n = 97)\).

Role of motive consistency on emotions’ valence. A multivariate regression of the six emotions on motive consistency was run to investigate whether perceived motive consistency predicts whether positive or negative emotions increase when paying less. The results indicate that the more personally desirable (i.e., motive-consistent) being advantaged is perceived, the more intense the positive emotions pride \((b = .464, t(94) = 4.361, p < .001)\) and gratitude \((b = .548, t(94) = 4.093, p < .001)\) – and the less intense the negative emotions anger \((b = -.321, t(94) = -3.027, p = .003)\), negative self-conscious emotions \((b = -.422, t(94) = -5.419, p < .001)\), and pity \((b = -.247, t(94) = -2.244, p = .027)\). However, motive consistency was un-predictive of malicious pleasure \((b = -.002, t(94) = -.018, p = .985)\).

Hence, \(H5a\) was only partially supported. Nonetheless, this finding – that motive consistency shows the expected valence dividing effect on all five tested emotions but malicious pleasure – perfectly replicates the results of Study 2. Figure 15 illustrates the effect of motive consistency on the six emotions at the arbitrary levels of one standard deviation above the mean (high motive consistency) and one standard deviation below the mean (low motive consistency).

Figure 15: Role of motive consistency in predicting emotions’ valence

\[\text{Intensity Rating} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{proud} & \quad \text{grateful to service provider} & \quad \text{negative self-conscious emotions} & \quad \text{angry at service provider} & \quad \text{pity} & \quad \text{malicious pleasure} \\
\hline
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\end{align*}

\text{motive consistency high (M+1SD)} \quad \text{motive consistency low (M-1SD)}

Note. \(N = 96\). Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). Motive consistency high = mean plus 1 SD = 1.02; motive consistency low = mean minus 1 SD = -2.32. These two arbitrary levels for motive consistency were placed into the regression equations derived from the multivariate regression of the six emotions on motive consistency to produce the graph.
Role of relational-interdependent self-construal on emotions’ valence. A multivariate regression of the six emotions on RISC was run in an attempt to assess whether a person's RISC disposition directly affects whether this person feels more positively or more negatively about paying less. Based on these results, a person's RISC level was only significantly related to pity $(b = .521, t(89) = 2.401, p = .018)$. Specifically, the more people define themselves in terms of close relationships (i.e., high RISC), the more they felt pity about the co-consumer's disadvantage. No further coefficient was significant at $p < .10$. Thus, $H5b$ was only partially supported for pity. Differently, in Study 2, RISC was found to decrease malicious pleasure. Hence, although the results of Study 2 and 3 are not consistent with respect to the specific emotion, they both suggest that RISC affects the type of co-consumer-related emotions.  

Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged ($H6$).

To investigate whether consumers feel blends of mixed emotions when being price advantaged or whether some consumers feel more positive and others more negative emotions, ambivalence indexes were calculated identical to Study 1 and 2 (see Chapter 4.5.3 for details on the procedure) (cf. Table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>disadvantaged</th>
<th>advantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>service-provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (overall)</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (self)</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (SP)</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence (co-consumer)</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 191$ (but $N = 189$ for the service provider (SP)-related ambivalence). Overall ambivalence was calculated based on a positive emotion index (i.e., mean of gratitude, pride, malicious pleasure, $\alpha = .682$) and a negative emotion index (i.e., mean across guilty, ashamed, regretful, angry at myself, angry at service provider, pity, $\alpha = .665$); self-related ambivalence was calculated based on pride and negative self-conscious emotions (i.e., mean across guilty, ashamed, regretful, angry at myself, $\alpha = .767$); SP-related ambivalence was calculated based on gratitude toward and anger at the service provider; co-consumer-related ambivalence was calculated based on malicious pleasure and pity.

---

8 As outlined in Chapter 5.6.3, individual differences can affect the appraisal-emotion elicitation process directly by influencing appraisals and emotions or indirectly by moderating how strongly an individual's appraisals are related to the proposed emotions. As outlined above, RISC did not have a direct effect on emotions except for pity. Further, the correlations do not suggest a direct association between RISC and motive consistency appraisals ($r = -.023, p = .829$). Hence, as in Study 2, this study explored whether RISC moderates the motive consistency appraisal-emotion relationships. The effect of motive consistency on the emotions found above was expected to be more indicative (i.e., stronger) for people high in RISC than for low RISC people. To test this, each of the six emotions was separately regressed on (mean-centered) motive consistency, RISC, and their product term. The results indicated that RISC significantly moderates the effect of motive consistency on gratitude $(b = .265, t(88) = 2.298, p = .024)$. As in Study 2, the MODPROBE macro was used (Hayes & Matthes, 2009) to probe the interactions and calculate the Johnson-Neyman (J-N) significance regions. The results suggest that the more personally desirable (i.e., more motive-consistent) paying less than a friend was perceived, the higher the positive emotion gratitude, particularly among people who incorporate close others' concerns into their self-concept (J-N region of significance at a RISC score beyond .32). However, no further interaction effects occurred at $p < .10$. Hence, the pattern observed in Study 2 could not be replicated, except for gratitude.
First, it was anticipated that a certain degree of mixed feelings co-occur when being price advantaged compared to a co-consumer (H6a). Hence, overall emotional ambivalence was expected to be higher in the advantaged compared to the non-ambivalent disadvantaged conditions. In line with this, a 2x2 ANOVA showed a strong main effect of fairness ($F(1, 187) = 55.913, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .230$). Emotional ambivalence was higher when being advantaged ($M = .70$) than disadvantaged ($M = -1.74$), which supported H6a. Additionally, a main effect of agency occurred ($F(1, 187) = 12.438, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .062$), while the interaction was non-significant ($p > .2$). Ambivalence was higher when the service provider ($M = .08$) rather than the self was the agent ($M = -1.08$). Although the results suggest that emotional ambivalence increases when being advantaged, the absolute values were rather low, given that possible values range from -6 to 12 (cf. Chapter 4.5.3).

Second, it was proposed that self-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of pride and negative self-conscious emotions) is highest when being advantaged is due to the self and that service provider-related ambivalence (i.e., co-occurrence of gratitude and anger) is strongest when the service provider is responsible (H6b). However, the respective planned complex comparison for self-related ambivalence was not significant ($M = -1.19$ vs. $M = -1.60, F(1, 187) = 1.079, p = .300$). As in Study 2, the pattern of the means across the two advantaged conditions was directionally even inverse to the pattern expected. A simple comparison indicated that self-related ambivalence was marginally lower (not higher) in the self/advantaged ($M = -1.19$) than the service provider/advantaged condition ($M = -.31, F(1, 187) = 3.375, p = .068, \eta_p^2 = .018$). The significant negative correlation supported the notion that pride and negative self-conscious emotions barely co-occur but rather diverge among the respondents in the self/advantaged condition ($r = -.319, p = .027$). Moreover, the planned complex comparison on the service provider-related ambivalence index was significant ($M = .71$ vs. $M = -2.21, F(1, 185) = 25.952, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .123$). A simple complex contrast confirmed that service provider-related emotional ambivalence was marginally significantly higher in the service provider/advantaged ($M = .71$) compared to the self/advantaged condition ($M = -.47, F(1, 187) = 2.801, p = .096, \eta_p^2 = .015$). Although this finding was as expected, the bivariate correlation provided a different picture. Among the respondents in the service provider/advantaged condition, gratitude and anger were significantly negatively correlated ($r = -.502, p < .001$).

In sum, the results of the hypothesis-testing complex contrast support H6b only for the service provider- but not for self-related emotional ambivalence. As expected, service provider-related ambivalence was found to be highest in the service provider/advantaged condition. However, the correlation results contrast with this finding. They suggest that gratitude and anger diverge (rather than co-occur) in the service provider/advantaged condition. Similarly, self-related emotional ambivalence was found to be lowest (rather than highest) in the
self/advantaged condition. Although these results are directionally inverse to those predicted, they replicate the pattern found in Study 1 and 2. Taken together, these results suggest that people experience concise feelings toward the agent of an event: either they feel positive or negative vis-a-vis the agent.

Third, co-consumer-related ambivalence (i.e., malicious pleasure and pity) was expected to be present when being price advantaged, independent of agency. A one-way ANOVA on the sample of the two advantaged conditions indicated that co-consumer-related ambivalence only marginally differed between the service provider/advantaged ($M = .61$) and self-/advantaged condition ($M = -.73$, $F(1, 95) = 3.010, p = .086, \eta^2_p = .031$). Hence, at the conventional level of $p < .05$, co-consumer-related ambivalence, as expected, was not found to differ.

In addition, the significant negative correlation between pride and negative self-conscious emotions in the self/advantaged condition deserves special attention. Within this condition, the mean level of pride was lower than expected and equal to the mean of negative self-conscious emotions (both $M = 1.67$). Taking their negative correlation into account suggests that the respondents who felt rather negative self-conscious emotions in this condition contributed to this attenuation of the mean of pride (and vice versa).

### 6.5.4 Hypotheses on emotion-behavior relationships

**Relationship between appraisals and post-purchase behavior.** Before investigating the specific emotion-behavior relationships and the mediational role of the emotions, the total effect of cognitive appraisals on behaviors was explored. To test whether agency and fairness interact in producing behavioral intentions, 2x2 ANOVAs with fairness and agency as factors and the four post-purchase intentions as dependent variables were conducted (for detailed results, see Table 17). The results provided significant main effects of fairness and agency for all four behaviors (all eight $p < .04$). Importantly, these main effects were qualified by significant agency x fairness interaction effects for repurchase ($p = .008$), and negative word of mouth ($p = .002$) and just not significant interaction effects at $p < .10$ for positive word of mouth ($p = .106$) and complaining ($p = .109$). Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons provided evidence that the two negative behavioral intentions were most likely when the service provider was responsible for the focal consumer paying more than a co-consumer ($M_{N-WOM} = 4.32$; $M_{complaining} = 4.21$), while the positive behavioral intentions were least likely in this condition ($M_{P-WOM} = .72$; $M_{repurchase} = 1.09$) (all 12 comparisons $p < .03$).

In sum, the means pattern of all behaviors supports an interactive effect of fairness and agency appraisals on the four post-purchase behaviors assessed, even though the interaction is just not significant for some behaviors. Nonetheless, for the assessment of the significance of the mediational role (i.e., indirect effect) of emotions, no significant interactive total effect of the
fairness by agency cognitions is required (for a review of this emerging position abandoning assumptions of the classical Baron and Kenny (1986) causal steps strategy in favor of a theory-guided analysis of indirect effects, see e.g., Rucker, Preacher, Tormala, & Petty, 2011).

Table 17: Cell means and 2x2 ANOVAs on post-purchase behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>disadvantaged</th>
<th>advantaged</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Fairness x Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F(1, 187)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>η²</td>
<td>F(1, 187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complain</td>
<td>3.02b</td>
<td>4.21a</td>
<td>1.81c</td>
<td>2.04br,c</td>
<td>31.879</td>
<td>.000 .146</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>5.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-WOM</td>
<td>1.81b</td>
<td>.72a</td>
<td>2.92c</td>
<td>2.51br,c</td>
<td>47.883</td>
<td>.000 .204</td>
<td>12.711</td>
<td>.000 .064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-WOM</td>
<td>2.23b</td>
<td>4.32a</td>
<td>1.65b</td>
<td>2.08b</td>
<td>29.150</td>
<td>.000 .135</td>
<td>23.200</td>
<td>.000 .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repurchase</td>
<td>2.15b</td>
<td>1.09b</td>
<td>3.65c</td>
<td>3.77c</td>
<td>89.628</td>
<td>.000 .325</td>
<td>4.516</td>
<td>.035 .024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 191 (except for repurchase N = 190 and dferror = 186). Intentions were measured on 7-point scales from 'definitely not' (0) to 'definitely' (6). Means within a row that do not share a common superscript differ significantly (p < .05) based on Tukey-Kramer post-hoc pairwise comparisons; Superscript with † indicate that the means differ at p < .10.

Relationship between emotions and post-purchase behavior. In order to assess the specific emotion-behavior hypotheses on how the emotions map onto the post-purchase behavioral intentions, a multivariate multiple regression was conducted with the six emotions as independent and the four behaviors as dependent variables (cf. Table 18). The across-equation F-tests corroborated the findings of Study 1 and 2 that particularly anger (F(4, 178) = 42.249, p < .001, η² = .487) and gratitude (F(4, 178) = 2.486, p = .045, η² = .053) – the two service-provider-related emotions – are significantly associated with the four post-purchase intentions. Further, negative self-conscious emotions were significantly related to the four behaviors (F(4, 178) = 2.574, p = .039, η² = .055) and pride marginally so (F(4, 178) = 2.214, p = .069, η² = .047). Moreover, the six emotions were found to explain from 34% to 48% of the variance in the behavior variables (see adjusted R²). This is akin to previous studies on the impact of multiple emotions on different behavioral intentions in marketing (see e.g., Gelbrich, 2011 with Adj. R² of .16 to .37; Soscia, 2007 with Adj. R² of .27 to .69; or Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004 with R² of .13 to .71).

Table 18: Multivariate multiple regression of post-purchase behaviors on emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>complain</th>
<th>P-WOM</th>
<th>N-WOM</th>
<th>repurchase</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-NE</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.349</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal. pleasure</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 188; b values indicate the unstandardized regression coefficients; bold indicate significant results at p < .10; self-NE = negative self-conscious emotions. * p < .10. ** p < .05. *** p < .001.
Regarding the specific emotion-behavior hypotheses, the regression results indicated that respondents who felt negative self-conscious emotions tended to be significantly less likely to spread negative word of mouth (\( b = -0.185, t(181) = -2.341, p = .020, \eta^2_p = .029 \)), confirming \( H7b \). However, they were not significantly less likely to complain (\( b = -0.051, t(181) = -0.560, p = .576 \)), disconfirming \( H7a \). Interestingly, negative self-conscious emotions were even found to foster positive word of mouth activities (\( b = 0.156, t(181) = 2.216, p = .028, \eta^2_p = .029 \)). This positive effect on positive word of mouth replicated the result of Study 2, albeit this effect was not predicted. In contrast, respondents who felt angry at the service provider were more likely to spread negative word of mouth (\( b = 0.681, t(181) = 11.426, \eta^2_p = .419 \) and to complain (\( b = 0.612, t(181) = 8.836, \eta^2_p = .301 \)), while they were less likely to spread positive word of mouth (\( b = -0.349, t(181) = -6.565, \eta^2_p = .192 \)) or to repurchase the service in the future (\( b = -0.368, t(181) = -6.178, \eta^2_p = .174 \) (all four \( p < .001 \)). This corroborated \( H8a \) through \( H8d \). Inversely, feeling grateful toward the service provider marginally significantly fostered positive word of mouth (\( b = 0.121, t(181) = 1.723, p = .087, \eta^2_p = .016 \)) as well as repurchase intentions (\( b = 0.153, t(181) = 1.945, p = .053, \eta^2_p = .020 \)). Hence, given the directional hypotheses, \( H10c \) and \( H10d \) are considered as supported. Also, grateful consumers were less likely to complain (\( b = -0.231, t(181) = -2.531, p = .012, \eta^2_p = .034 \)), but they were not significantly less likely to spread negative word of mouth (\( b = -0.368, t(181) = -6.178, \eta^2_p = .174 \) (all four \( p < .001 \)). This supported \( H10a \) but not \( H10b \) as both negative behaviors were expected to decrease with gratitude. As predicted, feeling pride increased positive word of mouth activities (\( b = 0.204, t(181) = 2.424, p = .016, \eta^2_p = .031 \)), which confirmed \( H9 \). Although no further behavioral effects of pride were expected, pride was additionally found to increase repurchase intentions (\( b = 0.211, t(181) = 2.228, p = .027, \eta^2_p = .027 \)). Regarding the co-consumer-related emotions, people feeling maliciously pleased were expected to spread negative word of mouth. Even though the respective regression coefficient was positive, it was just not significant (\( b = 0.135, t(181) = 1.462, p = .145 \)). Hence, \( H14 \) was disconfirmed at conventional significance levels but could at least directionally be replicated. As anticipated, pity was unrelated to all four behaviors related to the service provider (all four \( p > .10 \)).

In sum, the general pattern of the behavioral impact of the specific emotions, which was anticipated and essentially found in Study 1 and 2, could largely be replicated in Study 3. Specifically, the two service provider-related emotions, gratitude and anger, were again found to sizably affect post-purchase behaviors in accordance with their valence. The results demonstrate that consumers' coping with anger increased behavioral intentions that harm the service provider, while gratitude promoted beneficial post-purchase intentions for firms. In contrast to anger, consumers who felt negative self-conscious emotions responded with positive behavioral intentions, which would not be predicted by solely assessing the emotions' valence. This result supports the key notion of this thesis: it shows that not all negative emotions that
are primarily elicited when paying more have equally destructive consequences for firms. Similarly, not all positive emotions impact post-purchase behaviors to the same extent. Pride seemed to foster positive word of mouth and in Study 3 also repurchase intentions. However, the latter effect on repurchase should be carefully interpreted as it was absent in Study 1 and 2. While pride was found to foster positive behaviors, gratitude additionally decreased negative intentions, namely, complaining. The emotions related to the co-consumer's misfortune, pity and malicious pleasure, were not found to significantly affect post-purchase behaviors. Still, the predicted negative effect of malicious pleasure on negative word of mouth found in Study 2 received at least directional support. Taken together, these distinct behavioral responses of emotions of the same valence clearly indicate that it is crucial to study the formation and behavioral impact of specific price discrimination-related emotions to more accurately predict consumers' post-purchase behaviors when prices differ.

