

Tilburg University

Negative returns on positive emotions

Louro, M.J.S.; Pieters, R.; Zeelenberg, M.

Published in:

Journal of Consumer Research

Publication date:

2005

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Louro, M. J. S., Pieters, R., & Zeelenberg, M. (2005). Negative returns on positive emotions: The influence of pride and self-regulatory goals on repurchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4), 833-840.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Negative Returns on Positive Emotions: The Influence of Pride and Self-Regulatory Goals on Repurchase Decisions

MARIA J. LOURO
RIK PIETERS
MARCEL ZEELENBERG*

Contrary to the common assumption that positive emotions generally lead to favorable behavioral intentions, feelings of pride can decrease consumers' repurchase intentions. Results from three experimental studies demonstrate that the impact of pride on repurchase intentions is contingent on consumers' self-regulatory goals but that this is so only among consumers with high levels of pride. Specifically, consumers with high prevention pride are less likely to repurchase than those with high promotion pride, whereas no difference arises between consumers with low promotion pride and those with low prevention pride. These effects generalize across situational and chronic differences in self-regulatory goals and are accompanied by differences in consumers' information requirements.

A common assumption in marketing is that positive consumption-related emotions stimulate subsequent positive behaviors, such as repurchase at a particular store. This assumption stems from the valence approach to emotions (Bagozzi et al. 2000; Lerner and Keltner 2000), which posits that the influence of emotions on behavior is determined only by their valence (positive or negative). Hence, different positive emotions should exert a similar positive influence on behavior because they share the same positive valence. However, recent theorizing suggests that positive emotions may broaden individuals' thought-action repertoires with, for instance, pride driving individuals toward greater future achievements (Fredrickson 2001). Thus, pride may expand consumers' search and decision processes, leading to lower repurchase intentions. It is therefore unclear whether or not all positive emotions generally lead to repurchase.

This article investigates how feelings of pride may influence consumers' repurchase intentions. Because pride is associated with goal attainment, we conjecture that the effect of pride on repurchase intentions may depend on the type of self-regulatory goals that consumers have. According to reg-

ulatory focus theory (Higgins et al. 2001), pride may stem from the attainment of promotion or prevention self-regulatory goals. For example, a consumer could see his/her success in negotiating a discount as a way to gain money (promotion pride) or to avoid paying extra money (prevention pride). Results from three experimental studies demonstrate that, rather than all positive emotions being generally conducive to repurchase, pride can decrease repurchase intentions, depending on consumers' self-regulatory goals. Also, this phenomenon is independent of consumer satisfaction and emerges across situational and chronic differences in self-regulatory goals. Finally, the effects reflect differences in consumers' information requirements. Taken together, these results provide support for a self-regulation framework that accounts for when and why positive emotions do and do not promote repurchase intentions.

PRIDE AND REPURCHASE: THE INFLUENCE OF SELF-REGULATORY GOALS

Pride is a positive emotion that is experienced following a positive evaluation of one's competence or effort in achieving a goal (Weiner 1986), such as feeling responsible for obtaining a discount (Schindler 1998). It is a pleasant feeling, associated with self-achievement, autonomy, and disengagement from others (Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, and Fischer 2000).

Previous work on the influence of emotions on satisfaction

*Maria J. Louro is a doctoral candidate in marketing (m.j.s.louro@uvt.nl), Rik Pieters is professor of marketing (f.g.m.pieters@uvt.nl), and Marcel Zeelenberg is professor of social psychology (m.zeelenberg@uvt.nl) at Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands. This research is based on the dissertation of the first author and was supported by a grant from the Foundation for Science and Technology (Portugal). The authors thank the editor, the associate editor, and the reviewers for their very helpful comments.

and subsequent behaviors has generally contrasted positive versus negative emotions elicited during consumption, highlighting the extent to which these emotions have distinct effects on behavior (e.g., Oliver 1980; Nyer 1997). This stream of research, adopting a valence approach to emotions, has found that positive emotions generally increase satisfaction, leading to subsequent favorable behavioral intentions, whereas negative emotions have the opposite effect (Szymanski and Henard 2001). Generalizing previous research within the valence approach, one would predict that pride, being a positive emotion, should also promote repurchase intentions.

