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Previous research on price changes has focused on the analysis of price increases on the basis of rational processes. This paper focuses on the examination of the moderating role of emotions on the relationship between the magnitude of price increases and perceived price fairness. In addition, we analyze the effect of perceived price fairness and willingness to pay in consideration of the moderating influence of emotions. The empirical results demonstrate that emotions have the potential to compensate for the negative impact of price increases on perceived price fairness and the willingness to pay.
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The neglected integration of emotional factors into the information processing is surprising. Churchill and Surprenant (1982) maintain that in some situations cognitive aspects as moderator variables are of less importance than are emotional aspects. Empirical support is given by Westbrook and Oliver (1987). Their research examined the hypothesis that emotional components may even dominate cognitive components. In this context, an academic discussion of the emotional aspects of the customer within the behavioral pricing literature is valuable.

Therefore, this article enhances the understanding of situations in which consumers evaluate price increases as fair. Thus, in study 1 we assess price increases in the context of positive and negative emotions, and identify conditions in which a price increase may be considered unfair. The phrasing of our hypotheses is based on equity theory (Adams 1965; Walster, Walster and Berscheid 1978).

In a second study we intend to confirm the positive relationship between perceived price fairness and the willingness to pay, as did an earlier study by Bolton, Warlop, and Alba (1999). However, our study considers interaction effects due to emotions as well.

The article is divided as follows: (1) Hypotheses are derived from the theoretical background of how price increases affect perceived price fairness, and for this we review literature on equity theory and dual entitlement principle. (2) We conduct two experiments to confirm the stated hypotheses. (3) The results of the ANOVA provide implications to realize “successful” price increases and combine price actions with corporate communications.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Relationship between the magnitude of price increases and perceived price fairness

Price fairness research is based on the idea that consumers evaluate prices as fair or not fair, rather than evaluating prices rationally. Fairness is achieved if there is a balance between the contributions individuals make and the outcomes (rewards) they receive. Relative to those of other persons (Adams 1965), individuals seek distributive equity. Over the last ten years, several authors have focused on price fairness issues (Campbell 1999; Bolton, Warlop and Alba 2003; Xia, Monroe and Cox 2004). Kahnemann, Knetsch and Thaler (1986a) explain that judgments on fairness neither refer to cost-plus considerations nor to ask-and-bid relations. Rather, the profit could be identified as a critical influencing factor of perceived price fairness. Consequently, price fairness is determined by economic and psychosocial components (Maxwell 1995; Campbell 1999).

In marketing literature the explanation of fairness judgments is usually based on equity theory (Huppertz, Arenson and Evans 1978; Dickson and Kalaparakal 1994; Maxwell 1995). According to equity theory, fairness results from the means of decisions and allocations (Adams 1965; Walster, Walster and Berscheid 1978). The basic question, answered by equity theory, addresses what individuals perceive as fair and how they react to unfair relations. Judgments are based on a precise concept of exchange proportion-
ality, the equity function (Adams 1965), which opposes outcomes to inputs of exchange partners. Walster, Berscheid and Walster (1973) extend the theory by explaining that inputs can be allocated by positive inputs (assets) and negative inputs (liabilities). While positive inputs enable the exchange partner to achieve positive outcome, negative input enables to achieve negative outcome (Walster, Berscheid and Walster 1973). If input-outcome-relations do not differ significantly, the individual perceives equity or fairness. The perception of inequity results from an imbalance of the equity function. Adams (1965) claims that outcomes and inputs are subjective perceived values. Therefore, individuals evaluate input and outcome differently.

In the context of reactions to price increases, two equations play a major role: (1) a comparison of input-outcome relations before and (2) a comparison of input-outcome relations after the price increase (Homburg, Hoyer and Koschate 2005).

The higher the increase in price (price as input variable), the stronger the imbalances of the equity equation will be. We assume that the equity balance is balanced before the increase in price. Consequently, the stronger the imbalance of the equations after the increase in price, the stronger the decrease in perceived price fairness. Extreme price increases result in perceived inequity (Maxwell 1995). On the basis of this discussion we propose the following basic hypothesis:

**H1:** The higher the magnitude of price increase, the lower the perceived price fairness.

**Moderating effects of emotions on the relationship between price increases and perceived price fairness**

Marketing literature on price fairness has, to date, concentrated on the cognitive influencing factors (Xia, Monroe and Cox 2004). In their comprehensive study, Bolton, Warlop and Alba (2003) explore a variety of factors that contribute to consumer perception of price fairness.

