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ABSTRACT
This paper identifies and analyzes the causes customers ascribe to low prices in discount stores. Such causes are inferior product quality, unfair relations to employees and suppliers, and perceptions of being a mainstream supermarket (Kaas 1994). Furthermore, discount retailers buy large quantities of exclusive private label products that companies can influence customer perceptions, emotions, and shopping intentions by changing specific attributions to low prices.

INTRODUCTION
Grocery discounters have experienced rising market shares in many European countries (Colla 2003; Deller snyder et al. 2007), and they are also successful in the US (Brown and Bury 2008; Springer 2008). Discounters offer continuously low prices and many products are cheaper than in stores from other formats (Rondán Cataluña et al. 2005; Wood and Pearson 2006).

Although discounters have this price advantage, they attract certain customers while others avoid these stores. Attribution theory (Heider 1958; Kelley 1973; Kelley and Michela 1980) offers an explanation for this observation, as customers can ascribe different causes to low prices in discount stores. Customers might, for example, believe that discount stores offer lower prices than supermarkets because they compromise product quality. Other causes might be unfair relations to employees and suppliers, reasons related to customers (profit waiver), an efficient business model, and psychological tricks in price communication.

Even though attribution theory is used in many different marketing contexts (Folkes 1988; Mizerski et al. 1979), attributions to low prices are not analyzed systematically. This paper closes this gap by analyzing attributions to low prices in grocery retailing. It identifies the positive and negative causes customers ascribe to lower prices in discount stores and demonstrates how the diverse attributions impact perceptions, emotions, and behavioral intentions to buy in discount stores. The results underline that each attribution type has specific effects on certain dependent variables. The study has important implications, as it shows that companies can influence customer perceptions, emotions, and shopping intentions by changing specific attributions to low prices.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE ANALYSIS
Attribution theory constitutes the theoretical framework of this study (Heider 1958; Kelley 1973; Kelley and Michela 1980). This theory concerns the way in which individuals assign causes to observed actions or events. According to Folkes (1988), “attribution is concerned with all aspects of inference: how people arrive at causal inferences, what sort of inferences they make, and what the consequences of these inferences are”. In marketing and consumer behavior literature, many applications of this theory exist (Folkes 1988; Mizerski et al. 1979).

However, the literature does not provide many applications of attribution theory in price-related contexts. One research stream investigates attributions regarding price promotions with discount claims. Lichtenstein et al. (1989) found that attributions concerning the advertiser’s motives for a price discount offer have a significant effect on the consumers’ evaluations of the offer. Burton et al. (1994) observed that the extent of retailer and product attributions regarding a discount claim depends on the price positioning of the retailer. They also demonstrated that attributions to the retailer have a positive effect on different psychological and behavioral variables (perceived value, attitude toward the ad, shopping intentions) while product attributions have a negative effect. Other researchers investigated internal (customer) or external attributions with regard to price deals and satisfaction with rebate shopping experiences (Hunt et al. 1995; Schindler 1989, 1998).

A second research stream analyzes attributions to price increases. Several researchers argue that the inferred motives for a price increase have an impact on the perceived price fairness (Campbell 1999; Kahneman et al. 1986). Vaidyanathan and Aggarwal (2003) apply attribution theory to investigate the conditions under which even cost-justified price increases are perceived as unfair. They demonstrate that a cost-justified price increase is perceived as less fair when the locus of causality is internal to the seller and/or when the price increase is within the volitional control of the respective company.

The literature analysis illustrates that most applications of attribution theory are related to person (retailer) vs. stimulus (product) and circumstance (situational) or internal (customer) vs. external (other causes) attributions. In contrast to these studies, the present research analyzes attributions on a less abstract level. The aim of this study is to identify concrete causes to which customers attribute low prices in discount stores, and to analyze their impact on store perceptions, emotions, and shopping intentions. It is noteworthy that the present paper also differs from previous studies in that it focuses on attributions regarding the price level of a store instead of a single product, promotion or price increase.