**Ambivalence-behavior relationship.** Although no a-priori hypothesis was stated, the following multivariate regression analysis explored how emotional ambivalence affects post-purchase behavior. Regressing the four behaviors on the overall emotional ambivalence index with the subsample of the two advantaged conditions indicated that overall ambivalence exerts a negative impact on post-purchase behaviors. The more emotional ambivalent a consumer was, the more likely s/he was to complain \((b = .201, t(94) = 2.493, p = .014, \eta_p^2 = .062)\) and spread negative word of mouth \((b = .232, t(94) = 3.342, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .106)\), and the less likely s/he was to spread positive word of mouth \((b = -.163, t(94) = -2.364, p = .020, \eta_p^2 = .056)\) or to repurchase the service \((b = -.148, t(94) = -2.247, p = .027, \eta_p^2 = .051)\).

### 6.5.5  Hypotheses on the interplay between appraisals, emotions, and behavior

Thus far, the results suggest that the interactive effect of fairness and agency produces significant variation in the service provider- and self-related emotions (all three \(p < .03\), except for pride) as well as in post-purchase behaviors (all four sig. at \(p \leq .109\)). Further, the data provides evidence that these emotions affect post-purchase behaviors as outlined above. Drawing on appraisal theories, variations in post-purchase behavior were expected to reflect consumers' coping with the emotions which are elicited by the appraisal of a price discrimination event (see e.g., Lazarus, 1991; Peine et al., 2009). Hence, the following analyses assess whether the price-related discrete emotions mediate the effect of the cognitive fairness x agency appraisals on post-purchase behavior \((H11)\) (cf. Chapter 2.2.5). For this, a mediated moderation analysis with multiple mediators was run separately for each behavior using the INDIRECT macro provided by Preacher and Hayes (2008). For all four analyses, the fairness x agency product term was defined as the independent variable \((X)\), the six emotions as the mediators \((M_1 - M_6)\), and the respective behavioral intention as the dependent variable \((Y_i)\),
while controlling for the factors agency ($C_1$) and fairness ($C_2$) (see Hayes, 2011 on mediated moderation analyses using INDIRECT; or Garcia, Schmitt, Branscombe, & Ellemers, 2010 for an empirical example; for mediated moderation in general, see e.g., Muller et al., 2005; Preacher et al., 2007).

Figure 16: Illustration of the mediated moderation model

![Diagram of mediated moderation model]

**Note.** $X =$ independent variable; $Y_i =$ dependent variable ($Y_1 =$ complain; $Y_2 =$ P-WOM; $Y_3 =$ N-WOM; $Y_4 =$ repurchase); $M_1 - M_6 =$ mediators; $C_1, C_2 =$ covariates.

Source: based on SPSS INDIRECT Macro Syntax Reference (updated 2011/01/22) supplementary online material to Preacher & Hayes, 2008.

Figure 16 illustrates an exemplary multiple mediation design, and Appendix III provides the path estimates for each multiple mediation model per behavior, which were calculated using OLS regression. Specifically, the $a_i$ paths portray the effect of the agency x fairness interaction on the emotions, covarying out the effect of fairness and agency. The $b_i$ paths represent the effect of the emotions on the respective behavior, partialing out the effect of the agency x fairness interaction, agency, and fairness. The $c$ path estimates the effect of the agency x fairness interaction on the behaviors.

---

9 The $p$-values of the OLS regression results ($a$ and $c$ paths) calculated with the INDIRECT command (cf. Appendix III) do not exactly match with the $p$-values of the appraisal-emotion and appraisal-behavior relationships reported in the ANOVA table (cf. Table 15 and Table 17). The two analyses are based on slightly different sample sizes because the INDIRECT command excludes cases with missing values on any of the variables. Also, the regression coefficients and $p$-values of the $b$ paths diverge compared to the multivariate multiple regression on the emotion-behavior relationships (cf. Table 18). This is also due to slightly different sample sizes and because agency, fairness, and their product term serve as covariates in the calculation of the $b$ paths in the mediated moderation model.
fairness interaction on the respective behavior, controlling for the effect of the covariates (total effect), while the $c'$ path additionally controls for the effect of the emotions (direct effect). Taken together, the total effect of the agency x fairness interaction on the respective behavior (c path) can be expressed as the sum of its indirect effects through the emotions (sum of all $a_i x b_i$ paths) and its direct effect on the behavior ($c'$ path). The significance of the specific indirect effects ($a_i x b_i$ paths) and the total indirect effect (sum of all $a_i x b_i$ paths) is subsequently assessed using bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) bootstrap 95% (and 90%) confidence intervals (CI) based on 5000 bootstrap samples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).  

Regarding the total indirect effect, the bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap confidence intervals (BCa CI) provided evidence that the set of the six price-related emotions significantly mediated the interactive effect of agency x fairness on each of the four post-purchase behavior (none of the four BCa 95% CI included zero). Concerning the specific indirect effects, anger was found to significantly mediate the effect on all four behaviors (none of the four BCa 95% CI included zero). Also, a significant indirect effect was found via gratitude on complaining ($a_4 b_4$ on $Y_1 = -523$, BCa 95% CI [-1.13, -.13]) and a marginal indirect effect on positive word of mouth ($a_4 b_4$ on $Y_2 = .304$, BCa 90% CI [.04, .68]), but not on repurchase ($a_4 b_4$ on $Y_4 = .148$, BCa 90% CI [-.30, .54]). When covarying out not only the effect of the five remaining emotions but also of fairness, agency, and their interaction term (i.e., full DV-model), the effect of gratitude on repurchase found above became nonsignificant ($b_4$ on $Y_4 = .069$, $p = .458$). Negative self-conscious emotions were found to mediate the effect on positive word of mouth ($a_4 b_4$ on $Y_2 = .174$, BCa 95% CI [.03, .44]), but not on negative word of mouth ($a_4 b_1$ on $Y_3 = -.125$, BCa 90% CI [-.38, .00]). Again, the latter emotion-behavior effect became nonsignificant when all appraisal and emotion predictors were included in the full DV-model ($b_1$ on $Y_3 = -.137$, $p = .145$). Building on the nonsignificant fairness x agency interaction effect on pride ($a_3$ path), it comes as no surprise that no significant indirect effect via pride emerged ($a_3 b_3$ on $Y_2 = .055$, BCa 90% CI [-.02, .28]; $a_3 b_3$ on $Y_4 = .072$, BCa 90% CI [-.02, .33]). But also, in the full DV-model, the earlier observed effect of pride on positive

---

10 Bootstrapping is a nonparametric resample procedure that can be used to assess the significance of the total and specific indirect effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; 2008): To construct the respective bootstrap confidence intervals (CI), first, a sample size of $n$ cases with replacement is taken from the original sample. Next, all values of $a_i$ and $b_i$ are reestimated and the $a_i x b_i$ paths and the sum of the $a_i x b_i$ paths calculated. The latter procedure is repeated $k$ times (here 5000 times), yielding $k$ estimates of the specific and the total indirect effects. The distribution of these $k$ estimates provides an empirical approximation of the sampling distribution of the respective indirect effects at test. These $k$ estimates are then sorted from low to high and the lower and upper limits of a 100($1-\alpha$)% CI are defined, for $\alpha$ denoting the selected Type I error rate (here $\alpha = .05$ or .10). Such percentile CIs can be improved by adjusting the values of the percentile bounds using bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) intervals (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; 2008). See Preacher and Hayes (2004; 2008) for further technical details and for a discussion on why the use of such a nonparametric approximation of the sampling distribution to construct CIs to assess the significance of indirect effects is favored, compared to the use of the standard normal distribution to determine $p$ values for the indirect effect (e.g., Sobel test), particularly for small samples.
word of mouth became nonsignificant \((b_2 \text{ on } Y_2 = .137, p = .121)\) and marginally significant on repurchase \((b_3 \text{ on } Y_4 = .170, p = .073)\) (for the detailed results see Appendix III).

In sum, and in line with appraisal research, Study 3 corroborates that the set of price-related emotions tested in the present framework significantly mediates the interactive effect of agency x fairness appraisals on post-purchase behavior, confirming \(H11\). Specifically, the majority of the established emotion-behavior relationships (i.e., seven of eleven) constitute significant specific indirect paths (minimally at BCa 90% CI). Particularly anger, gratitude, and negative self-conscious emotions seem to explain (mediate) the interactive effect of agency and fairness on the respective post-purchase behaviors. Among the four non-approved potential indirect effects, the data showed that pride does not seem to affect the positive post-purchase behaviors at \(p < .05\) when controlling for the remaining emotions as well as fairness, agency, and their interaction. Interestingly, both positive emotions, pride and gratitude, lost their effect on repurchase behavior in the full DV-model at \(p < .05\). Only the effect of anger and fairness remained significant. The implications of these results are subsequently discussed.

### 6.6 Summary and discussion

The key objective of Study 3 was to evaluate the conceptual appraisal-emotion-behavior framework proposed in this thesis to study the formation and behavioral impact of consumers' emotional responses to price discrimination. Specifically, Study 3 aimed at testing (i) whether fairness and agency appraisals serve as relevant antecedent conditions to predict the elicitation of qualitatively different price discrimination-related emotions; (ii) whether these emotions exert the expected distinct effects on post-purchase behavior; and (iii) whether these price-related emotions affect post-purchase behaviors beyond price-related agency and fairness cognitions. The secondary objective was to elucidate the role of situational and personal variables in predicting positive versus negative emotions when being price advantaged, as well as the occurrence of emotional ambivalence when paying less. The key insights of Study 3 are subsequently outlined and discussed.

First, the results on the appraisal-emotion relationships suggest that whether (a) a customer perceives her/himself to be price advantaged or disadvantaged compared to a co-consumer (fairness appraisal) and whether (b) s/he attributes this price difference to have been caused by the self or the service provider (agency appraisal) provide a parsimonious set of cognitive antecedent conditions to predict the elicitation of a set of qualitatively different emotional responses to price discrimination. Specifically, negative self-conscious emotions were most intensely elicited when oneself was blamed for being price disadvantaged. However, when the service provider was regarded as the reason for paying more, anger at the service provider was most intense. When paying less than a co-consumer was credited to the service provider,
consumers felt highly grateful toward the service provider. Regarding *pride*, its anticipated prominence in the advantaged self-agency condition, which was corroborated in Study 1 and 2, could not be replicated in Study 3. Pity emerged as the emotion with the highest intensity when oneself was regarded as the responsible agent for paying less than a co-consumer. A possible explanation for the attenuation of pride in Study 3 may lie in inferences on the *type of relationship with the co-consumer*. In the scenarios used in Study 3, the focal customer booked a trip together with a friend (co-consumption situation). This may have indicated a close harmonic relationship attenuating feelings of pride, which could be maladaptive in that social context. Lazarus (2001) reasons that whenever pride can be perceived as a competitive putdown by others, it might be wise to keep it private, as has long been suggested by expressions such as "pride goeth before a fall" and "overweening pride" (p. 63). In the scenarios used in Study 1 and Study 2, the focal customer accidentally met a friend who had booked the same package (independent consumption situation). This may have fostered a more competitive mindset, rendering pride feelings more adaptive and acceptable. To better understand the antecedents of pride, Study 4 will deal with the issue of when people are more prone to express or socially suppress pride and tests the suggested effect of the type of relationship on pride elicitation.

Additionally, the present results indicate that when being advantaged, emotions related to the co-consumer's disadvantage are elicited. Hence, across the two advantaged conditions, some level of *pity*, *negative self-conscious emotions*, *anger at the service provider*, and *malicious pleasure* were present. These were not found to vary by agency, except for anger, which was somewhat higher when the service provider was responsible for the price advantage rather than the self. However, the latter effect was small in size and had not been present in Study 1 and 2. Hence, across the three studies, the three negative emotions, including malicious pleasure, do not seem to consistently vary by agency. This pattern was expected for the agency-independent emotions pity and malicious pleasure. However, for the agency-related emotions, anger at the service provider and negative self-conscious emotions, variations by agency were anticipated. Potential reasons and implications are delineated in the general discussion (cf. Chapter 9).

Second, *situational* and *personal variables* assist in understanding when and for whom positive emotions increase over negative emotions when being price advantaged. Particularly, the more personally favorable paying less than someone else was perceived, the higher the discrete positive emotions *pride* and *gratitude* and the lower the negative emotions *pity*, *anger*, and *negative self-conscious emotions*. Again, motive consistency did not significantly predict *malicious pleasure*. Hence, these results perfectly replicated the findings of Study 2. As has been speculated, the latter nonsignificant results might be due to the valence-wise mixed situation that the pleasure at another person's disadvantage includes (cf. discussion in
Study 2). Further, the individual difference variable relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) was again not found to exert a general valence-dividing effect, except on the co-consumer-related emotion pity. People who tend to define themselves in terms of close relationships felt more pity for their friend who had paid a higher price. RISC was found to decrease malicious pleasure in Study 2 and to increase pity in Study 3. Hence, although the results were not consistent regarding the specific emotion, they do suggest that RISC affects the type of co-consumer-related emotions rather than all types of emotions.

Third, the results on the ambivalence analyses suggest that when being price advantaged, rather low levels of mixed positive and negative emotions are present. More specifically, ambivalence in self-related emotions (i.e., pride and negative self-conscious emotions) was low (not high) in the self-agency condition. Ambivalence in the service provider-related emotions (i.e., gratitude and anger) also seemed low (not high) in the service provider-agency condition, at least based on the correlation results. The patterns found in Study 2 already provided these findings, which are directionally inverse to those that were expected. Thus, across Study 2 and 3 substantial evidence exists that customers do seem to feel concise emotions toward the agent of the price difference (i.e., self or service provider) – either they feel positive or negative emotions toward the agent rather than ambivalent. As expected, co-consumer-related ambivalence (i.e., malicious pleasure and pity) did not differ between agency conditions at p < .05. An explorative analysis on behavioral implications showed that people who experience mixed positive and negative feelings when being advantaged respond negatively in terms of post-purchase behaviors, which replicated the patterns found in Study 1 and 2.

Fourth, regarding the effect of emotions on consumer behavior, the results indicate that anger and gratitude – the two service provider-related emotions – considerably affect post-purchase behaviors. Consistent with their valence, angry customers were found to negatively respond to the firm, while grateful customers engaged in favorable post-purchase behavior. Inversely, both the positive and negative self-conscious emotions exerted a positive impact on post-purchase behaviors. Accordingly, not all negative emotions that are primarily elicited when paying more than a co-consumer were found to induce negative consumer responses. In contrast to anger, respondents who felt negative self-conscious emotions were found to be likely to recommend the service provider, while they were less likely to engage in negative word of mouth activities. Similarly, the different positive emotions elicited by a price advantage varied in their behavioral scope. Pride was found to foster positive behaviors toward the firm, while gratitude was also found to decrease complaining intentions. The two friend-related emotions, pity and malicious pleasure, were not found to significantly impact post-purchase behavior. However, as expected and shown in Study 2, malicious pleasure was at least found to directionally increase negative word of mouth activities. Importantly, mediation analyses
provided evidence that the set of six price-related emotions studied mediates and hence transmits the interactive effect of the cognitive agency and fairness appraisals on each behavior. In particular, the majority of the eleven established emotion-behavior relationships sustained when the behavioral effect of agency, fairness, and their interaction term were included (i.e., controlled for) in the model. Seven of these eleven emotional effects were found to significantly mediate the agency x fairness interaction effect on the respective post-purchase behavior. Interestingly, when the behavioral effects of appraisals were controlled for, the two established effects of pride on post-purchase behavior were attenuated and both pride and gratitude lost their effect on repurchase at $p < .05$. Only the effect of anger and fairness on repurchase remained significant. A possible explanation for why negative emotions and distributive fairness cognitions may have a stronger impact on repurchase than positive emotions may be due to a combination of (i) the advance purchase characteristic of many services such as the tour operator services used in this study (e.g., Shugan & Xie, 2000), and (ii) the more diffuse and transient nature of the positive compared to the negative emotions (e.g., Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). For services, the time of purchase, consumption, and hence repurchase may be far apart (Shugan & Xie, 2000). Thus, while the effects of the positive and negative emotions mostly hold beyond the effect of reasoning (i.e., appraisals) for the rather immediate behaviors such as complaining or positive and negative word of mouth activities, only the negative emotions seem to convey their effect further in time onto repurchase. Together, anger and cognitive fairness considerations about whether one pays more or less than someone else seem to become the dominant forces of repurchase.

In sum, the results of Study 3 support the key notion of this thesis that price-related emotions are crucial beyond price-related cognitions in predicting consumers' behavioral intentions. Specifically, the findings confirm that emotions of the same valence may have different (see e.g., pride and gratitude) and even valence-incongruent impacts on behavior (see e.g., anger and negative self-conscious emotions), which implies the need to go beyond positive versus negative price effect and to understand the antecedents of the relevant discrete price-related emotions in order to better predict how consumers respond to price discrimination.
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Study 3 confirmed that the interactive effect of fairness and agency predicts high intensities of *anger* when being price disadvantaged due to the service provider, *negative self-conscious emotions* when blaming the self for paying more, and *gratitude* when crediting the service provider for getting a better price. Differently than expected, the results of Study 3 also indicated that *pride* might not in all instances be the most prominent emotional response to being price advantaged due to self-agency. The attenuation of pride in Study 3 not only challenges (a) previous findings, which showed that customers experience pride-like smart-shopper feelings when taking credit for paying a low price (e.g., Schindler, 1998), but it also contradicts (b) the findings derived in Study 1 and 2, where pride was found to be prominent in the self/advantaged condition. A potential explanation for the inconsistent findings in Study 1 to 3 lies in variations in the social contexts that the price discrimination scenarios used across these studies. Study 3 was based on a pricing scenario where two friends faced a joint consumption experience (i.e., the two friends were planning and going on holidays together), which might have fostered a harmonious mindset. The focal customer might have regulated and suppressed feelings of pride in this social context in order not to damage the harmonious relationship with the friend and the joint consumption experience to come. In Study 1 and 2, the scenarios dealt with an independent consumption experience (i.e., incidentally learning that the friend purchased the same package at a different price), which might have promoted a more competitive mindset. Hence, it is speculated that the *type of relationship with the comparative party* determines whether pride is displayed or attenuated when being price advantaged due to self-agency (cf. Figure 17).