The authors investigated the role of three reference points—past prices, competitor prices, and costs—on price fairness judgments (Bolton, Warlop and Alba 2003). Using two studies, Campbell (1999) confirms the influence of the inferred motive for a firm’s price increase in perceptions of price fairness. The data analysis indicates a positive impact on price fairness (Campbell 1999). However, the role of emotions within the cognitive information processing has been neglected by the literature so far. Also, the study of Kalaparakal, Dickson and Urbany (1991), which identifies a positive relationship between the reputation of a company and the perceived price fairness, did not control for emotions. Considering Izard’s (1981) basic emotions, O’Neill and Lambert (2001) explore the influence of emotions on several price perceptions constructs and define the expression “price affect.” The authors analyze the relationships between price quality, internal reference prices, price consciousness, and willingness to pay, and integrate the emotions “surprise” and “happiness” in their model.

This neglect of attention to emotion is surprising since, for decades, literature on emotion has confirmed that individuals tend to adapt perceptions according to their needs, wishes, and goals (Izard 1981; Frijda 1988). Izard (1981) has revised the relationship between emotion and cognition. Several authors agree on this interaction, and even more importantly, the interaction’s impact on consumers’ perceptions (Forgas 2001; Adolphs and Damasio 2001; Harmon-Jones 2001; LeDoux 1998; Zajonc 1980).

Emotions are also associated with equity theory. As a powerful social-psychological theory, equity theory can shed light onto the subjective view of fairness. Equity theory claims that the comparison processes among buyers lead to the idea that their rewards should be proportional to their investments (Homans 1961). Emotions may lead to the revaluation of equity. Provided that there are constant outcomes, a price increase leads to cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1962). This is caused by the difference of the input-outcome relations before and after the price increase. Based on the argument of Zajonc (1980) and LeDoux (1998), which states that emotion and cognition are interrelated, it can be concluded that the cognitive inconsistency of inputs and outcomes has to interact with emotions. Emotions may influence the perceptions of the inputs and the outcomes, as well as the proportion of both inputs and outcomes to the other.

Understanding inputs and outcomes as subjective elements (Homburg, Hoyer and Koschate 2005), an acceptance of a price increase may be higher in the context of positive emotions. Emotions will influence perceived price fairness such that individuals confronted with positive emotions will adapt their inequity to a greater degree than individuals confronted with negative emotions. From an equity theory perspective, that means that a price increase leads to a raised input for the consumer, and to a reduced input-outcome relation. In this case positive emotions initiate a reinterpretation of the input- and outcome-variables, which in turn balance the input-outcome equation. In contrast to positive emotions, negative emotions cannot equalize the equity equation.

In summary, research based on the equity theory indicates that people make inferences about emotions, and that whether the emotion is positive or negative influences the perceptions of input-outcome relation before and after the price increase. We extend this research and suggest that the factor of emotion is likely to provide insights as to when a price increase is likely to be perceived as fair or unfair. The perception of the price increase will depend on the magnitude to which the consumer evaluates the new input-outcome relation in the context of emotion. Especially in buying decisions of high-involvement and branded products, Zeitlin and Westwood (1986) demonstrate that emotions, prices, and their individual perception play major roles.

Based on the consideration of emotions as influencing factor of the equity theory, we add to the literature by proposing that positive and negative emotions are another factor that influences perception of price fairness.

**H2:** Emotions moderate the relationship between the magnitude of a price increase and the perception of price fairness. Positive emotions increase the perception of price fairness more than negative do emotions.

**Price fairness and willingness to pay**

To quantify willingness to pay Thaler (1985) states that fairness is the “most important factor in determining p” (Thaler 1985, 205). Willingness to pay is defined as the maximum amount of money a customer is willing to pay for a product or a service (Winer 1985). Therefore, the construct provides a good measure of the value in monetary units (Goldman, Leland and Sibley 1984). To theoretically justify the nature of the relationship between price fairness and willingness to pay, we turn to Maxwell (2002), whose study determined that fairness of price practices influences attitude towards both a seller and willingness to pay. In general, it is feasible to maintain that customers who perceive a price increase as fair are more willing to accept a higher price (Maxwell 2002).