Yet, another line of evidence suggests that pride, despite its positive valence, may have the opposite effect, leading to lower repurchase intentions. Fredrickson (2001) suggests that pride may expand individuals' scope of attention and broaden their action repertoires by driving them toward greater achievements in the future. Pride can thus lead to a broadening of consumers' search and decision processes, which may in turn reduce the likelihood of repurchase. In addition, pride elicits a sense of autonomy by focusing individuals on their own role in attaining desired ends (Rodriguez Mosquera et al. 2000), which should inform consumers that they are capable of attaining positive outcomes through their personal effort or ability (i.e., independently of the chosen provider). This may also lower the likelihood of repurchase.

Because pride is the emotional consequence of successful goal attainment, its effect on repurchase intentions may depend on the type of goals that consumers pursue. There is evidence that goals can take the form of pursuing desirable ends (promotion goals) or avoiding undesirable ends (prevention goals) (Higgins 2002). Regulatory focus theory (Higgins et al. 2001) differentiates promotion pride, which originates from achieving positive outcomes and involves behavioral self-regulation toward the achievement of ideals, from prevention pride, which arises from avoiding negative outcomes and involves behavioral self-regulation toward security.

Building on regulatory focus theory, we conjecture that consumers with high prevention pride will be less likely to repurchase than those with high promotion pride. This prediction is based on evidence that consumers with high promotion pride and those with high prevention pride are likely, in new purchase situations, to use different means to achieve their desired ends (Higgins et al. 2001). Specifically, high-promotion-pride consumers are sensitive to the opportunities that arise, in order to minimize the absence of positive outcomes (i.e., nongains). Having found a satisfactory provider, they should be more likely to consider repurchase at this provider as an opportunity for goal achievement. Conversely, high-prevention-pride consumers are motivated to minimize the presence of negative outcomes (i.e., losses) by being vigilant and restraining their impulses. They should be more sensitive to the potential negative outcomes associated with the decision to immediately return to a provider, in particular to the loss of attractive offers that might be

available elsewhere. Thus, they should be less likely to return to the current provider. Low-pride consumers, in contrast, believe that their success stems from the actions of others (e.g., a particular provider). Hence, they should be likely to return to the current satisfactory provider, regardless of their self-regulatory goals. Thus, we predict that:

H1a: Consumers with high prevention pride will be less likely to repurchase than consumers with high promotion pride.

H1b: Consumers with low pride will be likely to repurchase independent of differences in self-regulatory goals.

If consumers with high prevention pride would at the same time be less satisfied than those with high promotion pride, then this could account for their lower repurchase intentions. However, there is reason to believe that consumers with high promotion pride and those with high prevention pride may be equally satisfied, because both succeed in attaining their goals. Thus, it is important to examine the predictions while controlling for satisfaction. Building on research showing that specific negative emotions influence behavior over and above satisfaction (Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg 2003; Zeelenberg and Pieters 1999), we predict that:

H2: The effects of pride and self-regulatory goals on repurchase intentions are independent of consumer satisfaction.

Support for these predictions would imply that, rather than positive emotions being generally conducive to repurchase, the effect of pride on repurchase intentions is contingent on consumers' self-regulatory goals. It would also demonstrate that these effects are independent of consumer satisfaction. These predictions are tested in study 1.

STUDY 1: SITUATIONALLY INDUCED SELF-REGULATORY GOALS AND THE PRIDE-REPURCHASE LINK

Method

A total of 120 undergraduate students (66 females, 54 males) participated for course credit. They were randomly assigned to the cells of a 2 (high vs. low pride) \times 2 (promotion vs. prevention goals) between-subjects design. Participants were instructed to read a scenario about a computer purchase. To manipulate participants' feelings of pride, we varied their role in obtaining a discount price for a laptop computer. In the high-pride condition, participants read that they got a discount due to their good negotiation skills. In the low-pride condition, the discount was obtained because the computer was on sale. Self-regulatory goals were manipulated by using language that emphasized the discount as either a gain or a nonloss; that is, the word "gain" was used to evoke promotion goals and the phrase "avoid losing"