Figure 17: Scope of Study 4: 1 fairness x 1 agency x 4 types of relationship
Pride has as of yet gained scant attention in social-personality research (Tracy & Robins, 2007b) and Tracey and Robins (2007a) claim that "future research should examine the extent to which the pride expression is displayed versus regulated in real-life contexts [...] in which social norms prohibit pride displays." (p. 148). Guided by the research gap and the inconsistent findings on pride across Study 1 through 3, the key objective of Study 4 is to investigate under what conditions the displaying of pride is socially acceptable versus less acceptable and thus attenuated when being price advantaged due to self-agency. Respective hypotheses are subsequently developed.

### 7.1 Additional hypotheses

To find answers to the question of when people are more or less prone to feel pride, the present project draws on (1) the social functions of emotion literature (e.g., Fischer & Manstead, 2008) and (2) the social comparison literature (e.g., Suls et al., 2002). Together they propose that the type of relationship to the comparative party might be indicative of whether pride will be elicited or suppressed. In the context of inequity, previous research has shown that the type of relationship that people maintain with the comparative party impacts how they respond to inequitable outcomes (Peters & van den Bos, 2008).

**Social functions of emotion account (affiliation vs. distancing).** Drawing on Fischer and Manstead (2008), emotions are suggested to primarily serve affiliation or social distancing functions. On the one hand, emotions such as love may serve *affiliation functions* and assist in forming and maintaining cooperative and harmonious relationships. On the other hand, emotions such as pride or anger may serve *social distancing functions*. These may help to establish and maintain a social position relative to others and to compete with those others for social status and power (Fischer & Manstead, 2008). Accordingly, pride in negotiations was found to be positively associated with competitive motives, while being unrelated to collaborative motives (Butt & Choi, 2006). Similarly, Schindler (1998) speculates that the pride-like feelings elicited by getting a self-attributed price discount may stem from the joy of having won the game against the seller or co-consumers. Hence, in this study, it is suggested that a self-attributed price advantage compared to a co-consumer with whom one maintains a competitive relationship is more likely to elicit intense pride than when being price advantaged within a harmonious relationship.

Further, the present study posits that beside the joy of 'winning' the monetary advantage (i.e., pride), the pleasure at the disadvantaged party 'losing' money (i.e., malicious pleasure) will also be increased in competitive compared to harmonious relationships. Within harmonious relationships malicious pleasure would be rather maladaptive. Given that the other's misfortune adds to one's dominance (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009), malicious pleasure is expected to increase
social distance, while contradicting affiliative motives. Thus, within competitive relationships, expressing malicious pleasure can add to expressing one's competitive power.

Social comparison account (upward vs. downward comparison). A person's perceived relative standing following a social comparison has been suggested to affect emotional responses such as malicious pleasure (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009) or self-esteem (pride) (Sundie et al., 2009). Pride in an achievement (such as paying less) may serve to enhance one's identity and to establish a sense of superiority over others (i.e., self-aggrandizing) (Lazarus & Cohen-Charash, 2001). Similarly, the misfortune of the other adds to one's superiority and comparative social position (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009). A comparison with a superior person is likely to elicit envy, which is regarded as an important precursor to malicious pleasure. When this envied person experiences a downfall or negative event, her/his superiority may be lessened or equalized (Sundie et al., 2009). Taken together, this suggests that malicious pleasure increases when the party who usually performs at a comparatively superior level now faces a disadvantage (upward comparison). Inversely, malicious pleasure might not be intensely elicited when a person who always performs worse than oneself (downward comparison) faces an additional misfortune (on upward vs. downward comparison, see e.g., Suls et al., 2002). In the latter case, a relative price advantage is less relevant to the higher social position or power that the focal consumer already has and is anticipated to be less likely to elicit intense pleasure. Similarly, the self-aggrandizing effect of pride seems particularly adaptive in conveying one's success to others and enhancing one's social status (Tracy & Robins, 2007b) when the co-consumer has been relatively superior. As a result, pride is expected to be less adaptive and less likely to occur when the disadvantaged person has been misfortuned ever since.

H15: Pride and malicious pleasure are higher in (a) competitive than harmonious relationships and (b) higher in upward than downward comparative relationships.

The remaining emotions focused on in the conceptual framework of this thesis, namely, gratitude, anger, negative self-conscious emotions, and pity, are not expected to be affected by the type of relationships investigated in the present study. Compared to exchange relationships (e.g., strangers, business associates), people in communal relationships (e.g., friends, family) are suggested to be personally concerned about the outcomes of the other (Peters & van den Bos, 2008). As a result, distributive fairness concerns are expected to be salient when a friend is disadvantaged, whether one maintains a harmonious or competitive friendship and whether one's friend usually performs superiorly or inferiorly to oneself. Hence, negative emotions are anticipated to be present in mutually positive relationships, independent of the type of relationship investigated in this study.
7.2 Overview and design

Study 4 focused on profoundly investigating the advantaged self-agency condition by varying the type of relationship to the comparative party (harmonious, competitive, upward comparative, downward comparative) in a single-factor between-subjects design.

7.3 Procedure

Study 4 was conducted with 101 undergraduate students from a US university who participated for course credit. The students completed this paper-pencil experiment along with other unrelated studies in a one-hour laboratory session while seated in separate cubicles. The procedure was identical to the procedure applied in Study 2 and 3. One respondent stopped before completing the main dependent variables and manipulation checks. The respective questionnaire was excluded from the sample. Thus, the final sample encompassed 100 respondents for analysis (mean age: 20 years; 54 % male).

7.4 Scenarios

The scenarios in Study 4 described a school trip to a North American winter sport destination. As part of this trip, the students were assigned to do certain winter sport activities in pairs. In all of the scenarios the focal student was assigned to a skiing trip with a friend. The relationship manipulation was introduced by describing the type of relationship with the friend as either harmonious, competitive, upward comparative, or downward comparative. All scenarios then continued with an advantaged self-agency price condition. Specifically, the friend paid $50 for the ski lift ticket compared to the focal student, who paid $35 because the focal student was attentive to the advice of the organizing committee to purchase the ticket in advance online at 30% off, while the friend had forgotten about it. Thus, Study 4 used a different tourist service industry (ski area provider, instead of travel agency) and a lower regular price level ($50, instead of $550) than Study 1 to 3.

You signed up for an optional school trip to a North American winter sport destination. This year, the program has already been planned and set up for you by the organizing committee. You have been looking forward to this trip for a couple of days. You will be enjoying a lot of different activities. The trip is structured so that you will participate in several activities with many different people. The people joining you in each activity will be randomly assigned to you by the committee. For the first day, you have been randomly assigned to go alpine skiing with student S.

[Scenario 1: harmonious] S is a close friend of yours who you have known for several years. You always have a great time together, understand each other without words, and you never have the impression that you two compete for things you like or want to have.

[Scenario 2: competitive] S is a close friend of yours who you have known for several years. You both like competing against each other, such as when you are playing a tennis match and sometimes even when it comes to romantic relationships.
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[Scenario 3: upward comparative] S is a good friend who you have known for several years. S is a fascinating and captivating person, best in class, great in sports, life and soul of every party, and has an active social life.

[Scenario 4: downward comparative] S is a good friend who you have known for several years. S is a very nice and friendly person, always a little clumsy, not very good at sports, and does not like competitions at all.

It is a sunny winter day and the snow conditions are perfect. You and S are going to the ski lift station. Following the advice of the committee members, you already bought the 1-day lift ticket online yesterday to get the 24 hours advanced purchase internet fare which is 30% off. When you arrive at the station, S suddenly notices that s/he forgot to purchase the ticket in advance online and has to buy one at the ticket window. So while you paid $35 for the 1-day lift ticket, S paid $50.

7.5 Measures

Emotions. As in Study 1 through 3, all emotions were measured using single-items (i.e., 'angry at the service provider', 'proud', 'grateful to the service provider', 'pity', 'malicious pleasure'), except for the class of negative self-conscious emotions, for which a composite scale was computed using the mean of the items 'guilty', 'ashamed', 'regretful', and 'angry at myself' ($\alpha = 0.761$). The respondents were asked to rate the intensity with which they felt these nine as well as other filler emotion items on a 7-point scale from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). The full emotion item list given was identical to Study 3.

Post-purchase behavior. The identical single-item questions as in Study 1 to 3 were used to assess complaining, positive word of mouth, negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions using 7-point scales ranging from 'definitely not' (0) to 'definitely' (6).

Appraisals/situational price cognitions. The three price-related cognitive appraisal dimensions motive consistency ($\alpha = 0.847$), motive relevance ($\alpha = 0.888$), and perceived fairness/justice ($\alpha = 0.860$) were assessed with the same two bipolar item sets used in Study 2 and 3. Further, a bipolar item set on the realism of the scenarios was incorporated, identically to Study 2 and 3. All adjectives were measured on 7-point bipolar scales ranging from '-3' for the semantically negative pole to '+3' for the semantically positive pole.

Manipulation check. The manipulation of the type of relationship was tested using two questions. The first question aimed at assessing the perceived dynamics within the relationship: "Based on what you read in the price situation, your relationship with friend S was described as:" ranging from 'competitive' (-3) to 'harmonious' (3) (competition rating). The second question assessed the perceived relative social standing within the relationship: "Based on what you read in the price situation, friend S was described as usually doing ___ than you in various aspects of life." ranging from 'worse' (-3) to 'better' (3) (comparison rating). To assess whether the respondents correctly classified themselves as being advantaged due to self-agency, the same two bipolar questions on the agency and fairness rating as in Study 1 and 3 were included.
Individual difference variables. As in Study 2 and 3, the 11-item relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) scale was assessed (Cross et al., 2000) ($\alpha = .877$). All items were measured using 7-point bipolar scales ranging from 'strongly disagree' (-3) to 'strongly agree' (3). A respondent's RISC level was calculated by averaging the scores across the 11 items. Finally, the respondents indicated their gender and age.

7.6 Analysis and results

This chapter outlines the analytical strategy to assess the key hypothesis of Study 4 (H15) (cf. Chapter 7.6.1) and provides the results of the manipulation check (cf. Chapter 7.6.2). It subsequently tests the key experimental hypothesis on the role of the type of the relationship in the elicitation of pride and malicious pleasure when being advantaged due to self-agency (cf. Chapter 7.6.3). In addition, the data from Study 4 was also subsidiarily used to substantiate the findings that had been accumulated in Study 1 to 3 on the mixed emotions when paying less (cf. Chapter 7.6.4) and on the emotion-behavior hypotheses (cf. Chapter 7.6.5).

7.6.1 Analytical strategy

To analyze H15, linear contrast vectors for the two planned complex comparisons of substantive interest were determined and included in the univariate GLM command. Specifically, contrast 1 was constructed to compare the harmonious with the competitive condition (i.e., Scenario 1 and 2; $C1 = [-.5 .5 0 0]$) and contrast 2 to compare the upward with the downward comparative condition (i.e., Scenario 3 and 4; $C2 = [0 .5 -.5]$).

7.6.2 Manipulation check and further preliminary analyses

Manipulation check. The results of the respective planned complex comparisons on the competition and comparison rating indicate that the type of relationship manipulation worked as intended (for cell means, see Table 19). The relationship to the friend was perceived as significantly more harmonious in the harmony condition ($M = 1.80$) than in the competition condition, which was regarded as more competitive ($M = -1.32$, $F(1, 96) = 44.879$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .319$). As expected, the upward ($M = .71$) and downward ($M = 1.35$) comparison conditions did not significantly differ in their competition rating ($F(1, 96) = 1.873$, $p = .174$). Inversely, in the upward comparative condition the friend was evaluated as usually doing better than oneself in various aspects of life ($M = .88$), while the friend in the downward comparative condition was assessed as usually doing worse ($M = -.96$, $F(1, 96) = 40.415$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .296$). Importantly, the competitive ($M = .04$) and harmonious ($M = -.32$) relationship conditions did not significantly differ in their comparative evaluation of the relationship ($F(1, 96) = 1.555$, $p = .215$).
Further preliminary analyses. Before testing the hypotheses, analyses were run to assess whether the respondents correctly understood that they were (i) price advantaged (ii) due to self-agency. Moreover, the (iii) realism of the scenarios and further appraisal dimensions such as (iv) motive consistency, (v) motive relevance, and (vi) fairness/justice were analyzed. In order to do so, separate one-way ANOVAs and the two complex contrasts of substantive interest were run for all six variables. None of the F-tests of the ANOVAs or contrasts were significant at p < .10, except for the marginally significant contrast comparing the upward and downward condition on realism (F(1, 96) = 3.901, p = .051, η² = .039). Thus, as expected, all four price scenarios were recognized as an advantaged price inequity condition (i.e., paying less than the friend) (M Overall = -1.45), which resulted due to self-agency (M Overall = 1.37). Moreover, the scenarios were regarded as rather motive-inconsistent (M Overall = -.80), as well as average in motive relevance (M Overall = -.05) and perceived fairness/justice (M Overall = .13). Hence, as in Study 2 and 3, the self/advantaged condition is descriptively perceived as somewhat more motive-inconsistent than unfair. Moreover, the scenarios were regarded as realistic (M Overall = 1.13), while the marginally significant contrast revealed that achieving a better price outcome compared to a comparatively superior friend is perceived as more realistic (M = 1.62) than compared to a friend who usually performs worse (M = .73). Although only marginally significant, this result can be considered as another manifestation of self-serving distortions in consumers' price cognitions. The descriptive statistic and bivariate correlations between the main variables of this study are presented in Appendix II.

7.6.3 Hypothesis on the role of the type of relationship in predicting emotions

To test H15, the two planned complex comparisons of substantive interest were conducted on the six emotions focused on in the main framework. The cell means and respective F-tests are displayed in Table 20.

The results of the hypothesis-testing complex comparisons revealed that the respondents felt marginally significantly more proud when they managed to get a price advantage compared to a friend with whom they were having a competitive (M = 2.88) rather than harmonious relationship (M = 1.92, F(1, 96) = 2.937, p = .090, η² = .030). Similarly, achieving a relatively better price within a competitive friendship elicited significantly higher feelings of malicious
pleasure ($M = 2.28$) compared to a harmonious friendship ($M = .84$, $F(1, 96) = 8.922$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2_p = .085$) (cf. Figure 18). Given the directional hypothesis, a one-tailed $t$-test could have been run (Keppel & Wickens, 2004), which indicates that the marginal result of pride is satisfactory to support $H15a$. The same pattern was expected for the upward versus downward comparative conditions. Descriptively, more intense pride was felt when one was able to get a better price compared to a friend who usually performs better in life than oneself ($M = 2.25$) than compared to a friend who usually performs worse ($M = 1.69$). However, the mean difference was not significant ($F(1, 96) = .990$, $p = .332$). Also, feelings of malicious pleasure did not differ between the upward ($M = .92$) and downward ($M = 1.12$) comparative condition ($F(1, 96) = .170$, $p = .681$). Hence, $H15b$ was refuted. As expected, the contrasts on gratitude, anger, negative self-conscious emotions, and pity did not differ between each pair of conditions (cf. Table 20).

Figure 18: Cell means and planned comparisons on pride and malicious pleasure

Table 20: Cell means and planned comparisons on the emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Harmony (n=25)</th>
<th>Competition (n=25)</th>
<th>Upward (n=24)</th>
<th>Downward (n=26)</th>
<th>Planned Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Negative</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry at SP</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grateful to SP</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Pleasure</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 100$ (except for angry at the SP $N = 99$ and $df_{error} = 95$). Contrast 1 (C1) = [-.5 .5 0 0]; Contrast 2 (C2) = [0 0 .5 -.5]; self-NE = negative self-conscious emotions; SP = service provider. $^*p < .10$. $^**p < .05$. $^***p < .01$. $^†p < .01$. $^‡p < .001$. $^†p < .10$.
In sum, pride and malicious pleasure in an advantaged self-caused price condition were found to be more likely when maintaining a competitive relationship with the co-consumer, while they were attenuated within more harmonious relationships. These results suggest that the elicitation of pride and malicious pleasure is a question of the dynamics in a relationship (harmonious vs. competitive) rather than of the comparative social standing in a relationship (upward vs. downward).

### 7.6.4 Hypotheses on mixed emotional responses to being price advantaged

**Triggers of positive vs. negative emotions when being price advantaged (H5).**

It was predicted that whether positive versus negative emotions arise when being advantaged depends on situational appraisals (i.e., motive consistency) \((H5a)\) and individual differences (i.e., relational-interdependent self-construal RISC) \((H5b)\).

Figure 19: Role of motive consistency in predicting emotions' valence

![Graph showing role of motive consistency in predicting emotions' valence](image)

**Note.** \(N = 99\). Emotion intensity was measured on 7-point scales ranging from 'not at all' (0) to 'very intensely' (6). Motive consistency high = mean plus 1 SD = .74; motive consistency low = mean minus 1 SD = -2.33. These two arbitrary levels for motive consistency have been placed into the regression equations derived from the multivariate regression of the six emotions on motive consistency to produce the graph.

**Role of motive consistency on emotions' valence.** As in Study 2 to 3, a multivariate regression of the six emotions on motive consistency was conducted. These results indicated that the more personally desirable (i.e., motive-consistent) being advantaged is perceived, the more intense the positive emotions **pride** \((b = .491, t(97) = 4.000, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .142)\), **gratitude** \((b = .405, t(97) = 3.290, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .100)\), and **malicious pleasure** \((b = .293, t(97) = 2.673, p = .009, \eta^2_p = .069)\) and the less intense the negative emotions **anger** \((b = -.295, t(97) = -2.823, p = .006, \eta^2_p = .076)\), **negative self-conscious emotions** \((b = -.173, t(97) = -2.569, p = .012, \eta^2_p = .064)\), and **pity** \((b = -.274, t(97) = -2.185, p = .031, \eta^2_p = .047)\).
Hence, $H5a$ was fully supported. These results largely replicate the findings of Study 2 and 3 and additionally provide support for the expected effect of motive consistency on malicious pleasure, which was not found in Study 2 and 3. Figure 19 illustrates the effect of motive consistency on the emotions at the arbitrary levels of one standard deviation above the mean (high motive consistency) and one standard deviation below the mean (low motive consistency).