ATRIBUTIONS TO LOW PRICES IN DISCOUNT STORES
Before developing hypotheses about the impact of attributions to low prices in discount stores, the nature of such attributions should be discussed.

Product-related attributions exist if customers attribute a discount store’s low prices to the inferior quality of the assortment. These attributions might be the consequence of price-quality inferences, where customers associate higher prices with better quality. Many empirical studies have identified such inferences (Völckner and Hofmann 2007). The inferior quality attribution is not necessarily limited to search and experience qualities, such as color or taste. Especially concerns about credence qualities might prove relevant in price-quality inferences for food products. Credence qualities include food safety, origin of products, environmental compatibility and animal welfare (Becker 2000; Bruun et al. 2002; Grunert 2005; Northen 2000). To sum up, the inferior quality attribution is a product-related attribution with a negative character.

In contrast, retailer-related attributions for low prices are often described as positive attributions. Burton et al. (1994) give examples of such positive attributions, e. g. “meeting competitors’ prices” or “passing on savings from bulk purchases from manufacturers”. Generally, discount retailers can meet their competitors’ prices by smaller margins or lower costs. Smaller margins can be interpreted as fair relations to customers, as managers or owners waive a part of their profit. A more efficient business model is a positive cause for lower cost. It costs far less to operate a discount store than a mainstream supermarket (Kaas 1994). Furthermore, discount retailers buy large quantities of exclusive private label
products, resulting in lower purchase costs and a more efficient supply chain management (Colla 2003). Customers might believe that discount stores are low-priced because they pass on these savings.

However, negative retailer attributions also exist. Customers might infer that discount stores have lower prices than other stores because they behave unethically towards different stakeholders, for example employees and suppliers. These attributions are supported by press reports on aggressive purchasing policies (e.g., McGreavy 2008) and the exploitation of employees (e.g., Boyes 2008). Even if some discount retailers actually pay higher wages than some of their supermarket competitors (Springer 2008), their customers might believe the contrary.

Finally, customers can ascribe the competitive price image of discount stores to psychological tricks in price communication. Customers might be aware of pricing tactics retailers use to improve their price perception (Hardesty et al. 2007) and they might be skeptical towards price claims in advertisements (Obermiller and Spangenberg 2000).

To recapitulate, customers can ascribe five types of causes to low prices in discount stores. These are inferior quality, unfair relations to suppliers and employees, fair relations to customers (profit waive), the efficiency of the business model and psychological tricks in price communication.

HYPOTHESES

The following section derives hypotheses about the impact of the five types of attributions on different dependent variables, such as perceptions, emotions and shopping intentions.

Perceptions

Firstly, it is assumed that customer attributions have an impact on several perceptions, such as price level perception, quality perception, perceived value for money, price fairness and ease of price evaluation. With the exception of product quality, these constructs are all dimensions of a retailer’s price image (Zielke 2006, 2009a).

Price level perception refers to the amount of money customers have to pay for a selected basket of goods without taking quality differences compared to other stores into account. The efficiency and the tricks attribution should especially have an impact on price level perception. If customers believe that discount stores operate more efficiently than other stores, they should perceive discount store prices as more competitive. However, if they suppose that the discount stores’ price image results from psychological tricks, they will rate the prices as more expensive.

H1: The stronger (a) the efficiency and the weaker (b) the tricks attribution, the better (lower) the perceived price level.

The inferior quality attribution should especially determine the quality perception of the store. This results from the nature of both constructs.

H2: The weaker (a) the inferior quality attribution, the better the perceived quality.

Value for money is defined as the result of matching price and performance evaluations (Dodds and Monroe 1985; Zeithaml 1988). Hence, the attributions influencing price level and quality perception should also influence perceived value.

H3: The weaker (a) the inferior quality and (b) the tricks attribution, and the stronger (c) the efficiency attribution, the better the perceived value for money.