An unexpected price increase is likely to lead consumer considerations about why the firm raised the price. Consistent with Kahnemann, Knetsch and Thaler (1986b), price increases will be perceived as fair if the company’s profit stays constant. To evaluate
TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>IAPS-No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pleasure rating Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Arousal rating Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7230</td>
<td>Banquet</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5830</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>Father and baby</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4220</td>
<td>Surfer</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8030</td>
<td>Ski jumping</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4533</td>
<td>Beach Volleyball</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4660</td>
<td>Kiss</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8080</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Puppies</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>Mother and baby</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>Married couple</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9180</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9160</td>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Pit Bull</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9040</td>
<td>Famished dog</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>Swollen eyes</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9050</td>
<td>Plane crash</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6230</td>
<td>Revolver</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>Baby with tumor</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9140</td>
<td>Dead cow</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9250</td>
<td>War victim</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3230</td>
<td>AIDS patient</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderating effects of emotions on the relationship between perceived price fairness and willingness to pay

Loomes and Sudgen (1986) developed the disappointment theory, which integrates the expected utility model with emotions. The disappointment theory states that the perceived product value depends on the difference between the real value and the expected value. Loomes and Sudgen (1986) refer to the specific emotion function \( D(u(x) - u(\bar{X})) \), with \( u(x) \) as the perceived value and \( u(\bar{X}) \) as the expected value, based on experience. Consistent with the expected value theory, we assume that consumers intend to maximize their utility. Because the intensity of emotions increases the higher the intercept, the authors conclude that the function is convex for positive values of \( u(x) - u(\bar{X}) \) and concave for negative values of \( u(x) - u(\bar{X}) \). Consequently, the intensity of emotions rises for extreme differences between the expected value and the perceived value (Loomes Sudgen 1986). Referring to the emotion function of Loomes and Sudgen (1986), positive emotions may increase the willingness to pay, while negative emotions disproportionately decrease the willingness to pay.

**H4:** Emotions moderate the relationship between the perception of price fairness and the willingness to pay. Positive emotions increase the willingness to pay, whereas negative emotions decrease the willingness to pay.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Sample design and experimental procedure**

Two studies were conducted to test these hypotheses. The sample was comprised of 210 students from a German university. The average age of the participants was 26.7 years, and the sample included 134 men and 76 women. The stimuli consisted of written scenarios describing a sports shoe retailer that realized to increase prices. Laurent and Kapferer (1985) and Zaichkowsky (1985) identified athletic shoes as a high-involvement product and tested them within several experimental designs (Laurent and Kapferer 1985; Zaichkowsky 1985). The basic scenario described a situation of buying athletic shoes.

We did not pay incentives to participants. While it is common practice in experimental economics to employ financial incentives to increase performance, we doubt that such a practice is worth the
effort in our context (Hertwig and Ortmann 2001). Decision within our experiments cannot be evaluated in terms of right or wrong and thus, give no basis for performance-oriented payments.

In all studies we used a 3x2 between subjects designs (Hair et al. 2007). In order to control confounding variables, we assigned subjects to the experimental groups in a randomized way (Homburg, Hoyer and Koschatz 2005).

**STUDY 1**

Study 1 uses a 3x2 between subject design, crossing the magnitude of a price increase and emotions (positive, negative). The dependent measure was the perceived price fairness.

The pricing literature offers little guidance when it comes to manipulating price levels. The price increase was changed at three levels. Thus, to pretest the level of price increases we conducted a Vickrey auction (Vickrey 1961). Based on a starting price of 80, the three proper levels of price increase were 5 (6.25%), 15 (18.75%) and 20 (25%).

The experimental factors of emotion were manipulated before describing the scenarios and collecting the data. There are several methods to manipulate emotions (Gerrards-Hesse, Spies and Hesse 1994; Lang, Bradley and Cuthbert 1997). We used the International Affective Picture System (IAPS) by Lang et al. (1988). The success of IAPS was confirmed in several studies (Bradley and Lang 1994; Lang, Bradley and Cuthbert 1997). Positive and negative emotions were manipulated by 12 pictures each. The pictures used are presented in Table 1.