**Role of relational-interdependent self-construal on emotions' valence.** To assess whether a person's RISC level directly affects whether the positive or negative emotions increase when paying less, a multivariate regression of the six emotions on RISC was conducted. In line with the correlation results (see Appendix II), the regression results indicated that a person's RISC disposition only significantly influenced feelings of pity ($b = .597, t(95) = 2.896, p = .005, \eta_p^2 = .081$). This means that the more people maintain self-views that incorporate close relationships with others (i.e., high RISC; e.g., Cross, 2009), the more intensely they felt pity about the co-consumer's price disadvantage. No further coefficient was significant at $p < .10$. Thus, differently than anticipated, a person's disposition in RISC did not generally predict whether positive or negative emotions increase when being price advantaged, except for pity. Hence, $H5b$ was only partially supported for pity. This perfectly replicated the findings of Study 3, while in Study 2, RISC was found to decrease malicious pleasure instead. Hence, although the results of Study 2, 3, and 4 were not perfectly consistent regarding the specific emotion, they all suggest that RISC affects the type of co-consumer-related emotions (i.e., pity or malicious pleasure).

As discussed in Study 2, individual differences can influence the appraisal-emotion elicitation process directly via affecting appraisals and emotions or indirectly by moderating how strongly appraisals are related to the anticipated emotions (cf. Chapter 5.6.3). As outlined above, RISC did not have a direct effect on emotions, except for pity. Also, the correlations suggest that the negative impact of RISC on motive consistency appraisals is only marginal ($r = -.170, p = .095$). Hence, as in Study 2 and 3, regression analyses were run to explore whether RISC moderates the motive consistency appraisal-emotion associations. The valence-dividing effect of motive consistency on the positive and negative emotions was anticipated to increase for people high (versus low) in RISC. To test this, each of the six emotions was regressed on motive consistency, RISC, and their product term. RISC and motive consistency were first mean-centered. The results indicated that RISC significantly moderates the effect of motive consistency on negative self-conscious emotions ($b = -.164, t(94) = -1.770, p = .080$), anger ($b = -.262, t(94) = -1.960, p = .053$), pride ($b = .343, t(94) = 2.222, p = .029$), and malicious pleasure ($b = .439, t(94) = 3.081, p = .003$). As in Study 2 and 3, the MODPROBE macro was used to probe the interactions and calculate the Johnson-Neyman (J-N) significance regions at the chosen alpha-level of .05 (Hayes & Matthes, 2009) (cf. Figure 20).
Figure 20: Probing the motive consistency x RISC interactions

Note. high RISC = mean plus 1 SD = 2.06; average RISC = mean = 1.13; low RISC = mean minus 1 SD = .20. The Johnson-Neyman points of transition are at a level of RISC beyond .99 for negative self-conscious emotions, beyond .91 for anger, beyond .50 for pride, and outside -1.04 to 1.00 for malicious pleasure.

The regression results imply that the less personally favorable paying less than a friend was perceived, the higher the negative emotions, specifically among people average to high in RISC. For people who scarcely incorporate close others’ concerns into their self-concept, perceived motive consistency did not seem to affect negative emotions. As in Study 2, this pattern was found to significantly apply for anger (J-N region of significance at a RISC score beyond .91) and negative self-conscious emotions (J-N beyond .99). Although not significant, the direction of the regression coefficient of pity ($b = -.157, t(94) = -.969, p = .335$) points to the same general pattern. A similar pattern materialized for positive emotions. High perceived motive consistency increased pride particularly among people average to high in RISC (J-N beyond .50), but had no effect for people low in RISC. Although the interaction was not significant for gratitude ($b = .186, t(94) = 1.170, p = .245$), its coefficient implies the same directional result. A distinct pattern occurred for malicious pleasure. For low RISC people malicious pleasure was suggested to increase, the more motive-inconsistent being advantaged is perceived (J-N below -1.04). However, only one observation was detected with a RISC score lower than -1.04, which calls the substantive meaning of this result into question. Moreover, in line with the general pattern for positive emotions, motive consistency increased malicious pleasure, particularly among people average to high in RISC (J-N beyond 1.00). In sum, as in Study 2, the valence-dividing effect of motive consistency was found to largely depend on the level of RISC. The more people define themselves through close others, the
more indicative motive consistency appraisals become as an indicator for whether positive or negative emotions increase when paying less.

*Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged (H6).*

No formal tests of *H6* could be conducted as Study 4 only incorporates four different self/advantaged conditions. Nonetheless, the descriptive and correlational results provide support for the pattern detected in Study 1 through 3 that some (low) level of emotional ambivalence might be present when being price advantaged. The overall ambivalence index can take values from -6 to 12 (on the index computation, see Chapter 4.5.3). Hence, its mean suggests that low levels of ambivalence might exist (*M* = .41). The nonsignificant correlation between the positive emotion index (mean of gratitude, pride, malicious pleasure) and negative emotion index (mean of guilt, regret, shame, anger at the self, anger at the service provider, pity) (*r* = -.088, *p* = .384) support the notion that ambivalent feelings might exist for some customers but not for others. Hence, these indices are supportive of *H6a* that some degree of emotional ambivalence might be present when paying less. Additionally, the just not significant negative correlation between pride and negative self-conscious emotions (*r* = -.138, *p* = .170) again indicates that self-related emotional ambivalence seems low (rather than high, as expected) in the self/advantaged condition.

### 7.6.5 Hypotheses on emotion-behavior relationships

In order to assess how the emotions map onto the post-purchase behavioral intentions, a multivariate multiple regression was conducted with the six emotions as independent variables and the four behaviors as dependent variables (cf. Table 21). Overall, the partial eta-squared ($\eta^2_p$) effect size measure of the across-equation *F*-tests corroborated the findings of Study 1 through 3: It was particularly anger (*F*(4, 87) = 7.590, *p* < .001, $\eta^2_p$ = .259) and gratitude (*F*(4, 87) = 4.892, *p* = .001, $\eta^2_p$ = .184) – the two service-provider-related emotions – that were strongly associated with the four post-purchase behavior intentions.

Regarding the specific emotion-behavior hypotheses, respondents feeling *negative self-conscious emotions* were expected to be less likely to complain and spread negative word of mouth. Although not significant, negative self-conscious emotions directionally decreased negative word of mouth (*b* = -.125, *t*(90) = -.643, *p* = .522). Hence, *H7b* was not significantly but at least directionally supported. Similarly, directional support existed for the effect found in Study 2 and 3 that negative self-conscious emotions even increase positive word of mouth (*b* = .161, *t*(90) = .765, *p* = .446). As in Study 1 through 3, consumers feeling negative self-conscious emotions were again not found to be less likely to complain (*b* = -.100, *t*(90) = -.573, *p* = .568), disconfirming *H7a*. In contrast, feeling *angry* at the service provider
was found to foster negative word of mouth \((b = .491, t(90) = 4.018, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .152)\) and complaining intentions \((b = .484, t(90) = 4.396, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .177)\), while it decreased positive word of mouth activities \((b = -.295, t(90) = -2.232, p = .028, \eta_p^2 = .052)\). These results supported \(H8a, H8b,\) and \(H8c\). Further, anger was only directionally negatively associated with repurchase intentions \((b = -.133, t(90) = -.939, p = .350)\) and hence did not significantly support \(H8d\). Moreover, pride was not found to have the expected positive effect on positive word of mouth activities \((b = .008, t(90) = .081, p = .936)\), disconfirming \(H9\). However, as expected, no further post-purchase behavior was significantly affected by pride \((all \ p > .3)\). In contrast, gratitude toward the service provider was found to increase positive word of mouth \((b = .340, t(90) = 3.878, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .143)\) and decrease negative word of mouth activities \((b = -.210, t(90) = -2.590, p = .011, \eta_p^2 = .069)\). Moreover, grateful customers were more likely to repurchase the service in the future \((b = .202, t(90) = 2.140, p = .035, \eta_p^2 = .048)\). This confirmed \(H10b, H10c,\) and \(H10d\), while the expected decrease in complaining was not present \((b = -.012, t(90) = -.170, p = .866)\), contradicting \(H10a\). As anticipated, pity was unrelated to complaining, negative word of mouth, and repurchase intentions \((all \ three \ p > .10)\). However, consumers experiencing pity were found to be more likely to spread positive word of mouth \((b = .222, t(90) = 2.516, p = .014, \eta_p^2 = .066)\). This effect was not expected and moreover contradicts the findings in Study 2. For malicious pleasure no effects on post-purchase behavior were found at \(p < .10\). The only predicted effect of malicious pleasure to increase negative word of mouth activities was directionally but not significantly present \((b = .078, t(90) = .813, p = .419)\), disconfirming \(H14\).

Table 21: Multivariate multiple regression of post-purchase behaviors on emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>complain</th>
<th>P-WOM</th>
<th>N-WOM</th>
<th>repurchase</th>
<th>F-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self-NE</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal. pleasure</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. (R^2)</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F(6, 90))</td>
<td><strong>5.367</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>4.930</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>6.076</strong>*</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(Note. \ N = 97; \ b \) values indicate the unstandardized regression coefficients; **bold** indicate significant results at \(p < .10\); self-NE = negative self-conscious emotions; \(^\dagger \) \(p < .10. \) * \(p < .05. \) ** \(p < .01. \) *** \(p < .001. \)**

In sum, the service provider-related emotions anger and gratitude exerted substantive effects on post-purchase behavior in line with their valence. Although not significant, the direction of the coefficients for negative self-conscious emotions suggest a positive effect on net word of mouth behavior (as found in Study 1 through 3), which is different than would be expected by
their mere valence. The expected effects of pride and malicious pleasure on word of mouth intentions were not significant. Further, pity was found to foster positive word of mouth, which is directionally inverse to the results in Study 2 and calls for further research on behavioral coping responses of pity.

### 7.7 Summary and discussion

The primary aim of Study 4 was to assess under what conditions consumers experience pride when they credit themselves for paying a lower price than a co-consumer. Investigating this issue is important for two reasons. First, the attenuation of pride in Study 3 challenges earlier findings on smart-shopping feelings: that customers experience intense pride when paying a self-attributed low price (e.g., Schindler, 1998), and contradicts the findings derived in Study 1 and 2. Second, emotion scholars consider the investigation of the social acceptability of pride display as an important future research avenue (Tracy & Robins, 2007a; 2007b). Two fields of social psychology research have been regarded as key to providing answers to the social acceptability of pride displays within price comparison settings: the social functions of emotion and the social comparison literature. Drawing on these two streams, it was hypothesized that pride and malicious pleasure are higher when a self-caused price advantage takes place (a) within a competitive rather than harmonious or (b) within an upward comparative rather than a downward comparative relationship with the co-consumer.

The results of the experiment of Study 4 provide evidence that pride and malicious pleasure toward an advantaged self-caused price condition are more likely to be high within competitive relationships, while they were attenuated in more harmonious relationships. However, no significant difference was present when the self-caused price advantage occurred compared to a superior co-consumer rather than an inferior co-consumer. Overall, the present results suggest that the elicitation of pride and malicious pleasure is a question of the dynamics in a relationship (harmonious vs. competitive) rather than of the comparative social standing (upward vs. downward).

A potential reason for the nonsignificant difference in the emotional response to upward versus downward comparisons could be that these comparative others are non-informative to the perceiver and hence make no difference in her/his (emotional) response to being advantaged. Building on social comparison theory, people tend to compare themselves with similar others to derive accurate evaluations of their own abilities and opinions (Festinger, 1954; Suls et al., 2002). Hence, comparing one's outcome with the outcome of a superior or inferior other might not be as informative for self-evaluations because any differences in performance can be attributed to the different relative standing (Suls et al., 2002). Upward and downward comparisons are more informative when the motive is to self-enhance (rather than self-
evaluate) (Suls et al., 2002; Suls & Wheeler, 2012). However, it seems that a need to self-enhance was not salient in this experiment; rather, the respondents were primed to self-evaluate their price outcome with the other customer's price outcome. Hence, it would be interesting to test in future research whether pride and malicious pleasure might increase following a self-attributed price advantage within upward (vs. downward) comparisons if a person is in need of self-enhancing. Moreover, it would be interesting for future research to study whether pride displays differ across private versus public settings (Tracy & Robins, 2007a).

The present results add insights into the social display of self-positive emotions. A recent study has shown that pride and malicious pleasure depend on the relationship quality. They were found to increase when being advantaged within a negative relationship (i.e., rivalry; not mutually well-disposed) rather than within a positive or neutral relationship (Gelbrich, 2011). Differently, the present study suggests that different types of relationships constituted by the relationship dynamics (i.e., competitiveness vs. harmony) can explain an increase in pride and malicious pleasure even within qualitatively positive relationships (i.e., mutually well-disposed) such as between friends who pay a different price.

Additionally, Study 4 replicated the patterns found on mixed emotions when being advantaged. Perceived motive consistency of paying less was found to exert the expected valence-dividing effect on all emotions including malicious pleasure. As in Study 3, RISC was again found to increase pity, which corroborates that RISC affects co-consumer-related emotions rather than all types of emotions. Additionally, the moderating effect of RISC on motive consistency-emotion relationships, which was found in Study 2, could be substantively corroborated in Study 4. It seems that, in general, the more people include the concerns of their close others in their own self-concept, the more strongly perceived motive consistency predicts whether positive or negative emotions increase when paying less. Also, Study 4 corroborates that emotions of the same valance have distinct effects on post-purchase behaviors. Although some of the effects were subtle, directionally, the general pattern, which was anticipated and found in Study 2 and 3, could be confirmed. The only inverse effect was produced by pity. While pity was expected to be unrelated to behaviors toward the service provider, pity was found to increase positive word of mouth behaviors. This contradicts the expectations and also the pattern found in Study 2 and hence needs to be discussed in further detail.

The following chapter summarizes the results of the hypothesis tests of Study 1 through 4 (cf. Chapter 8). The cumulative findings of this thesis are then consolidated and their key theoretical and practical implications and limitations discussed (cf. Chapter 9).
8 Summary of the hypothesis tests across Study 1 to 4

Table 22 summarizes the results of the formal hypothesis tests. Additionally, Table 23 provides an overview of the regression coefficients of the individual emotion-behavior relationships. Together, these provide the foundations for the general discussion (cf. Chapter 9).

Table 22: Summary of the results on the hypothesis tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Study 1 (Pretest)</th>
<th>Study 2 (Preceding)</th>
<th>Study 3 (Main)</th>
<th>Study 4 (Follow-up)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong> Self/disadvantaged condition → negative self-conscious emotions strongest.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong> Service provider/disadvantaged condition → anger strongest.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3a</strong> Self/advantaged condition → pride strongest...</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3b</strong> ...→ some degree of negative self-conscious emotions present compared to the SP/advantaged condition.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4a</strong> Service provider/advantaged condition → gratitude strongest...</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4b</strong> ...→ some degree of anger present compared to the self/advantaged condition.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5a</strong> In advantaged conditions, positive (negative) emotions increase when it is perceived as motive-consistent (motive-inconsistent)...</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5b</strong> ...and for people low (high) in RISC.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6a</strong> Emotional ambivalence (i.e., positive and negative emotions) will be present when being advantaged (vs. disadvantaged).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6b</strong> Specifically, self-related emotional ambivalence will be highest in the self/advantaged condition and service provider-related emotional ambivalence in the service provider/advantaged condition.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7 a,b</strong> Negative self-conscious emotions are negatively associated with (a) COMP and (b) N-WOM.</td>
<td>Y: b</td>
<td>N: a (directional)</td>
<td>Y: b</td>
<td>N: a (directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8 a-d</strong> Anger is positively associated with (a) COMP and (b) N-WOM and negatively with (c) P-WOM and (d) REP.</td>
<td>Y: a,b</td>
<td>N: c,d (directional)</td>
<td>Y: a-d</td>
<td>N: a-d (directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H9</strong> Pride is positively associated with P-WOM.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(directional)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H10 a-d</strong> Gratitude is negatively associated with (a) COMP and (b) N-WOM and positively with (c) P-WOM and (d) REP.</td>
<td>Y: c,b,d</td>
<td>N: a (directional)</td>
<td>Y: c,d</td>
<td>N: a,b (directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H11</strong> The effect of agency x fairness appraisals on each post-purchase behavior is mediated by the emotions proposed.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H12 a,b</strong> In the circumstance/advantaged and no-agency/advantaged conditions → (a) surprise and (b) relief strongest...</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>P: a circumstantial, b: no-agency</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H12c</strong> ...→ some degree of negative self-conscious emotions present compared to the SP/advantaged condition.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H13 a,b</strong> In advantaged (vs. disadvantaged) conditions some degree of (a) pity and (b) malicious pleasure will be present independent of agency.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(Y: a)</td>
<td>(N: b)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H14</strong> Malicious pleasure is positively associated with N-WOM.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(directional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H15 a,b</strong> Pride and malicious pleasure are higher in (a) competitive vs. harmonious and (b) upward vs. downward comparative relationships.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y: a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Y = Yes (i.e., confirmed), N = No (i.e., disconfirmed), P = Partially confirmed, n/a = not applicable (i.e., not tested in the respective study); (Y) parentheses indicate absence of full formal significance test (i.e., hypothesis assessed based on descriptive and correlation results); N (directional) indicates emotion-behavior relationships that were not significantly but directionally supported by the data.
### Table 23: Summary of the results on the emotion-behavior relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>emotion-behavior relationship</th>
<th>complain</th>
<th>P-WOM</th>
<th>N-WOM</th>
<th>repurchase</th>
<th>across-equation test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>negative self-conscious emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>- .176</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>- .246</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.802**</td>
<td>- .514*</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>3.970**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>- .051</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>- .185*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>2.574*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>- .100</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anger at the service provider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>+ .544***</td>
<td>- .152</td>
<td>+ .438***</td>
<td>- .094</td>
<td>5.767***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.355***</td>
<td>- .325**</td>
<td>.481***</td>
<td>- .194*</td>
<td>9.037***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>.612***</td>
<td>- .349***</td>
<td>.681***</td>
<td>- .368***</td>
<td>42.249***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>.484***</td>
<td>- .295*</td>
<td>.491***</td>
<td>- .133</td>
<td>7.590***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pride</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>+ .116</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.211*</td>
<td>2.214*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gratitude to the service provider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>- .092</td>
<td>+ .227*</td>
<td>- .238*</td>
<td>+ .278*</td>
<td>1.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.347***</td>
<td>4.818**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>- .231*</td>
<td>.121*</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>2.486*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.340***</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>4.892**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>- .300***</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>malicious pleasure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>1.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>surprise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>relief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table summarizes the results of the multivariate multiple regressions of Study 1 (cf. Chapter 4.5.4), Study 2 (cf. Chapter 5.6.4), Study 3 (cf. Chapter 6.5.4), and Study 4 (cf. Chapter 7.6.5). $H$ indicates hypotheses $H7$-$H10$ and $H14$; $b$ values indicate the unstandardized regression coefficients.