Price fairness is defined as a judgment if prices are reasonable, acceptable or just (Xia et al. 2004). Some studies in the literature explain the perceived fairness of a price increase based on customer attributions related to the cause of the increase (Campbell 1999; Kahnemann et al. 1986; Vaidyanathan and Aggarwal 2003). Furthermore, previous research found strong relations between value and fairness and some authors even operationalize price fairness very similarly to value for money (Beu and Chiao 2001). Hence, the attributions influencing value perception should also influence price fairness. In addition, the fair relations to customers and the unfair relations to stakeholders attributions should influence this construct.

H4: The weaker (a) the inferior quality, (b) the unfairness and (c) the tricks attribution, and the stronger (d) the fairness attribution, and (e) the efficiency attribution, the better the perceived price fairness.

Ease of price evaluation is related to price uncertainty (Mazumdar and Jun 1992) and describes how easily customers perceive the evaluation of a store’s prices (Zielke 2006, 2009a). The psychological tricks attribution should especially influence this price image dimension, as the prices might seem to be more competitive than they really are.

H5: The weaker (a) the psychological tricks attribution, the better the ease of price evaluation.

Emotions

Secondly, attributions to low prices should influence several emotions which are related to price and quality perception. The role of attributions as antecedents of emotions is extensively discussed in the literature, such as in Weiner’s attributional theory of emotions (Weiner 1985, 1986). The emotional consequences of attributions to low prices may be manifold; however, the present study concentrates on the negative emotions of shame and guilt, which might be especially relevant and interesting in discount shopping contexts.

Shame and guilt are both self-related emotions. Guilt results when customers believe that their actions violate societal or internal standards (Dahl et al. 2003), while shame or embarrassment result when actions violating moral or societal standards are observable for others (Izard 1977). Customers might believe that buying low quality food for the sake of saving money violates standards of good nutrition. Similarly, buying in a store that exploits farmers and employees to offer low prices might be perceived as a violation of standards regarding fairness in business relationships. Hence, the inferior quality and the unfair relations to stakeholders attribution should increase shame and guilt.

H6: The stronger (a) the inferior quality attribution and (b) the unfairness attribution, the greater the shame.

H7: The stronger (a) the inferior quality attribution and (b) the unfairness attribution, the greater the guilt.

Shopping intentions

Finally, it is assumed that all attributions influence intentions to buy in discount stores. This hypothesis is supported by previous
studies, where price-related attributions influenced shopping intentions and behavior (e.g. Burton et al. 1994; Schindler 1998).

\textbf{H8:} The weaker (a) the inferior quality, (b) the unfairness and (c) the tricks attribution, and the stronger (d) the fairness and (e) the efficiency attribution, the stronger the intentions to buy in discount stores.

**RESEARCH DESIGN AND SAMPLE**

A paper-and-pencil questionnaire was designed to test the hypotheses. The item-scale for the attributions was developed based on a discussion with students from a Master’s course in retail pricing at a large European University. The question “why are prices in discount stores so low?” was discussed with the students, their arguments were collected and then translated into an item-scale. A pre-test proved that the wording of the items was clear and understandable. The twenty items cover aspects of product quality, fair relations to customers, the efficiency of the business model, relations to employees and suppliers, and psychological tricks in price communication. A large scale pilot study with 597 respondents confirmed the hypothesized factor structure of the attributions (Zielke 2007). However, as the factor loadings and alpha values were not completely satisfactory, the item-scale was refined to a shorter and more manageable scale of 13 items. In this scale, each attribution is measured by not more than three items. Perceptions, emotions and behavioral intentions were measured with three to five items each. Scales for all these dependent variables are based on prior research (Zielke 2009a, 2009b) and presented in the appendix. All items were measured on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The respondents were asked to evaluate one particular discount store. Similar to Zielke (2009a, 2009b), they selected the store from a list of different grocery discounters. This was necessary to guarantee that the respondents have at least a rudimental impression of the store they evaluate. The questionnaires were distributed to people of different levels of age, gender, household size and income buying groceries at least once a week. The respondents usually completed the questionnaires at home and then returned them to the research team personally or by post. This procedure resulted in 402 usable questionnaires. The mean age of the respondents was 35 years, 57.8 percent of the respondents were female and the median net income ranged between 1,501 and 2,000 euros per month.

**ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

The first part of the results section analyzes the factor structure of the attributions to low prices in discount stores. The second part investigates the hypothesized effects of these attributions on perceptions, emotions and shopping intentions.

**The factor structure of attributions**

Firstly, the factor structure of the attribution scale was analyzed with exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. The exploratory analysis was conducted to replicate the results from the pilot study. The principal component analysis of the 13 attribution items yielded five factors with eigenvalues greater than one, explaining 74.1 percent of the item variance (table 1). The factors are identical to those found in the pilot study and clearly interpretable as inferior quality (F1), unfair relations to stakeholders (F2), profit waive or fair relations to customers (F3), the efficiency of the business model (F4) and psychological tricks in price communication (F5). Alpha values indicate an acceptable amount of convergent validity. Only the alpha value for fairness to customers is slightly below the level of .70.

In addition to the principal component analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis tested the convergent and discriminant validity. Table 2 presents the results from a confirmatory analysis conducted in Mplus using the MLR estimator (Muthén and Muthén 2007). The fit indexes are acceptable (CFI: .955, RMSEA: .048, SRMR: .055, \(\chi^2/d.f: 122/55\)). For each attribution type, the variance explained is larger than any squared correlation with another attribution. Hence, the discriminant validity is given according to Fornell and Larcker’s criterion. Furthermore, the average variance explained for each attribution is close to or above 50 percent.

**The impact of attributions on perceptions, emotions and shopping intentions**

Before testing the hypotheses, alpha values for the dependent variables were calculated. Only the coefficient for ease of price evaluation was below .70, but still acceptable (.61). Furthermore, discriminant validity between attributions and all dependent variables was sufficient according to Fornell and Larcker’s criterion. The only exception was the inferior quality attribution, which correlates strongly with quality perception. After testing convergent and discriminant validity, a separate structural equation model was calculated for each dependent variable. Again, all fit indexes are acceptable, CFI is between .940 and .964 and SRMR is between .044 and .050 (table 3).

H1 assumed that the stronger the efficiency and weaker the tricks attribution, the better the perceived price level. The results support this hypothesis with a positive coefficient for efficiency (.50) and a negative coefficient for the tricks attribution (-.26). Furthermore, H2 is supported by a negative impact of the inferior quality attribution on quality perception (-.82). In addition, there are small effects from the fairness (.16) and efficiency attribution (.14), which were not hypothesized. Supporting H3, the inferior quality (-.30), the efficiency (.37) and the tricks (-.23) attribution influence value in the hypothesized direction. H4 is only partly supported. The inferior quality (-.32), the unfairness (-.23) and the psychological tricks attribution (-.22) have a negative impact on price fairness. The coefficient for efficiency (.12) is only significant for a ten percent level of significance. Surprisingly, the fairness to customers attribution has no impact on price fairness. Supporting H5, psychological tricks have a negative effect on the ease of price evaluation (-.27). In addition, the efficiency attribution has a positive effect on the ease of price evaluation, which was not hypothesized (.24).

H6 is supported by the positive impact of the inferior quality attribution on shame (.32). Interestingly, the effect of the unfairness attribution on shame is small and not significant. H7, in contrast, is completely supported. The inferior quality (.34) and the unfairness attribution (.31) both have a significant impact on guilt.

According to H8, the inferior quality, the unfairness to stakeholders and the psychological tricks attribution should have a negative impact on shopping intentions, while the fairness to customers and the efficient business model attribution should have a positive impact. However, the results only support H8 for the inferior quality (-.36), the unfairness to stakeholders (-.20) and the efficiency of the business model attributions (.23).