Participants completed manipulation checks. To measure emotions, we used the PAD (Pleasure-arousal-dominance) scale developed by Mehrabian and Russel (1974), which has been used by marketing scholars to assess emotional response to interpersonal aspects of shopping (Izard 1981; Plutchik 1989; Mehrabian and Russel 1984). The scale contains 18 semantic differential items, six each of pleasure, arousal, and dominance.

The manipulation in experimental groups perceiving positive and negative emotions was confirmed by the PAD-scale. Subjects confronted with positive pictures reported more positive emotions (\(\text{Mean}_{\text{pos. emotion}}=4.35\)) than did subjects to whom we presented negative pictures (\(\text{Mean}_{\text{neg. emotion}}=3.69\)). A pairwise t test on the means of emotion measure between the two scenarios was large in the intended direction (t=8.23; p<.001). The pretest to measure the level of price increases served as a manipulation check. The use of a pretest study is adopted when it is difficult to obtain a manipulation check within the main study (Perdue and Summer 1986).

After reading through one scenario, subjects provided fairness evaluations. Consistent with Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler (1986) and Maxwell (1995), we measured price fairness by using a four-item scale from 1 ("fully agree") to 7 ("fully disagree"). The midpoint of the scales are described as neither. Scales were: "The price is fair," "The price increase of the shoe is appropriate." "All consumers were treated fairly," and "Price calculation of the athletic shoe is understandable." The scale had an acceptable Cronbach reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha=.84). Also, exploratory factor analysis of the scale returned a single factor solution.

It was hypothesized that participants will perceive price increases as more fair in a scenario with positive emotions. Results strongly support this hypothesis. In order to test the significance of the differences a 3x2 ANOVA using the fairness as dependent measure revealed the desired main effect of the price increase (F=91.64; p<.001). Also, the interaction effect, which means that emotions moderate the main effect, can be confirmed (F=7.137; p=.012). Results indicate that the higher the price increase; the less important are emotions as influencing factors.

As well, the second main effect is tested significantly (F=9.993; p<.000). This means that subjects find the price increase in the positive emotion scenario to be more fair than in the negative emotion scenario. However, in the context of low price increases, emotions are even more relevant. This effect is presented in Figure 1. Surprisingly, results indicate that positive emotions have a greater impact in price fairness than do negative emotions.

**STUDY 2**

Study 2 examined different levels of price fairness as the independent variable. Experiment 2 assessed the impact on the willingness to pay (Hypothesis H3). Additionally, we test hypothesis H4, which maintains that emotions mediate the relationships between the magnitude of price fairness and the willingness to pay (Hypothesis H4). Study 2 involved a 3x2-between subject design. Before measuring the willingness to pay, subjects were confronted with a similar scenario in the shoe store, as used in study 1. The experimental groups with different emotions (\(\text{Mean}_{\text{positive emotion}}/>\text{Mean}_{\text{negative emotion}}\)) were manipulated in terms of three different levels of price fairness.

The levels of price fairness are positive inequity, negative inequity, and perceived equity. Thus, the scenarios read as follows: “To buy a athletic shoe, you visit a store shop. A friend has recommended a certain shoe. But the price of the show has increased. The salesperson, who is a friend of yours, explains that the company raised the prices of their shoes due to increased R&D and production costs”. Because the marketing literature does not provide an appropriate manipulation procedure, we manipulated the scenario using Campbell’s (1999) inferred motive for price increases for a firm’s price increase. When participants inferred that the company had a negative motive for the price increase, the increase was perceived as less fair than the same increase when consumers inferred that the company has a positive motive (e.g., rising production costs) (Campbell 1999). Therefore, the reason for the price increase varied between three different groups: In one group the price increase was justified by rising production costs. Consequently, participants should perceive the price increase as fair (equity). When the price stays the same despite rising production costs, we expected the perception of fair prices (positive inequity). When the salesperson does not explain the price increase, the price increase shifts the input-output relation of the equity function to the disadvantage of the producer. Negative inequity would be the consequence (Campbell 1999). We used the same measurement of price fairness as in the first experiment. Positive and negative emotions were manipulated using IAPS-pictures. Subjects were confronted with the same type of emotions as in the first experiment. These pictures guaranteed a well-founded manipulation. The results of the PAD—Measurement of Mehrabian and Russel (1984) supported this approach.