$p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$. 

†Study 1 (S1): $F(4, 69)$; Study 2 (S2): $F(4, 69)$; Study 3 (S3): $F(4, 178)$; Study 4 (S4): $F(4, 87)$. 

Summary of the hypothesis tests across Study 1 to 4
9 General discussion of the research findings

The present thesis aimed to investigate consumers' emotional responses to price discrimination in the service context by analyzing the situational conditions which give rise to different discrete emotions (antecedents) as well as their specific impact on post-purchase behavior (consequences). By mainly drawing on appraisal theories of emotion, a conceptual framework and a set of hypotheses were developed to study the formation and impact of consumers' discrete emotions when paying a different price than a co-consumer. These hypotheses were empirically tested using a set of four experiments on a service price comparison context. In the following, the cumulative findings of these studies are consolidated with regard to the research questions (cf. Chapter 9.1). Moreover, the theoretical contribution (cf. Chapter 9.2), practical implications (cf. Chapter 9.3), and conceptual and methodological limitations of the findings are discussed, followed by an outline of avenues for future research (cf. Chapter 9.4).

9.1 Synopsis and discussion of empirical results

The key findings of the present thesis can be divided into three categories. Each will provide a synopsis and discussion of the research results across the four empirical studies. Table 22 provides an overview of the tested hypotheses.

(1) Evidence on a parsimonious conceptual framework to study consumers' cognitive appraisals, emotions, and behavioral intentions when prices differ.

The present research demonstrates that consumers respond highly emotionally when paying a different price than a co-consumer. To provide answers regarding which specific emotions are elicited (RQ1-a), how and why they are formed (RQ2) and impact post-purchase behavior (RQ3), as well as how they interact with cognitive aspects in consumers' processing of price discrimination information (RQ1-b) (i.e., research questions (RQ) 1 to 3), the present thesis conceptually derived and empirically tested a parsimonious framework to study the situational antecedents and behavioral consequences of price-related emotions.

Situational antecedents of specific emotional responses to price discrimination (RQ 1-a/2). The results suggest that the way consumers perceive a price discrimination event in terms of its distributive fairness (i.e., advantaged vs. disadvantaged) and agency (i.e., responsibility for price difference) gives rise to and discriminates between a set of qualitatively different price-related emotions. Specifically, consumers were found to feel intensely angry when the service provider was blamed for paying a higher price than a co-consumer (H2), while they felt negative self-conscious emotions when blaming themselves for being disadvantaged (H1) (cf. Study 1 and 3). Differently, when a price advantage was credited to the service provider,
intense *gratitude* toward the service provider was elicited (*H4a*) (cf. Study 2 and 3). Further, customers were found to feel *surprised* when the circumstances were regarded as responsible for paying less (*H12a*) and *relieved* when they did not explicitly know why they were paying less (*H12b*) (cf. Study 2). Other than expected, *pride* was not consistently found to be the most prominent emotional response to being price advantaged due to self-agency (*H3a*) (cf. Study 1, 2 vs. 3). The results of a follow-up study suggest that whether pride occurs following a self-attributed price advantage depends on the type of relationship with the disadvantaged co-consumer. Pride increased when a self-caused price advantage happened within a competitive rather than a harmonious relationship (*H15*) (cf. Study 4). Moreover, some degree of *pity* (*H13a*) and *malicious pleasure* (*H13b*) were present when being advantaged rather than disadvantaged, independent of self- versus service provider-agency (cf. Study 2 and 3). Additionally, other negative emotions in the form of anger and negative self-conscious emotions were present when being price advantaged, yet at a rather low intensity. Other than expected, they were not found to consistently vary by agency (*H3b, H4b*) (cf. Study 1 to 3).

**Consequences of the set of price-related emotions on post-purchase behavior (RQ 3).** Notably, consumers' coping with these specific emotions was found to affect behavioral consequences in distinct ways. The majority of the observed emotion-behavior associations were in line with the hypotheses. Note that in some studies the effects were subtle, providing directional support while just not reaching conventional significance levels. This particularly applied to the results of the pretest, Study 1, given that some emotion items had not yet been fully specified, or of the follow-up study, Study 4, which can be explained by the focus on self/advantaged conditions only. Hence, consistencies among the significant effects of Study 2 and 3 are focused on in the following discussion and directional results are indicated in parentheses.

Most importantly, not all negative emotions that were primarily elicited when paying more than a co-consumer (i.e., anger and negative self-conscious emotions) were found to induce consumer responses detrimental to the firm. In detail, the results suggest that customers who felt *angry* at the service provider were, as predicted, likely to vent their feelings by complaining (*H8a*) and spreading negative word of mouth about the service provider (*H8b*). Additionally, angry customers were less likely to spread positive word of mouth (*H8c*) (in Study 1 directional) and repurchase the service in the future (*H8d*) (in Study 1 and 4 directional). In contrast to anger, consumers who blamed themselves and felt *negative self-conscious emotions* were, as anticipated, found to be less likely to spread negative word of mouth (*H7b*) (in Study 4 directional). However, differently than predicted, negative self-conscious emotions were not found to also decrease complaining (*H7a*). Interestingly, although not hypothesized, the results across the studies provide substantial support for the notion that negative self-conscious emotions even increase positive word of mouth activities (in Study 1 and 4 direc-
A potential explanation for why spreading positive word of mouth may serve as a coping mechanism for self-negative feelings can be derived from their self-regulatory function in social interactions (Beer & Keltner, 2004). Specifically, customers who feel self-punitive emotions acknowledge that they have transgressed by not doing the socially right thing (Tangney et al., 2007), such as redeeming a valid coupon and saving money. These self-conscious emotions are suggested to serve self-regulatory functions and to motivate socially appropriate behaviors (Beer & Keltner, 2004; Beer et al., 2003). Hence, recommending the specific service provider to others may serve as an attempt to help these others to get a better price. This prosocial act of the focal consumer may make her/him feel better about her-/herself (i.e., self-enhance) and eventually eliminate such self-punitive negative feelings.

Similarly, the different positive emotions primarily elicited by a price advantage varied in the scope of their behavioral impact. In particular, feeling grateful toward the service provider was, as expected, found to trigger redistributive behaviors, such as spreading positive word of mouth about the service provider ($H_{10c}$) and repurchasing the service in the future ($H_{10d}$). However, across the studies, gratitude was not found to also consistently prevent negative behaviors toward the firm, such as complaining ($H_{10a}$) or spreading negative word of mouth ($H_{10b}$). As with gratitude, consumers who felt proud were, as expected, likely to spread positive word of mouth ($H_{9}$) (in Study 1 and 4 directional), presumably to make one's achievement visible to others in order to enhance one's social status (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). However, in contrast to gratitude, pride was, as anticipated, not found to significantly affect repurchase intentions across all the studies, except in Study 3. Given that only Study 3 produced an effect, pride is not suggested to be associated with repurchase. Moreover, in line with expectations, surprise and relief were not found to be related to active behaviors toward the firm at conventional significance levels.

Concerning the co-consumer-related emotions, the results provided substantial support for the hypothesis that malicious pleasure increases negative word of mouth activities (in Study 3 and 4 directionally) ($H_{14}$). Sundie et al. (2009) speculate that this effect might be triggered by a motive to relive the joy, to share it with others, or to spread a cautionary tale. As an alternative reason, the author of this thesis suggests that coping with this spiteful form of pleasure might motivate customers to publicly pick on the service provider as a means to cover and distract from their own transgression. Pity was the only emotion that produced significant opposite regression results across the studies, which calls for further investigation. However, none of the effects were highly significant at $p < .001$ and the effect sizes were all $n_p^2 < .10$. Pity was not expected to affect post-purchase behaviors related to the firm, but rather to foster prosocial behavior, aiming at providing equal opportunity to the disadvantaged co-customer (Harth et al., 2008). Hence, it can be speculated that the prosocial behavior catalyzed by pity may or may not be achieved through some behaviors targeted toward the service provider,
such as boycotting the service provider in the future and discouraging others by not recom-
mending her/him (Study 2) or increasing recommendation activities to help others to get the
same good price (Study 4).

*Interplay between price discrimination-related appraisals, emotions, and behavior (RQ 1-b).*
Most importantly, in line with appraisal theories of emotion, the path analyses of Study 3
provide evidence that the set of price-related emotions studied significantly mediates the
effect of the cognitive appraisals on post-purchase behaviors. Put differently, the significant
total indirect effect suggests that the impact which the different agency by fairness conditions
exert on each of the four post-purchase behaviors is transmitted via the set of six emotions.
Hence, these results provide support for the postulated mediated moderation hypothesis
(H11). The results on the specific indirect effects of each emotion further reveal that most of
the established individual emotion-behavior relationships remain when controlling for the
joint effect of cognitive agency and fairness appraisals. The attenuated effects of the positive
emotions pride and gratitude on repurchase intentions were suspected to have occurred due to
the advance purchase characteristic of many services, including those used in the experi-
mental pricing scenarios (for a detailed discussion, see Chapter 6.6 and 9.4).

In sum, the results on the conceptual appraisal-emotion-behavior framework support the key
notion of this thesis that price-related emotions are crucial beyond price-related cognitions in
predicting consumers’ behavioral intentions. Specifically, the findings confirm that emotions
of the same valence may have different (e.g., pride and gratitude) and even valence-
incongruent impacts on behavior (e.g., anger and negative self-conscious emotions). This
implies a need to go beyond positive versus negative price affect and to understand the ante-
cedents of specific price-related emotions in order to better predict consumers' responses to
price discrimination.

(2) *Preliminary findings on situational and personal factors affecting mixed emotions when
being price advantaged.*

In a price discrimination situation, being price advantaged implies that the comparative con-
sumer is disadvantaged. The present project provides insights into (i) whether being advant-
aged also elicits negative emotions, (ii) whether these positive and negative emotions co-
occur, and (iii) when and for whom positive emotions increase compared to negative (cf.
research question 4).

*Emotions related to the co-consumer’s price disadvantage.* The results across the studies
suggest that besides the positive/neutral emotions primarily elicited when being advantaged
(i.e., pride, gratitude, surprise, relief), some degree of emotions related to the co-consumer's
disadvantage occurred, such as pity, negative self-conscious emotions, anger at the service
provider, and malicious pleasure. The results provide evidence that the four primary positive/neutral emotions are associated with different agency conditions, while the four emotions related to the co-consumer's misfortune did not consistently vary by agency. No variation by agency was expected for the agency-independent emotions pity and malicious pleasure (H13). However, anger was anticipated to be present in the service provider/advantaged rather than in the self/advantaged condition, where some degree of negative self-conscious emotions was expected instead (H3b, H4b). Note that the level of anger and negative self-conscious emotions elicited when paying less was rather low. Hence, this nonsignificant effect of agency might have been simply caused by floor effects, preventing variations between agency conditions to reach significance. In sum, positive and some level of negative emotions were present in price advantaged conditions. However, these averaged intensity levels obscure whether these positive and negative emotions were elicited as ambivalent emotional blends within the same person or whether some people felt high positive emotions, while others felt some degree of negative emotions. This will subsequently be discussed.

Emotional ambivalence when being price advantaged. In line with the rather low levels of negative emotions when being advantaged, the results across the studies suggest that emotional ambivalence is present, but at rather low levels (H6a). The nonsignificant correlations between positive and negative emotions (Study 2 to 4) indicate that the two emotions vary independently. Consequently, ambivalence might occur for some customers but not for others. Moreover, it was predicted that consumers feel particularly ambivalent about the agent (self vs. service provider) who caused the price difference (H6b). However, an opposite pattern appeared. Across Study 2 and 3, substantial evidence was accumulated indicating that ambivalence in self-related emotions (i.e., co-occurrence of pride and negative self-conscious emotions) is low (rather than high) in the self-agency condition and ambivalence in the service provider-related emotions (i.e., co-occurrence of gratitude and anger) is low (rather than high) in the service provider-agency condition. Hence, customers were found to feel concise emotions toward the agent of the price difference: either one feels positive toward the agent for the personally favorable price outcome or negative for having caused the co-consumer to suffer.

Role of situational and personal variables in predicting emotions' valence when being advantaged. The results across the studies confirm that the more personally motive-consistent being price advantaged is perceived by the customer, the higher the positive emotions and the lower the negative emotions (H5a). As exceptions to this general pattern, perceived motive consistency did not consistently predict whether one feels more malicious pleasure (cf. Study 2, 3 vs. 4) or relief (cf. Study 2). It can be speculated that this is due to the valence-wise mixed emotion eliciting situations. Relief reflects the positive feeling related to a negative event which does not materialize (Lazarus, 2001; Roseman et al., 1990; Zeelenberg, 2009) and
malicious pleasure echoes the positive feelings at another person's negative outcome (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009). Further, the individual difference variable relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) was not found to exert an overall valence-dividing effect. Nonetheless, it was found to increase pity (cf. Study 3 and 4) and decrease malicious pleasure (cf. Study 2). Although these results were not consistent regarding the discrete emotion, they do suggest that the extent to which a person incorporates close others' concerns into her/his self-concept affects co-consumer-related emotions (i.e., pity, malicious pleasure) rather than all types of emotions. Moreover, Study 2 and 4 provide preliminary evidence for a moderating effect of RISC on a broad range of motive consistency-emotion relationships. Put differently, a stronger valence-dividing effect of motive consistency was found for people defining the self in terms of close relationships. As a general pattern, the results imply that the less (more) motive-consistent paying less than a friend is perceived, the higher the negative (positive) emotions, specifically among people high in RISC. Beyond that, for surprise the interactive effect of motive consistency and RISC helped to disentangle for whom low motive consistency increases unpleasant surprise and for whom high motive consistency elicits pleasant surprise.

In an attempt to conceptualize the findings on RISC, the author of this thesis suggests that this individual difference variable could potentially enter the appraisal-emotion process via four routes, among which two were supported by the present data. (1) **Informational route**: Given the impact of RISC on information processing (Cross, 2009), it was proposed that for people who take the needs and interests of close others into account when paying less, fairness motives may be salient over egocentric motives (cf. Chapter 2.2.3). However, RISC was not found to be significantly correlated with motive consistency appraisals (Study 2 to 4). (2) **Emphatic route**: Previous research demonstrates that high RISC people consider the other's perspective in social interactions (Cross et al., 2000). Being able to take someone else's perspective is a precursor to empathic feelings (D'Arms, 2009; Decety, 2009). People with an interdependent self-construal are suggested to experience more frequently other-focused emotions such as sympathy (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In line with this reasoning, RISC was found to affect the type of co-consumer-related emotions by increasing pity (Study 3 and 4) or reducing malicious pleasure (Study 2). (3) **Personal distress route**: People with an interdependent self-construal are suggested to be more sensitive to others' emotions, which in turn may affect their own emotional experiences (Cross & Madson, 1997). The personal distress elicited by others in need (Batson, Fultz, & Schoenrade, 1987) could elicit, for example, negative self-conscious emotions or anger depending on the agent. However, the results provided no support for significant effects of RISC on these emotions. (4) **Comparative route**: The present results suggest that RISC may also affect emotions indirectly by moderating how strongly motive consistency appraisal affect emotions (Study 2 and 4). Previous research has revealed that high RISC people perceive close others as more similar (Cross, Morris, & Gore,
2002). According to social comparison theory, the more similar the comparative other is, the more informative a (price) comparison with others will be for evaluative purposes (Suls et al., 2002; Suls & Wheeler, 2012) and hence, the stronger the motive-consistency-emotion inferences. In sum, the present results support the notion that RISC enters the emotion-appraisal process through the **emphatic route**, directly affecting pity and malicious pleasure as well as the **comparative route**, making motive consistency appraisals more indicative of the valence of the emotional outcome. No evidence was found for the informational and personal distress route.

(3) **Insights into the emotional consequences of self-serving bias tendencies in agency attributions for price differences.**

Although the aim of the present project was to investigate the emotional outcomes of agency appraisals rather than the nature of agency appraisals per se, the pretest results revealed interesting self-serving bias tendencies in agency attributions when paying less. Hence, Study 2 was designed to gain further insights into the nature and formation of agency appraisals.

**Self-serving bias in agency attributions when being price advantaged.** Specifically, the present results indicate that a self-caused price advantage is likely to be credited to the self, while a service provider-caused advantage results in little credit to the service provider (cf. Study 1 and 3). Even when the reasons were identical for the advantaged and disadvantaged service provider-caused conditions (cf. Study 3), the service provider was scarcely perceived as the agent when the outcome was positive for the self. However, as soon as the focal customer changed position with the co-consumer and became the disadvantaged party, the service provider was then blamed as the agent for the price difference. Nevertheless, although the service provider was cognitively not as strongly credited for positive outcomes, emotionally, customers reported feeling intense **gratitude** toward the service provider in the service provider/advantaged condition (cf. Study 3). This means that despite cognitively biased agency appraisals, the emotions and behavioral intentions were as expected in the service provider/advantaged condition.