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

The results support most of the hypothesized effects. Beyond the (intuitive) finding that positive attributions have positive effects while negative attributions have a negative impact, the results illustrate that specific attributions influence different dependent variables and that some attributions have stronger effects than others. The inferior quality attribution is the strongest predictor of perceived quality, price fairness, shame, guilt and shopping inten-
The efficiency attribution influences price level perception and value for money most strongly. The psychological tricks attribution is the strongest predictor of the ease of price evaluation. Unfairness to stakeholders is also an important attribution, which influences price fairness, guilt and shopping intentions. Fairness to customers (profit waive) seems the least important as this attribution only has a small impact on the quality perception.

The study has several theoretical implications. It extends the previous research by providing a typology of attributions to low prices. In addition, the empirical results underline that these attributions explain differences in customers’ perceptions of discount stores, emotions related to these stores and their shopping intentions. Therefore, the results contribute to the understanding of discount buying.

Some effects are especially interesting from a theoretical perspective. The results contribute to price fairness research as they show that unfairness to employees and suppliers has a strong impact on general price fairness. Therefore, unfair relations to stakeholders

### TABLE 1
Factor structure of attributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prices in discount stores are so low ...</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because they do not attach great importance to quality management</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they compromise product quality</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because their products contain more artificial ingredients</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because discount stores exploit their employees</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because discount stores exploit their suppliers</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because discount stores behave unethically towards suppliers and farmers</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because management salaries are smaller than in other companies</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because owners and managers are more modest than in other companies</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because these companies buy larger quantities</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because the business model is more efficient</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they purchase products at lower prices</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however, prices in these stores are not as low as many people believe</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however, these stores are only perceived as low-priced because they use psychological tricks</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha

| .77 | .84 | .65 | .72 | .82 |

Factor loadings smaller than .40 are suppressed

### TABLE 2
Discriminant validity (variance explained and squared correlations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>QUAL</th>
<th>UNF</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>TRICK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferior quality</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair relations</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair relations</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient business model</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological tricks</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFI: .955; RMSEA: .048; SRMR: .055; χ²/df: 122/55
should be integrated in price fairness research. Also, the effects on shame and guilt are remarkable. While guilt has different attributional antecedents (inferior quality and unfair relations), only the inferior quality attribution influences shame. Customers do not feel ashamed when they attribute low prices to the exploitation of employees and suppliers. Hence, although shame and guilt are similar constructs, they depend on different antecedents. The findings for the tricks attribution are also remarkable. This attribution has a negative impact on a number of perceptions, while the effects on emotions and shopping intentions are not significant. Hence, customers are aware of such tricks, but they do not change their behavior. This explains why some stores which are known for using such tricks are still very successful.

The results also have important managerial implications. They show that retailers can influence store perceptions, emotions and shopping intentions by influencing customers’ attributions to low prices. If discount retailers want to improve shopping intentions, they should especially communicate the existence of quality management systems and results from independent product tests to their customers, but also the efficiency of their business model. While communicating results from product tests is a matter of course, communicating the business model’s efficiency is not common practice. This is problematic as the results show that the efficiency attribution significantly influences price and quality perceptions.

Moreover, discount retailers should attach greater importance to establishing and communicating fair relations to their employees and suppliers. Reducing the unfairness to stakeholders attribution is important as this attribution has a negative impact on perceived price fairness and increases guilt. In practice, some discount retailers pay their cashier higher wages than their supermarket competitors, although this is often unknown to the public (Springer 2008). If discounters want to improve price and quality perception, they should also try to reduce the psychological tricks attribution by conducting and communicating objective price comparisons with their competitors. However, whether this also increases customer shopping intentions is questionable.