Willingness to pay was measured using the card method (Hoehvennagel 1996). The subjects were given a certain number of cards with prices printed on them. Subjects are instructed to choose the card of the highest price they were willing to pay (MitchellCarson 1989). Even if the presentation of cards restricts the choices, the procedure eliminates anchoring-effects (Hoehvennagel 1996). At the same time, the presentation of prices is easily implemented. Participants can chose between different cards on a scale from 25 to 150. Results of the measurements indicated that prices range from 45 to 145. Ignoring the manipulations, the mean price of the athletic shoe was about 87.\(\text{Mean}_{\text{WTP}}=86.59\).

The same items used in the first interviews were used to measure the price fairness (Cronbach’s Alpha=.93). The item-to-total correlation gives no reason to skip an item. The measurement
of emotions reveals a high difference between positive and negative emotions (t=7.63; p<.001).

The manipulation checks do not justify the differentiation in equity, positive inequity, and negative inequity. Positive inequity and equity do not provide a significantly different mean value (t Positive InequityEquity =1.53). Therefore, we use a 2x2-between subject design and limit the experiment to negative inequity and positive inequity. Subjects of the "negative inequity" scenario (Mean Negative Inequity=3.753) perceive the price increase as more unfair than do the subjects of the "positive inequity"-scenario (Mean Positive Equity=5.18).

Hypotheses H3 and H4 were tested by means of a 2x2-ANOVA with willingness to pay as dependent variable. Both main effects were significant. In terms of the results for willingness to pay, there was a main effect for emotion (F=7.387; p<.007). Participants in the positive emotion condition were willing to pay a higher price than participants in a negative emotion condition. The positive relationship between price fairness and willingness to pay was also tested significantly, meaning that participants who perceive price increases as fair are willing to pay more (F=12.264; p<.001). However, the interaction effect cannot be confirmed.

**IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH**

This is an exploratory study. Thus, there are few strong conclusions, and many limitations. Our study extends previous research in the area of price fairness research by investigating how emotions moderate the relationship between perceived price fairness and consumer’s willingness to pay. The implementation of price increases is easier if price increases are perceived as fair. Our paper indicates the impact of emotions on the relationship between the magnitude of price increases and the perception of price fairness. We add emotion as an important element of price fairness perceptions that accompany the cognition considerations of equity theory. It is logical, therefore, to speculate about the nature of the relationship between emotions and price fairness. However, our study focused on positive and negative emotions. Further research should extend the spectrum of emotions and investigate whether positive and negative emotions compensate each other or negative emotions dominate positive emotions, as stated by Izard (1981). In addition, we did not measure the negative emotions caused by the price increase itself.

As with any methodology, there are limitations associated with experimental research. The results refer to a limited data set. Additionally, the use of the athletic shoe scenarios is not complex enough to generalize the findings. Consequently, future research should explore the relationship between emotion and price for other consumer groups and buying situations.

Our results provide explanations for irrational behavior of consumers. Cognitive behavioral theories have to consider emotional aspects. This article supports the rising attention of marketing literature towards emotions because cognitive theories are revealed to be limited in explaining consumer behavior. Price judgments are complex and intrapersonal procedures. Emotions and emotion-induced actions cannot, therefore, be neglected. The integration of emotions revalues the prognosis of pricing actions and consumer behavior.

With regard to the moderating effect of emotions in the impact of price increases on the consumer’s willingness to pay, our study indicates that a 20% increase in price can be absorbed by positive emotions. The impact of positive emotions declines for higher price increases. Hence, firms should consider emotional and cognitive aspects within their price measures. Advertising needs to pay more attention to the role of emotions in all aspects of marketing (O’Neill and Lambert 2001). Advertising currently relies on repetitions, while strong emotions are avoided. Feelings of delight, joy, sympathy, and happiness should be reflected in the store appearance. Especially pictures have an impact in this concern.
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