**Default agency attribution when no environmental cue is present.** The results of Study 2 provide three key insights into consumers' default agency attribution. First, per default, when no agency information was present, the focal consumer regarded her-/himself as the more likely agent for the favorable price than the service provider. Combined with the discussion above: When service provider-agency cues are present, the latter might not be as strongly credited for providing a price advantage. However, when agency is unknown, the service provider is least likely credited among all tested human and non-human agents. Second, the circumstances were regarded as the most natural and likely explanation for getting a better
price when no agency cue was present. Moreover, if the focal consumer did not credit the price advantage to her-/himself, a substantial share of circumstance-agency was acknowledged for all types of external agents. Third, the high circumstance- and medium self-agency pattern of the advantaged/no-agency condition was found to elicit a unique emotional response in the form of relief, which was different from the emotional response to pure circumstance-agency (surprise) or pure self-agency (pride).

9.2 Theoretical contribution

The preceding synopsis of the research findings elucidated the key theoretical contributions of this research project.

*Adding evidence on price-related emotions as crucial determinants of consumers' behavior beyond price-related cognitions.* First, the results generally add to the literature on the role of emotions in marketing (e.g., Bagozzi et al., 1999) and behavioral pricing in particular (e.g., O'Neill & Lambert, 2001). In line with the tenets of appraisal theories and previous findings of price affect studies (e.g., Peine et al., 2009; Gelbrich, 2011), Study 3 provides evidence that the proposed set of price-related emotions transmits the effect of agency and fairness cognitions on behavioral responses. Hence, price-related emotions are crucial determinants of consumers' behavior beyond price-related cognitions. This suggests that previously cognitively biased models may have overestimated the behavioral effect ascribed to certain price cognitions (see Peine et al., 2009).

*Providing a conceptual derivation and empirical test of a framework to study the formation and impact of consumers' emotional responses to price discrimination beyond valence.* The present results advocate that the different emotions elicited by a price discrimination event affect behaviors in a way which would not always be predicted by the emotions' mere valence (i.e., positive vs. negative). While the different positive emotions were found to differ in the scope of post-purchase behaviors affected (e.g., pride vs. gratitude), the negative emotions even produced opposite behavioral effects (e.g., anger vs. negative self-conscious emotions). As a consequence, it is crucial to understand the formation and impact of discrete emotional responses to price discrimination. To the knowledge of the author, the present project is the first to advance and empirically examine a comprehensive yet parsimonious framework which stipulates the antecedents and consequences of a set of relevant price discrimination-related emotions, encompassing both advantaged and disadvantaged price unfairness. This framework assists in the study of qualitatively different emotional responses to price events beyond valence and allows more accurate predictions of how consumers cope with specific emotions in terms of post-purchase behaviors.
Qualifying the previously stipulated negative effect of perceived price unfairness. Previous behavioral pricing research suggests that perceived price unfairness induces strong negative consumer responses, such as complaining, boycotting, or even revenge behavior (e.g., Xia et al., 2004; Campbell, 1999a). In Study 3, being disadvantaged was found to be perceived as highly unfair and significantly more unfair than being advantaged (see also e.g., Loseman et al., 2009). However, not all consumers' responses were found to be more negative when disadvantaged than when facing a price advantage – it depended on perceived agency and the respective emotion elicited. For example, when oneself was blamed for a price disadvantage, the price difference was cognitively perceived as unfair. Nonetheless, the negative self-conscious emotions elicited in this situation fostered coping responses that increased positive consumer responses, such as spreading positive word of mouth. In contrast, anger resulting from blaming the service provider induced strong negative behavioral responses, similarly to what has been witnessed in previous price fairness research (see e.g., Xia et al., 2004 for a review). Qualifying price fairness frameworks by incorporating the moderating effect of perceived agency and the respective emotions elicited might help to provide a more nuanced picture of the effect of perceived price fairness on consumers' post-purchase behavior. Hence, the behavioral effect of price fairness might not only have been overestimated in frameworks that do not account for emotions and other price-related appraisals (Peine et al., 2009); they might even have disguised specific conditions producing directionally different behavioral outcomes.

Elucidating the antecedents to the expression of price-promotion pride. Although self-attributed price discounts have long been suggested to elicit pride-like smart-shopper feelings (Schindler, 1989; 1998), the results of Study 3 challenge this notion. Drawing on emotion and social psychology, Study 4 elucidates how the relationship to the comparative co-consumer provides an additional vital antecedent of pride. Pride and malicious pleasure were found to increase when a self-attributed price advantage occurred compared to a co-consumer with whom one is maintaining a competitive rather than harmonious relationship. A recent study has shown that pride and malicious pleasure increased when the self-attributed price advantage occurred within qualitatively negative rather than positive or neutral relationships (Gelbrich, 2011). The present study expands these findings by advocating that the relationship dynamics (i.e., competitive vs. harmonious) can explain an increase in pride and malicious pleasure even within qualitatively positive relationships, such as between friends who pay a different price. In this way, the empirical findings of Study 4 more generally contribute to social psychological research on pride and malicious pleasure. By building on the social functions of emotions, these results provide a potential explanation to address the gap regarding when "the pride expression is displayed versus regulated in real-life contexts" (Tracy & Robins, 2007a, p. 148). Moreover, previous research suggests that malicious pleasure may
occur following hostile feelings such as envy (Sundie et al., 2009; Smith et al., 1996). The results of Study 4 revealed that malicious pleasure may also co-vary with positive emotions, particularly pride, when competitive motives are salient. This is an interesting emotional co-variation that calls for future research.

Explicit assessment of mixed ambivalent emotional responses to being price advantaged. These results provide preliminary insights into the mixed emotionality of being advantaged. They suggest that consumers are not only concerned with their own advantage. Some level of emotions is triggered by the co-consumer's disadvantage in the form of pity, anger, negative self-conscious emotions, and malicious pleasure. However, correlation results and ambivalence calculations based on the similarity-intensity model (Priester & Petty, 1996; Thompson et al., 1995) suggest that emotional ambivalence is rather low. By using an explicit ambivalence measure on the individual level, instead of relying on group means for different emotions, the present results challenge the notion that mixed, emotional blends occur when being advantaged (Gelbrich, 2011; Xia & Monroe, 2010). The results suggest that ambivalence might be present for some but not all customers. It further specifies that emotions are particularly directionally clear and non-ambivalent toward the agent of the price advantage.

Providing foundations for the future study on determinants of positive versus negative emotions when being advantaged. The results demonstrate that in line with appraisal research, perceived motive consistency predicts an increase in positive over negative emotions when being price advantaged. Overall, these results provide the foundation for further research into identifying when and for whom being price advantaged is perceived as personally motive-(in)consistent and when and for whom emotions are ambivalent. This is regarded as particularly important because ambivalence as well as some of the negative emotions (e.g., anger) may have strong negative effects for the service provider. Hence, even consumers who are advantaged might behaviorally respond negatively via emotions such as anger or mixed feelings. Moreover, the present project provides preliminary evidence for a moderating effect of RISC on a broad range of motive consistency-emotion relationships, suggesting a stronger valence-dividing effect of motive consistency for people high in RISC. Thus, the results support the notion that RISC enters the appraisal-emotion process through an emphatic route directly affecting the intensities of co-consumer-related emotions (i.e., pity, malicious pleasure), as well as a comparative route, rendering motive consistency appraisals more indicative of the strength of the positive or negative emotions felt when being advantaged. The moderating effect of RISC on motive consistency further assists in predicting for whom surprise will occur in an unpleasant and for whom in a pleasant form. This challenges the perception of surprise as a hedonically neutral state of mind (e.g., Reisenzein & Meyer, 2009), while supporting the perception of surprise as a hedonically toned emotion (e.g., Roseman et al., 1990).
Qualifying the effect of cognitive self-serving bias tendencies on emotions. While self-serving bias tendencies in agency attributions are in and of themselves nothing new (see Weiner, 1985), the present project further qualifies how these self-serving agency attributions subsequently transform into emotional responses. First, although the service provider is cognitively not as strongly credited in the service provider/advantaged condition, emotionally, customers reported intense *gratitude* toward the service provider. As a possible social or ontogenetic explanation, it is suggested that gratitude may often be derived from social norms or politeness rather than true beliefs regarding the role of others (Hareli & Weiner, 2002). Alternatively, a physiological or phylogenetic explanation is conceivable. The present results suggest that despite self-serving bias tendencies in agency cognitions, emotionally, the agency inference seems to pass in an unbiased manner. We might be able to bias or control the thoughts we express, but not our feelings. Second, the present project generates insights into consumers' default agency attributions. Based on the literature, it was expected that the unspecified agency condition would resemble the circumstance condition in its emotional response (building on Roseman et al., 1990) or, alternatively, the self-agency condition, given self-serving bias tendencies (Weiner, 1985). Yet, neither of these two notions was supported. The results instead suggest that unspecified agency reflects a unique condition characterized by high circumstance- and moderate self-agency appraisals that elicits the discrete emotion relief rather than surprise (pure circumstance-agency) or pride (pure self-agency). While some of the currently active appraisal theories study self-, other person-, and circumstance-agency separately (e.g., Roseman, 2011), to the knowledge of the author, no explicit hypotheses on conditions in which agency is unspecified or unknown are provided. Given the present results, such a distinction might be helpful in disentangling the earlier ambiguous results in the literature on some of the emotions suggested to be elicited by circumstance-agency, such as between surprise and relief (cf. discussion in Chapter 5.1.1), which in this thesis were found to be elicited by circumstance versus the no-agency condition, respectively.

9.3 Practical contribution

This thesis provides relevant insights into the formation and behavioral impacts of consumers' emotional responses to price discrimination. Price discrimination strategies are key for many service providers (e.g., airlines, hotels, tour operators etc.) to increase profitability by charging prices according to consumers' price sensitivity and particularly by optimizing the capacity allocation (e.g., Bieger, 2007; Desiraju & Shugan, 1999; Kimes & Wirtz, 2003). Importantly, the present results demonstrate that charging different prices between consumers elicits a portfolio of different emotional responses. These accompanying emotions induce behavioral side effects that can challenge or boost a firm's profitable and sustainable development. In particular, consumers' coping with each of these emotions was found to exert a
distinct effect on post-purchase behaviors which would not always be predicted by simply identifying the emotions' valence or only assessing a consumer's fairness perception. Hence, it is important for marketers to pay attention to the formation and impact of consumers' emotional responses in order to understand, predict, and manage the emotionally driven behavioral side effects that accompany price discrimination strategies. The present results assist marketers with insights into which specific price discrimination conditions give rise to different emotions and how these emotions will distinctively affect post-purchase behavior. This knowledge provides indications on how price discrimination systems can be designed and communicated more effectively.

As a first key implication, the present results indicate that charging a higher price for Customer A does not always trigger negative consumer responses. Similarly, offering a lower price to Customer B does not always pay off in equal measure. More specifically, although paying a higher price than someone else was perceived as highly unfair and elicited negative emotions, disadvantaged customers were not always found to respond negatively to the firm – the behavioral outcomes depended on the perceived agency and the respective specific negative emotion that was most intensely elicited. For example, when Customer A acknowledged being responsible for paying more (e.g., s/he forgot to redeem a coupon), s/he felt negative about her/his own inaction or inability. The findings revealed that consumers deal with such negative self-conscious emotions by recommending the firm to others rather than defaming the firm. Helping others to get a lower price via recommendations might serve as a means to compensate for and ease negative feelings about oneself. In contrast, when Customer A blamed the service provider for paying more, s/he felt anger at the service provider. Angry customers were found to be likely to vent their feelings by complaining to the service provider, spreading negative word of mouth, and even boycotting the service provider. Turning to the comparative party, Customer B, the present results suggest that the scope in which advantaged consumers respond favorably to the firm equally depends on perceived agency and the respective discrete positive emotion most intensely elicited. If consumers credited themselves for paying less, they were found to feel proud of the achievement, particularly if they had a competitive relationship to the disadvantaged Co-consumer A. Proud consumers were found to boast about their achievement by spreading positive word of mouth. In contrast, if a price advantage was credited to the help of the service provider, consumers were likely to feel grateful toward the service provider, which was also found to consistently increase positive word of mouth and, additionally, repurchase intentions. Overall, these distinct behavioral outcomes of Consumer A's coping with anger versus negative self-conscious emotions or Consumer B's coping with pride versus gratitude will be unnoticed when a firm identifies the valence of their consumers' emotions only (i.e., positive vs. negative emotions) or by merely
investigating a consumer's gradual fairness perception (both paying more and less were perceived as unfair).

As a second key implication, the present results advocate that when firms merely post their prices without providing supplementary self- or service provider-related agency information, they will be unlikely to capitalize on the positive side effects of offering lower prices. When cues indicated to Customer B that her/his price advantage was due to the circumstances (instead of the self or service provider), consumers were found to feel *surprised* about paying less, which did not affect post-purchase behaviors. Similarly, when a firm provided no agency cues, a price advantage was perceived as highly circumstance- and moderately self-caused. This condition was found to give rise to feeling *relieved* about paying less, which also had no effect on post-purchase behaviors. Notably, the service provider was regarded as the least likely agent when no default agency information was given. Taken together, this implies that all of a service provider's actions or measures implemented to offer lower prices will pass unnoticed if they are not communicated. When the customer is not aware of the measures the service provider has taken, s/he will feel relieved about the lower price rather than grateful to the service provider. Hence, simply offering and posting lower prices is not enough to create the emotional foundation to establish and maintain mutually benevolent, long-term relationships. Marketers need to actively manage the agency information and cues that accompany posted prices. Without informing the consumer whether the lower price occurred due to actions taken by the customer or the service provider, firms forgo the positive behavioral returns of providing pleasurable, pride- or gratitude-like purchasing experience.

In sum, for service providers it is important to understand and actively manage the emotionally driven behavioral side effects of price discrimination. Regarding the disadvantaged Customer A, first and foremost, firms should avoid having consumers become angry when prices differ (*minimize negative side effects*). Additionally, regarding the advantaged Customer B, service providers may want to provide pleasurable purchasing experiences involving self-agency (i.e., pride) when their main aim is to foster awareness and customer acquisition (*optimize positive side effects*), or pleasurable experiences involving service provider-agency (i.e., gratitude) when their main aim is to foster long-term relationships and customer retention (*maximize positive side effects*) (cf. Figure 21).

1. **Minimize negative side effects.** Anger was found to be most intensely elicited when the service provider was blamed for the price disadvantage. Therefore, measures in the design and communication of price discrimination systems that prevent blaming the service provider are crucial. Given that the firm is normally the agent who sets the price, it can be assumed that Customer A is likely to feel controlled by the firm when price differences are not understood and price schemes cannot be freely chosen. Hence, regarding the price design, it is conceiva-
ble that third-degree price discrimination systems in which the firm imposes certain prices on a customer based on her/his characteristics might be less favorably received than when the customer can self-select among pricing schemes as with second degree price discrimination systems (e.g., quantity- or quality-based price discrimination) (Carroll & Coates, 1999; see also Pigou, 1932). Price communication measures to increase the transparency and understandability of the price differentiation mechanism might further empower Customer A to take an active part in her/his choice of pricing scheme, eventually blaming her-/himself rather than the service provider when still paying a higher price than Customer B.

Figure 21: Strategies to manage emotionally driven side effects of price discrimination

(2a) Optimize positive side effects. The present results suggest that if the service provider is additionally able to provide Customer B with a pleasurable purchasing experience involving the self (i.e., pride), he will not only prevent negative responses, but even increase positive word of mouth by fostering (i) self-agency, (ii) competitive motives, and (iii) active price comparisons. (i) As discussed, to increase self-responsibility among customers, second-degree price discrimination systems might be an effective means. Similarly, potential communication measures to increase the transparency and understandability of price plans should help to empower the customer's responsibility for her/his own price/product choices. For example, firms could provide insights into how the prices fluctuate over time or educate their customers by informing them that they should check their offers regularly, accumulate miles, be attentive to coupons, and watch out for the expiration dates of price promotions. (ii) However, it should be considered that self-agency alone will elicit little pride about being price advantaged when the comparative parties are maintaining a harmonious relationship (as presumably existent with family members and friends). In this condition, pity for the disadvantaged party was most intense, which was not found to consistently affect post-purchase behavior. There-
fore, the results demonstrate that it is also important to prime competitive motives to elicit pride among mutually positive relationships. Price differences or promotions could, for example, be designed as competitions between customers or communicated in a game-like fashion. (iii) The effect of self-agency appraisals can presumably be triggered by promoting active price comparisons. In such a situation, not only one party may incidentally learn or overhear that s/he paid less (more), but also the comparative party. Such price communication measures aiming at provoking customers to actively talk about price differences and competitively comparing prices seem likely to induce a 'viral spin': Advantaged customers, who get the lower price, will talk positively about the firm to boost their pride, while the others, who did not get the lower price, will recommend it in an attempt to eliminate self-negative feelings. Social media-based promotions might offer an ideal channel to provoke such competitive price comparisons.

(2b) Maximizing positive side effects. If the primary strategic marketing objective is to build long-term relationships and foster repurchase (customer retention), the present results suggest that additionally to decreasing anger, it will be worthwhile to make an effort as the service provider to provide Customer B with a pleasurable purchasing experience (i.e., gratitude). Based on the present results, customer retention could be achieved by fostering (i) self-agency among the disadvantaged, (ii) and service provider-agency among the advantaged customers. Additionally, to effectively implement such a dual-agency strategy (iii) a passive price comparison will be crucial. (i) Potential measures to advance self-agency have been discussed above. (ii) To foster service provider-agency, comparable cues could be provided in the design and communication of price differences. Importantly, firms should actively communicate the measures they implement and the effort they invest in offering lower prices to some customer segments; otherwise, these efforts are likely to pass unnoticed. (iii) It should be noted that increasing self-agency among the disadvantaged and service provider-agency among the advantaged customers will be a balancing act. People typically tend to actively compare themselves with others in an attempt to self-evaluate (e.g., Suls et al., 2002). Hence, disadvantaged parties might become angry if they learn about the service provider's effort to offer the lower price to Customer B only. To reduce such comparisons, firms could provide price comparison opportunities by proactively communicating and explaining the prices other customers pay. As a positive side effect, this would also increase price transparency. Taken together, price transparency seems to be the key to promoting positive and preventing negative consumer responses. Understanding why the co-consumer was offered a lower price and what one could do to get the same low price from the service provider in the future might provide a valuable basis for long-term consumer relationships.
9.4 Limitations and avenues for future research

The present project faces conceptual and methodological limitations that provide opportunities for future research.