Finally, some limitations and implications for future research should be discussed. Firstly, this study analyzed the impact of attributions on a number of different dependent variables with separate structural equation models. This allowed a clean analysis of the hypothesized effects. However, as there might be relationships between emotions, perceptions and shopping intentions, attributions can influence shopping intentions via a number of indirect effects. Hence, future research should develop an integrated model of attributions, emotions and perceptions to explain discount buying more holistically. Another limitation refers to individual differences in the strength and impact of attributions. Future research should investigate whether customer segments with different attributions to low prices exist. Furthermore, customers selected the evaluated store from a list of different grocery discounters. This procedure guaranteed that the respondents have at least a rudimental impression of the store, but store selection can also bias the results. Finally, the fair relations to customers scale seems somewhat problematic as the items are only indirectly related to concerns about customer welfare. This might explain why this factor had so little impact on the dependent variables.
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TABLE 3
Results of hypotheses tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>QUAL Beta (sig.)</th>
<th>UNF Beta (sig.)</th>
<th>FAIR Beta (sig.)</th>
<th>EFF Beta (sig.)</th>
<th>TRICK Beta (sig.)</th>
<th>Latent Var.</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price level</td>
<td>.08 (.358)</td>
<td>-.13 (.088)</td>
<td>.12 (.171)</td>
<td>.50 (.000)</td>
<td>-.26 (.003)</td>
<td>.302 .046</td>
<td>.954 .047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.82 (.000)</td>
<td>.66 (.350)</td>
<td>.16 (.025)</td>
<td>.14 (.024)</td>
<td>.07 (.308)</td>
<td>.954 .048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>-.30 (.001)</td>
<td>-.07 (.264)</td>
<td>.12 (.151)</td>
<td>.37 (.000)</td>
<td>-.23 (.020)</td>
<td>.940 .050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price fairness</td>
<td>-.32 (.000)</td>
<td>-.23 (.005)</td>
<td>.07 (.350)</td>
<td>.12 (.089)</td>
<td>-.22 (.009)</td>
<td>.960 .048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of price</td>
<td>-.20 (.069)</td>
<td>-.04 (.677)</td>
<td>-.04 (.849)</td>
<td>.24 (.016)</td>
<td>-.27 (.013)</td>
<td>.955 .047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>.32 (.008)</td>
<td>.03 (.694)</td>
<td>-.06 (.631)</td>
<td>-.03 (.818)</td>
<td>.13 (.123)</td>
<td>.964 .044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>.34 (.000)</td>
<td>.31 (.000)</td>
<td>-.04 (.488)</td>
<td>-.09 (.253)</td>
<td>-.07 (.376)</td>
<td>.958 .046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>-.36 (.000)</td>
<td>-.20 (.003)</td>
<td>.02 (.676)</td>
<td>.23 (.008)</td>
<td>.00 (.986)</td>
<td>.954 .048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-scale</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Price level** | The prices are more competitive than in other stores.  
The prices are generally very low here.  
You can buy cheap groceries here.  |
| **Perception** | You can buy good quality products in this store.  
In this store, the product quality is only moderate.*  
The product quality is perfectly alright.  
The product quality is considerably better compared to other stores.  
The product quality is here worse than in other stores.*  |
| **Quality** | The prices here are appropriate in relation to what I get for my money.  
The prices here are excessive in relation to what I get for my money.*  
I get good value for money here.  
Compared to other stores, the price-performance ratio is very good here.  
The ratio between price and performance is considerably worse here than in other stores.*  |
| **Value for money** | This store sometimes behaves unfairly regarding the prices.*  
This store sometimes behaves dubiously regarding the prices.*  
This store always behaves very correctly regarding prices.  |
| **Price fairness** | I can assess this store very well regarding the prices.  
I cannot assess this store at all regarding the prices.*  
I find it difficult to assess the prices in this shopping establishment.*  |
| **Ease of price evaluation** | I feel embarrassed buying food in this shop.  
I feel a bit embarrassed when I have to shop here.  
I feel awkward offering guests food from this shop.  |
| **Shame** | I have a bad conscience when I buy groceries here.  
It is not correct to buy food from this shop.  
I feel irresponsible when I buy groceries here.  |
| **Guilt** | I should shop at this store as often as possible.  
I should shop at this store as seldom as possible.*  
I should consider this store for my shopping.  
I should disregard this store for my shopping.*  |

* reverse coded