From a conceptual perspective, the present thesis offers a theoretical framework to study the complex research phenomenon with a parsimonious set of key variables. First, this comes at the expense of considering further elements or nuances present in reality. Foremost, this thesis focused on a limited set of appraisals, namely, agency and fairness. Adding further appraisal dimensions could assist in providing a more nuanced picture of the emotion elicitation process. Particularly, the inclusion of further social appraisals such as the justice-related appraisal of deservingness (Feather et al., 2011) for paying a different price might be fruitful. Also, this thesis investigates the antecedents and consequences of a specific set of key emotional responses to price discrimination. Although reducing the focus to a small but relevant set of emotions is along the lines of appraisal theories (see e.g., Lazarus, 1991; Roseman et al., 1990; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), future research might want to incorporate additional potentially relevant emotional responses to price discrimination. For example, emotions such as envy or resentment of the co-consumer's desirable outcome might be pertinent among the disadvantaged customers (Ortony et al., 1988; Feather & Sherman, 2002). In a similar vein, the present project investigated consumers' coping responses related to four key post-purchase behaviors. Nevertheless, it would be worthwhile for future research to investigate how further behaviors could serve as coping mechanisms for price-related emotions such as switching, third-party complaining (Bougie et al., 2003), inertia (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004), or prosocial behaviors aiming to provide equal opportunity to the disadvantaged customer (Harth et al., 2008).

Second, further limitations are imposed by the present operationalization of fairness and agency appraisals in terms of their dimension and levels. Fairness appraisals were conceptualized based on a distributive fairness conception, while focusing on the levels of advantaged versus disadvantaged unfairness (cf. Chapter 2.2.1). Regarding the levels of fairness, it might be worthwhile to also investigate the emotional responses to conditions of price equality, where both consumers pay the same price. Although it has been questioned whether price equity triggers substantial fairness perceptions (Xia et al., 2004) and hence emotional responses per se (cf. Chapter 2.2.1), Tsai and Lee (2007) found, for example, that actual consumers perceive it as unfair when they pay the same price than a prospective consumer. This finding calls for further research on price equality conditions and their emotional outcomes. Regarding the dimensions of fairness, previous research has shown that besides distributive fairness, interactional and procedural fairness play a prominent role in the emotion elicitation process (see e.g., Krehbiel & Cropanzano, 2000; Schoefer, 2008; Weiss et al., 1999), provid-
ing further avenues to study. Similarly, agency appraisals were operationalized in this thesis based on the locus of responsibility (Roseman et al., 1990; Weiner, 1985), while chiefly distinguishing between self- versus service provider-agency. However, the results of Study 2 suggest that circumstance-agency and particularly situations where agency cues are absent provide valuable conditions to study unique emotional experiences and their distinct behavioral consequences to being price advantaged. Hence, it will be fruitful for future research to also examine the emotional responses to these two conditions in price disadvantaged conditions. Moreover, besides the locus dimension of attributions, previous research stipulates that the stability and controllability of causes as proposed by Weiner (1985) provide additional antecedents that help to differentiate between qualitatively different emotions (e.g., Hareli & Hess, 2008). Particularly, whether the price difference event is attributed to non-stable, situational or rather to stable, global personal dispositions could assist in distinguishing pride from hubris and guilt/regret from shame (Lewis, 2008). Extending the dimensions and levels of the present fairness (distributive: advantaged vs. disadvantaged) by agency (locus: self vs. service provider) framework can assist in capturing real-life nuances in consumers' emotional responses to prices.

Third, the present thesis focused on testing causal appraisal-emotion paths by experimentally manipulating the respective appraisals. While it is important to initially understand how appraisals transform into emotions, several appraisal scholars have recently promoted a shift toward studying the antecedents of appraisals (e.g., Kuppens & van Mechelen, 2007; Smith & Kirby, 2009). The emotion elicitation process is embedded in and influenced by person and situation variables (e.g., Kuppens et al., 2007). Hence, building on the present appraisal-emotion results, for future research it seems particularly relevant to investigate how variations in situational aspects such as the design and communication of price discrimination systems affect perceived agency. In the implications section (cf. Chapter 9.3) several recommendations were offered. Future research could test them in order to provide empirical knowledge on how a price system’s design, framing, and communication affect relevant price-related appraisals. For example, it would be interesting to test how different types of price discrimination (i.e., second versus third degree price discrimination, see e.g., Carroll & Coates, 1999; Pigou, 1932), different dimensions of price discrimination (i.e., location-based, time-based, consumer-based etc., see e.g., Haws & Bearden, 2006), as well as price transparency affect agency appraisals. Additionally, moderating effects of individual differences (e.g., a person's attributional style, see Peterson, 2009) on price event-appraisal relationships could be investigated (e.g., Kuppens et al., 2007).

Fourth, the formation of the emotions pride and malicious pleasure were less clear across the studies. A self-attributed price advantage was not always found to elicit pride (Study 1, 2 vs. 3). Study 4 clarified that consumers felt prouder and more maliciously pleased when a
self-caused price advantage resulted within a relationship where competitive motives are salient than within a harmonious relationship. The social acceptability of displaying pride is regarded as an important future research area (Tracy & Robins, 2007a), as are investigations on the previously widely neglected emotion malicious pleasure (Sundie et al., 2009). Building on a social functions of emotion explanation, Study 4 adds to these gaps by suggesting that the dynamics within relationships provide relevant conditions under which pride and malicious pleasure are displayed. Further research could investigate additional antecedents such as the role of high *cognitive business* which was found to foster positive feelings when being advantaged (van den Bos et al., 2006) or whether pride is more likely displayed in *private versus public conditions* (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Moreover, although positive emotions were expected to increase the more an event fits one's motives (Roseman et al., 1990), malicious pleasure was not consistently related to motive consistency. Malicious pleasure reflects positive feelings at another person's negative outcome (Ben-Ze'ev, 2009) and this mixed-valence condition calls for further research (the same applies to relief, see Study 2). Interestingly, across all the studies, malicious pleasure and pride were positively correlated and Study 4 further showed that they uniquely respond to determinants that did not affect the other emotions tested. Previous research suggests that malicious pleasure may occur following prior hostile feelings such as envy (Sundie et al., 2009; Smith et al., 1996). The present results add that malicious pleasure also co-varies with pride. Considering that self-related responses are suggested to occur rather automatically while incorporating the other's position may need more cognitive capacity (van den Bos et al., 2006), pride may precede malicious pleasure. Hence, to better tap into the nature of pride and malicious pleasure, it seems worthwhile to investigate *causal associations between pride and malicious pleasure* together with further contexts in which these emotions, which are socially not always favorably received, are displayed versus attenuated.

Fifth, the mediation analyses in Study 3 showed that the effect of positive emotions on repurchase was attenuated when additionally controlling for the effect of appraisals, while the effect of negative emotions and distributive fairness remained. This attenuation in the effect of positive emotions on repurchase may be due to the advance purchase characteristic of many services (e.g., Shugan & Xie, 2000) and the more diffuse and transient nature of the positive compared to the negative emotions (e.g., Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). The effects of the positive and negative emotions were found to hold beyond the effect of reasoning (i.e., appraisals) for the rather immediate behaviors such as complaining or positive and negative word of mouth activities. However, only the negative emotion anger and distributive fairness considerations seem to convey their effect further in time onto repurchase. This notion calls for future longitudinal investigations. To date, most previous research on emotions' impact on judgment and behavior has been limited to static observations (Han et al., 2007). As a conse-
quence, the examination of the underlying *dynamics* and how emotional episodes unfold over time is regarded as a promising avenue for future research (Lerner et al., 2007; and already posited by Parkinson & Manstead, 1993). The dynamic impact of emotional responses to price discrimination could be studied in multiple ways along a purchase episode (however, this structuring is not mutually exclusive) (for a similar structure see e.g., Sawhney, 2006). (1) **Pre-purchase:** Before purchasing a service, consumers are in a certain mood when encountering a price discrimination event. Hence, the direct and moderating effect of positive and negative mood on the appraisal-emotion relationships could be investigated. As another conceptual approach to capture the dynamics, Cavanaugh et al. (2007) propose investigating emotions within a sequence of choices. Thus, future research could investigate how the emotional outcome of a first price/service-choice (i.e., hotel decision) transfers to a subsequent price/service-choice (i.e., flight decision). While the focus of this thesis was on integral emotions, studying the impact of consumers' general mood or emotions elicited by preceding, unrelated choices would additionally allow the investigation of the influence of incidental emotions (Cavanaugh et al., 2007; Lerner et al., 2007). (2) **During purchase:** Following the discussions on advanced purchasing, it would be interesting to investigate in a longitudinal setting how long the effect of the emotions and their coping responses persist as a function of the time between purchase, consumption, and re-purchase. (3) **Post-purchase:** In this phase, questions are crucial, such as how emotional responses are transformed by coping actions such as reappraising the encounter (e.g., Lazarus, 1991; Yi & Baumgartner, 2004) or how the subsequent consumption of the service affects the emotion episode and behavioral responses toward the service provider.

Finally, the emotions related to the co-consumer's disadvantage (i.e., negative self-conscious emotions, anger, pity, malicious pleasure) were not found to constantly vary by agency, but by perceived motive consistency, particularly among customers high in RISC disposition. Hence, it is relevant to understand which conditions or individual differences directly affect when and for whom a price advantage is perceived as personally favorable versus inconsistent with one's motives. The same applies to the ambivalent mixed feelings that were found to be present for some customers but not others. In particular, understanding when and for whom negative emotions such as anger or mixed emotions increase is important as they were found to substantially negatively affect post-purchase behavior. If they are present, offering a lower price could result in negative consumer responses.

From a *methodological perspective*, the present thesis used hypothetical scenario experiments conducted in laboratories or classrooms and a subjective approach to measure emotions. Hence, the results would benefit from being validated in field surveys with customers using *naturally occurring emotion settings* and *objective emotion measurements* (see e.g., Schorr, 2001). Although "[i]n truth, there is no perfect methodology for studying appraisal-emotion
relationships" (Roseman et al., 1996, p. 266), appraisal research has often been criticized for building on retrospective recall reports or hypothetical scenarios (Silvia, 2008; see e.g., Parkinson & Manstead, 1993). Scenario experiments provide evidence on appraisals' causal impact on emotions, while their generalizability to real-life situations may be weak (Roseman et al., 1996). However, countering this latter criticism, the study by Robinson and Clore (2001) showed that a high degree of convergence in the observed appraisal-emotion relations exists when emotions are simulated using scenarios versus naturally elicited. Nevertheless, although manipulating appraisals (as in the present studies) allows for stronger inference, future research might benefit from measuring emotions and appraisals in their real-life context (Silvia, 2008; see also Parkinson & Manstead, 1993). Given the conceptual, logistical, and economic challenges with real-life observations of emotion occurrence (Schorr, 2001), few previous studies have applied real-life observations (see e.g., Scherer & Ceschi, 1997; Tong et al., 2007). Moreover, although this thesis follows a syndrome definition of emotions, it explicitly focused on the appraisals, emotional experience, and coping components of an emotion episode, while excluding physiological processes and physical expressions (cf. Chapter 1.4). Also collecting objective psycho-psychological data in future research could assist in gaining a more comprehensive picture of consumers' emotional responses (see e.g., Grandjean & Scherer, 2008 using Electroencephalography).

In sum, the present thesis provides key insights into how consumers appraise, feel, and cope with price inequalities, while it simultaneously establishes a foundation for future research to extend the present framework to more comprehensively study consumers' responses to price discrimination.
### Appendix I: Overview of empirical research on price affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Main theoretical approach(s)</th>
<th>Focus / area of research</th>
<th>Industry focus</th>
<th>Price information</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)*</th>
<th>Dependent Variable(s)*</th>
<th>Methodological approach*</th>
<th>Conceptualization</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Schindler, 1998            | Attribution theory           | Promotion affect         | Retail/goods (dress, television, fast food) | Price discount      | 1) responsibility for and size of discount  
2) 2 (kinds: internal vs. external) x 2  
(stable control: stably vs. not stably controlled) x 3 (product type: dress vs. television vs. fast food) | 1) Price satisfaction (affective), WOM, repurchase intention  
2) Positive feelings, pride, gratitude, WOM, repurchase intention | 1) Recall survey  
2) Scenario experiment (focus and control within-subjects; products types between-subjects)  
consumer sample (N=202, 148) | PA (DE) | Price discounts attributed to internal rather than external causes elicited more intense positive feelings (particularly in the form of pride rather than gratitude) and increased repurchase and for some products also positive word of mouth intention. |
| O'Neill & Lambert, 2001    | Reference price theory       | Basic emotions approach  | Retail/goods (athletic shoes) | Actual prices encountered | No a-priori directional relations stated between price affect and (1) product involvement, (2) price consciousness, (3) internal reference price, or (4) price-quality inferences | Recall survey student sample (N=271) | A (DE) | Surprise and enjoyment were found to be distinctively associated with involvement or price consciousness and price-quality inferences, respectively. |
| Suri, Manchanada, & Kohli, 2002 | Mood-as-information theory  | Price affect              | Retail/goods (t-shirt) | Pricing formats (fixed vs. discount) | 1 x 2 (price format: fixed [EDLP] vs. discounted [HI-LO]) | Positive affect, uncertainty, perceived sacrifice/value, type of information processing, price knowledge | Scenario experiment (between-subjects) student sample (N=34) | PA | Fixed every-day-low price formats [EDLP] elicited more intense positive affect and more positive evaluations than discounted high-low price formats [HI-LO]. |
| Ackerman & Perner, 2004    | Social comparison theory     | Reference price theory   | Unspecified product | Price difference between customers (i.e., friend) | 1 x 2 (bargain: for self vs. for other (i.e., friend)) | Satisfaction, appraisals, emotions (regret, anger, happiness, shame, positive feelings (i.e., items grateful, pride)), reference price | Recall survey (within-subjects) student sample (N=55) | DE | In situations where the focal customer received a bargain while the friend did not, happiness and the pride/gratitude index were higher, compared to when the friend received a bargain. The latter condition elicited relatively higher anger, regret, and shame. |
| Honea & Dahl, 2005         | Prevalent emotion descriptors | Promotion affect         | Diverse selling promotions | Price discount (among other sales promotions) | [Five phases of data collection to explore and refine relevant emotion descriptors in order to develop a psychometric measurement scale that assesses consumers' affective responses to sales promotion offers] | Literature review; focus group; recall surveys | A | The authors developed the Promotion Affect Scale (PAS) encompassing 28 emotion descriptors that can be structured along the dimensions valence and agency. |
| Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2005 | Regulatory focus theory      | Repurchase decision      | Retail/goods (laptop, shoes) | Price promotion | 1/2/3) 2 (level of pride: high vs. low) x  
2 (self-regulatory goals: promotion vs. prevention)  
1/2/3) Satisfaction, repurchase intention  
3) necessity and sufficiency of information, negative self-conscious emotions | 1-3) 3 Scenario experiments (between-subjects) student sample (N=120, 204, 192) | DE (pride) | High pride triggered by avoiding paying more (i.e., a nonloss) reduced repurchase intentions compared to high pride elicited by gaining money by paying less (i.e., a gain). |
| Matzler et al., 2003        | Previous evidences from research on price fairness and personality traits | Price fairness | Service (banking) | Price increase and decrease | Personality, price fairness | Price fairness, positive and negative affect | Scenario survey student sample (N=234) | PA/NA | Price fairness was found to decrease negative affect and unexpectedly also positive affect. Further, extraversion was positively related to positive and neuroticism to negative affect. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Main theoretical approach(s)</th>
<th>Focus / area of research</th>
<th>Industry focus</th>
<th>Price information</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)*</th>
<th>Dependent Variable(s)*</th>
<th>Methodological approach*</th>
<th>Conceptualization</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, 2007</td>
<td>Multicomponent models/Affective-cognitive model</td>
<td>Retail/goods (rug, suit)</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Price increase and decrease</td>
<td>1) 2 (price change) x 2 (price source) 2) 2 (processing resources) x 2 (price change) x 2 (price source) 3) 2 (price source) x 2 (rational)</td>
<td>1/3) Price fairness, price affect, inferred motive 2) Price fairness</td>
<td>1-3) 3 Scenario experiments (between-subjects) student sample (N=97, 257, 80)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The price source (human vs. non-human) moderated the effect of a price change on inferred motives and on affect, which in turn influenced perceived price (un)fairness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampani-er, Mazar, &amp; Ariely, 2007</td>
<td>Standard economic model/Zero price model</td>
<td>Retail/goods (candy)</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Zero price (free product)</td>
<td>5) 1 x 4 (prices: 0, 1, 13, 14 cents) 6) 2 (prices: 1&amp;14 vs. 0&amp;13 cents) x 2 (survey type: neutral vs. forced analysis)</td>
<td>5) Affect 6) Choice</td>
<td>6 Experiments (among 5/6 affect-related) (between-subjects) student sample (N=243, 200)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Zero priced goods seem to provide an intrinsic benefit that is most likely explained by the positive affect they evoke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsai &amp; Lee, 2007</td>
<td>Principle of dual entitlement</td>
<td>Service (fitness center)</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Price promotion difference between customers (i.e., friend)</td>
<td>2 (customer categories: present vs. prospective) x 2 (promotion discount inequality conditions: advantaged vs. disadvantaged)</td>
<td>Price un fairness, negative emotions, perceived value, purchase intentions</td>
<td>Scenario experiment (between-subjects) student sample (N=104)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Facing a disadvantaged price discount is deemed more unfair by present than prospective customers, while no difference in un fairness was found among the advantaged conditions. The effect of price unfairness on purchase intentions was mediated by negative emotions and perceived value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peine, Heitmann, &amp; Herrmann, 2009; Peine 2008</td>
<td>Appraisal theories of emotion/Affect evaluation and regulation theories</td>
<td>Service (airline, skiing) Goods (automotive)</td>
<td>Price affect</td>
<td>Service (airline, skiing) Goods (automotive)</td>
<td>1) 1 x 2 (relative price levels: high vs. low) 2) 1 x 3 (multi-dimensional price profile: ascending vs. flat vs. descending) 4) 3 (relative medium position) x 3 (quality of funding rate)</td>
<td>1/2) Perceived fairness, perceived value, PA, NA, P-WOM, purchase intention 4) Perceived value, perceived reward, PA, NA, likelihood of joining program, loyalty intentions</td>
<td>4 Experiments (among 1/2/4 affect-related) 1) within- and 2/4) between-subjects student samples (N=1533, 1628, 1366)</td>
<td>PA/NA</td>
<td>Different price stimuli (e.g., price increase, installment pattern) were found to elicit affective responses. Positive and negative price affect were found to mediate the effect of price cognitions on behavioral intentions and to act as standalone predictor of behavior beyond price cognitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai, Tang, &amp; Jia, 2009</td>
<td>Mood congruency/Mood regulation</td>
<td>Retail/goods (ball pen)</td>
<td>Price as cue</td>
<td>Price level</td>
<td>2 (price level: high vs. regular) x 2 (mood: positive vs. negative)</td>
<td>Perceived quality, purchase intention</td>
<td>Scenario experiment (between-subjects) student sample (N=100)</td>
<td>PA/NA</td>
<td>People in a positive mood showed a higher purchase intention for regularly priced products while customers in a negative mood indicated a higher likelihood to buy a high-priced product.</td>
</tr>
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<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Main theoretical approach(s)</td>
<td>Focus / area of research</td>
<td>Industry focus</td>
<td>Price information</td>
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<td>Dependent Variable(s)*</td>
<td>Methodological approach*</td>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>Main Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heussler, Huber, Meyer, Vollhardt, &amp; Ahlert, 2009</td>
<td>Equity theory Disappointment theory</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Retail/ goods (athletic shoes)</td>
<td>Price increase</td>
<td>1) 3 (magnitude of price increase) x 2 (emotions: positive vs. negative) 2) 3 (price fairness) x 2 (emotions: positive vs. negative)</td>
<td>1) Perceived price fairness 2) Willingness to pay</td>
<td>Scenario experiment (between-subjects) student sample (N=210)</td>
<td>PA/NA</td>
<td>Respondents in a positive emotional state perceived a price increase as fairer (particularly if the magnitude of the price increase was low) and were willing to pay more than persons in a negative emotional state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu &amp; Sy, 2009</td>
<td>Appraisal theories of emotion</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Retail/ goods (travel guide)</td>
<td>Price difference between customers (i.e., friend (disadvantaged iniquity)</td>
<td>1) x 4 (types of differential (Internet) pricing tactics: buyer identification vs. purchase quantity vs. purchase timing vs. multi-channel)</td>
<td>1) Price fairness, PA (index of joy, satisfaction, surprise), NA (index of anger, outrage, disappointment, fear) P-WOM, complaining, switching, repurchase intentions</td>
<td>1) Scenario experiment (between-subjects) student sample (N=367)</td>
<td>PA/NA</td>
<td>Perceived price fairness was found to differ between various price discrimination tactics and to be positively related to positive emotions and negatively to negative emotions. Both types of emotions were found to mediate the impact of fairness on behavioral intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielke, 2009</td>
<td>Appraisal theories of emotion</td>
<td>Price affect/ price image</td>
<td>Retail stores</td>
<td>Price level image</td>
<td>Price-level perception, price consciousness, price-quality inferences</td>
<td>Discrete emotion descriptors</td>
<td>Survey customer sample (N=291)</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Perceived store-price level predicted different price-related emotions like enjoyment, contempt, shame, distress, anger, fear and interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton, Keh, &amp; Alba, 2010</td>
<td>Individualism/collectivism Self-construal</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Retail/ goods (printer)</td>
<td>Price difference between customers</td>
<td>3) 3 (price comparison: lower vs. higher vs. equal) x 2 (referent: friend vs. stranger) x 2 (culture: Chinese vs. U.S.)</td>
<td>3) Price fairness, emotions (angry, ashamed), repurchase intention</td>
<td>4 Scenario experiments (among only Study 3 emotion-related (between-subjects) student sample (N=270)</td>
<td>DE (shame, anger)</td>
<td>Collectivist consumers felt more intense shame when they paid a higher (versus lower) price compared to a friend (i.e., in-group) than when compared to a stranger (i.e., out-group) while no such effect appeared among the individualistic consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsiros &amp; Hardesty, 2010</td>
<td>Adaptation-level theory Behavioral decision theory</td>
<td>Price promotion/ framing</td>
<td>Retail/ goods (personal digital assistant PDA)</td>
<td>Pricing formats (SDD vs. HI-LO)</td>
<td>1) x 2 (price format: steadily decreasing discounting [SDD] vs. high-low [HI-LO] pricing)</td>
<td>1) Future price expectations, anticipated inaction regret, purchase likelihood, store and brand image</td>
<td>1) Scenario experiment student sample (N=463)</td>
<td>DE (regret)</td>
<td>SDD tactics produced higher anticipated inaction regret than HI-LO pricing. Anticipated inaction regret increased the likelihood to purchase and also mediated the effect of future price expectations on purchase likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xia, Kukar-Kinney, &amp; Monroe, 2010</td>
<td>Fairness heuristic theory</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Retail/ goods (CD, DVD, MP3 player)</td>
<td>Price promotions</td>
<td>1/2) 2 (effort: high vs. low) x 2 (outcome: promotion granted vs. denied) 3/4) 1 x 3 (effort: high vs. moderate vs. low)</td>
<td>1/2) Price fairness 3/4) Price fairness, promotion fairness, feeling of entitlement, inferred retailer's motive</td>
<td>4 Scenario experiments (between-subjects) student sample (N=97, 90, 186, 116)</td>
<td>DE (entitlement)</td>
<td>Perceived effort triggered intense feelings of entitlement for a price promotion. The more entitled people felt, the less favorably the promotion and price fairness was perceived (the latter was n.s. in Study 4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Main theoretical approach(s)</th>
<th>Focus / area of research</th>
<th>Industry focus</th>
<th>Price information</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)*</th>
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<th>Conceptualization</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xia &amp; Monroe, 2010</td>
<td>Transaction value Social comparison theory Hedonic editing principle of mental accounting</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Retail/goods (DVD player)</td>
<td>Price difference (between customers, sellers, own prices encountered)</td>
<td>1) 1 x 3 (price difference: higher vs. lower vs. equal) x 3 (reference: other customer (friend), other seller, self) 2) 1 x 2 (price paid: same vs. lower than reference party) 3) 6 sets of price comparison sequences</td>
<td>1/2/3) Price fairness, perceived transaction value, positive emotions, negative emotions, purchase intention, WOM intention</td>
<td>1-3) 3 Scenario experiments (between-subjects) student sample (N=139, 51, 148)</td>
<td>PA/NA</td>
<td>A price disadvantage elicited higher negative and lower positive emotions than advantaged or equal pricing. When the price of another customer served as reference, positive and negative emotions were directionally higher in the advantaged than equal pricing condition (although n.s.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbrich, 2011</td>
<td>Appraisal theories of emotion Social comparison theory Equity theory</td>
<td>Price affect</td>
<td>Retail goods (coat, personal shopping experience)</td>
<td>Price difference between customers (i.e., fellow student) (advantaged inequity)</td>
<td>1/2/3) 1) Emotions (i.e., happiness, gratitude, pride, pity, outrage, guilt, malicious joy), customer reactions (i.e., satisfaction, repurchase, WOM referral, WOM activity)</td>
<td>1) Scenario experiment (between-subjects) student sample (N=272) 2) field study using critical incident recall method student sample (N=261)</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Different discrete positive and negative emotions when being price advantaged were found to vary by agency and relationship quality. The discrete positive emotions exerted a distinct effect on behavioral consequences, while only pity was found to affect consumer responses among the negative emotions. Full mediation by emotions was found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu, Liu, &amp; Wang, 2011</td>
<td>Social justice theory Transaction utility theory Social comparison theory</td>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>Service (fitness center, restaurant)</td>
<td>Price difference between customers</td>
<td>1) 5 (discriminating base) x 2 (inequity: advantaged vs. disadvantaged) 2) 5 (discriminating base) x 2 (disclosure timing: pre- vs. post-purchase) 1) Negative emotions, perceived fairness, internal reference price, store choice 2) Negative emotions</td>
<td>1/2) 2 Scenario experiments (between-subjects) student sample (N=345, 351)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Negative emotions were higher when being price disadvantaged than advantaged for most forms of price discrimination. Post-purchase disclosure of a price disadvantage elicited more negative emotions than pre-purchase disclosure for coupon and quantity discounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numbers [e.g., 2]) indicate the number of the study in the respective paper that is relevant to this thesis (i.e., that investigates affective price phenomena) and hence is outlined in the table.

Note. A = Affect; NA = Negative Affect; PA = Positive Affect; DE = Discrete Emotions; WOM = Word of mouth.
### Appendix II: Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations (Study 1 to 4)

#### Table 24: Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 negative self-conscious emotions&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 angry</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 proud</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 grateful</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 complaining</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 positive word of mouth</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 negative word of mouth</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 repurchase</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 77-78.*  
All scales ranged from 0 to 6.  
<sup>a</sup> Multi-items encompassing the respective scale were averaged.  
**Bold** indicates bivariate correlations that were significant at p < .05 (two-tailed).
Table 25: Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81-83.
all scales ranged from 0 to 6, except for constructs with the superscript that ranged from -3 to +3.
*multi-items encompassing the respective scale were averaged.
**bold indicates bivariate correlations that were significant at p < .05 (two-tailed).
Table 26: Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 angry at the service provider</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 negative self-conscious emotions$^a$</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 proud</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 grateful to the service provider</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pity</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 malicious pleasure</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 complaining</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 positive word of mouth</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 negative word of mouth</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 repurchase</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 motive consistency$^{1,a}$</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 RISC$^{1,a}$</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 185-191$.

all scales ranged from 0 to 6, except for constructs with the superscript $^1$ that ranged from -3 to +3.

$^a$ multi-items encompassing the respective scale were averaged.

**bold** indicates bivariate correlations that were significant at $p < .05$ (two-tailed).
Table 27: Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations (Study 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative self-conscious emotions(^a)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at the service provider</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to the service provider</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complaining</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive word of mouth</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative word of mouth</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repurchase</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motive consistency(^1,(^a)</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISC(^1,(^a)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 97-100.
all scales ranged from 0 to 6, except for constructs with the superscript \(^1\) that ranged from -3 to +3.
\(^a\) multi-items encompassing the respective scale were averaged.
bold indicates bivariate correlations that were significant at \(p < .05\) (two-tailed).
Appendix III: Regression and bootstrap results of mediation models (Study 3)

Table 28: Regression and bootstrap results of multiple mediation model on complaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y: Complaining</th>
<th>a path</th>
<th>b path</th>
<th>Product of Coeff. (ab path)</th>
<th>Bootstrapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-M6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-conscious NE</td>
<td>.9121</td>
<td>.0171</td>
<td>-.0557</td>
<td>.6109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>-1.2604</td>
<td>.0100</td>
<td>.6078</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.3308</td>
<td>.1172</td>
<td>.3067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>2.0932</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.2498</td>
<td>.0269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>-.4193</td>
<td>.4163</td>
<td>-.1067</td>
<td>.1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>.0987</td>
<td>.7950</td>
<td>.0251</td>
<td>.8159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X:            |       |        |       |      |       |       |      |                  |                 |                  |                  |
|               | Coeff. | p      | Coeff. | p      | Coeff. | p     |      |                  |                 |                  |                  |
| fairness x agency | -1.0503 | .0822  | .1955  | .7303  | -      | -     |      |                  |                 |                  |                  |
| C1; C2:       |        |        |        |      |        |       |      |                  |                 |                  |                  |
| fairness      | -      | -      | -      | -     | -0.999 | .8352 |      |                  |                 |                  |                  |
| agency        | -      | -      | -      | -     | -0.0480 | .9128 |      |                  |                 |                  |                  |

Note. Bold indicates significant results at \( p < .10 \) and BCa CI > 90%.

Coeff. = unstandardized regression coefficients;
Adj. \( R^2 \) = Adjusted \( R^2 \) (model summary of full DV model);
BCa CI = Bias Corrected and Accelerated Confidence Intervals;
Data = indirect effect estimates of the original sample;
Boot = mean of indirect effect estimates across all bootstrap samples;
SE = standard deviation of the bootstrap estimates of the indirect effect;
section 'Covariates' (C1; C2) provides partial effect of control variables on DV.
Table 29: Regression and bootstrap results of multiple mediation model on P-WOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Y_2$: Positive word of mouth</th>
<th>$M_{r-M_e}$</th>
<th>Bootstrapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Adj. R^2 = .339; n = 189$</td>
<td>$F(9, 179) = 11.723; p &lt; .001$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$ path</td>
<td>$b$ path</td>
<td>Product of Coeff. ($ab$ path)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-conscious NE</td>
<td>.9121</td>
<td>.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>-1.2604</td>
<td>.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.3308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>2.0932</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>-.4193</td>
<td>.4163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>.0987</td>
<td>.7950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X$: Total Effect ($c$ path) | Direct Effect ($c'$ path) | Covariates
| Coeff. | $p$ | Coeff. | $p$ | Coeff. | $p$ |
| fairness x agency | .6647 | .1174 | -.1670 | .7010 | - | - |

$C_1$: $C_2$:
| fairness | - | - | - | - | .8446 | .0228 |
| agency | - | - | - | - | -.3124 | .3531 |

Note. **bold** indicates significant results at $p < .10$ and BCa CI > 90%;

$Coef.$ = unstandardized regression coefficients;

$Adj. R^2$ = Adjusted $R^2$ (model summary of full DV model);

BCa CI = Bias Corrected and Accelerated Confidence Intervals;

Data = indirect effect estimates of the original sample;

Boot = mean of indirect effect estimates across all bootstrap samples;

$SE$ = standard deviation of the bootstrap estimates of the indirect effect;

section 'Covariates' ($C_1$: $C_2$) provides partial effect of control variables on DV.
Table 30: Regression and bootstrap results of multiple mediation model on N-WOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y: Negative word of mouth</th>
<th>M&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;-M&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Bootstrapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product of Coeff. (ab path)</td>
<td>BCa 95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Boot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;-M&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-conscious NE</td>
<td>.9121</td>
<td>.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>-1.2604</td>
<td>.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.3308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>2.0932</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>-.4193</td>
<td>.4163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>.0987</td>
<td>.7950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X:</th>
<th>Total Effect (c path)</th>
<th>Direct Effect (c' path)</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness x agency</td>
<td>-1.7352</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>-.7013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C<sub>1</sub>; C<sub>2</sub>:

| fairness                  | -       | -     | -       | -     | .0312  | .9393 |
| agency                    | -       | -     | -       | -     | .7685  | .0411 |

Note. **bold** indicates significant results at p < .10 and BCa CI > 90%;

*Coeff.* = unstandardized regression coefficients;

*Adj. R²* = Adjusted R² (model summary of full DV model);

*BCa CI* = Bias Corrected and Accelerated Confidence Intervals;

*Data* = indirect effect estimates of the original sample;

*Boot* = mean of indirect effect estimates across all bootstrap samples;

*SE* = standard deviation of the bootstrap estimates of the indirect effect;

*section 'Covariates' (C<sub>1</sub>; C<sub>2</sub>) provides partial effect of control variables on DV.*
### Table 31: Regression and bootstrap results of multiple mediation model on repurchase

**Y**: Repurchase  
*Adj. $R^2 = .403$; n = 188*  
*F*(9, 178) = 15.013; $p < .001*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M_1$-$M_2$:</th>
<th>$a$ path</th>
<th></th>
<th>$b$ path</th>
<th></th>
<th>Product of Coeff. ($ab$ path)</th>
<th>Bootstrapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Boot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-conscious NE</td>
<td>.8946</td>
<td>.0199</td>
<td>.1339</td>
<td>.1390</td>
<td>.1198 .1150 .1030</td>
<td>.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry at SP</td>
<td>-1.3127</td>
<td>.0073</td>
<td>-2.649</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0716 .0757 .0995</td>
<td>-0.0366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>.4204</td>
<td>.3087</td>
<td>.1702</td>
<td>.0728</td>
<td>.1479 .1436 .2545</td>
<td>-0.0396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful to SP</td>
<td>2.1467</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0689</td>
<td>.4584</td>
<td>.0992 .0089 .0411</td>
<td>-0.0396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pity</td>
<td>-0.4249</td>
<td>.4126</td>
<td>-0.0216</td>
<td>.7371</td>
<td>-0.0021 .0027 .0373</td>
<td>-0.1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious pleasure</td>
<td>.0442</td>
<td>.9067</td>
<td>-0.0483</td>
<td>.5916</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X$:</th>
<th>Total Effect ($c$ path)</th>
<th>Direct Effect ($c'$ path)</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness x agency</td>
<td>1.1728</td>
<td>.0093</td>
<td>.4787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C1; C2:**  
fairness  
agency

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Bold indicates significant results at $p < .10$ and BCa CI > 90%;  
$Coeff.$ = unstandardized regression coefficients;  
Adj. $R^2$ = Adjusted $R^2$ (model summary of full DV model);  
BCa CI = Bias Corrected and Accelerated Confidence Intervals;  
$Data$ = indirect effect estimates of the original sample;  
$Boot$ = mean of indirect effect estimates across all bootstrap samples;  
$SE$ = standard deviation of the bootstrap estimates of the indirect effect;  
section 'Covariates' ($C_1; C_2$) provides partial effect of control variables on DV.
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