TABLE 1
STUDY 1: MEANS AS A FUNCTION OF PRIDE AND SELF-REGULATORY GOALS

	Low pride		High pride	
	Prevention goals	Promotion goals	Prevention goals	Promotion goals
Manipulation check for self-regulatory goals	3.83 (1.86)	6.07 (.78)	4.57 (1.72)	6.10 (.96)
Pride	4.40 (1.68)	4.43 (1.57)	5.63 (1.14)	5.77 (.96)
Satisfaction	5.58 (.78)	5.70 (.60)	5.85 (.78)	6.12 (.63)
Repurchase intentions	5.05 (.88)	4.87 (.69)	4.19 (.78)	4.98 (.70)

NOTE.—All variables range from 1 to 7. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. $N = 30$ for each cell.

was used to evoke prevention goals. The scenario for the high-pride/promotion (prevention) condition is reported below:

You want to buy a laptop computer. Last week, you saw the computer that you want at the InfoShop at a reduced price of \$1,500 instead of its regular price of \$2,000. Because you want to take advantage of this \$500 gain [to avoid paying an extra \$500], you decide to buy this computer at InfoShop, but you have not done this yet. Today, you return to InfoShop to buy the computer. You realize that the promotion was over two days ago and that the price of the computer is again the regular \$2,000. You think to yourself: "If I can convince the salesperson to sell me the computer at the promotional price, I will gain [avoid paying an extra] \$500." Meanwhile, you notice another customer who tries to get the promotional price for the same computer and fails. The salesperson indicates that the price is nonnegotiable. In spite of this, you decide to give it a try. Due to your good negotiation skills, you succeed in gaining [avoid losing] the \$500.

In the low-pride/promotion (prevention) condition, the last sentences read: "Today, you return to InfoShop to buy the computer. You think to yourself: 'If I buy this computer now, I will gain [avoid paying an extra] \$500.' Meanwhile, you notice that another customer in the store is just finishing buying the same computer for the promotional price. Afterward, you approach the salesperson. The salesperson is willing to help you, and you buy the computer. With this purchase you gained [avoided losing] \$500."

After reading the scenario, participants completed manipulation checks and reported their satisfaction and repurchase intentions. First, participants completed a check on the manipulation for regulatory focus (Roese, Hur, and Pennington 1999, 1113). The pride manipulation check had two items ($r = .79$): "To what extent did getting the \$500 discount make you feel good about yourself?" (1 = not at all; 7 = very much) and "Think about your ability in getting the \$500 discount. How much pride did you feel?" (1 = none; 7 = very much). Next, satisfaction was assessed by two seven-point items ($r = .50$) adapted from Oliver (1997)

(e.g., "Overall, how satisfied did you feel with the price you paid?"). As a test of discriminant validity, we compared a measurement model with the satisfaction and pride items loading on separate factors against an alternative model with all items loading on a single factor. A chi-square difference test (Kline 1998) demonstrated that the two-factor solution was superior ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}}(1, N = 120) = 21.27, p < .001$), indicating discriminant validity between the measures. Finally, repurchase intentions were measured by four seven-point items ($\alpha = .85$) adapted from Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1996; e.g., "How likely are you to consider InfoShop your first choice the next time you buy new computer hardware or software?"). The entire procedure was presented on a personal computer, using the software program Authorware 6.0 (Macromedia Inc. 2001).

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Checks. As expected, promotion-framed scenarios reflected greater achieving relative to prevention-framed scenarios ($M = 6.08$ vs. $M = 4.20$; $F(1, 116) = 53.64, p < .001$). Also, participants reported greater pride in the high-pride than in the low-pride conditions ($M = 5.70$ vs. $M = 4.42$; $F(1, 116) = 26.30, p < .001$). No other effects were significant (see table 1).

Satisfaction. Results of a 2×2 ANOVA of satisfaction yielded only a significant main effect of pride ($F(1, 116) = 7.16, p < .01$). Participants reported higher satisfaction in the high-pride conditions ($M = 5.98$) than in the low-pride conditions ($M = 5.64$).

Repurchase Intentions. Hypothesis 1a predicts that consumers with high prevention pride will have lower repurchase intentions than those with high promotion pride. Hypothesis 1b predicts that consumers with low pride will be likely to repurchase, independent of their self-regulatory goals. A 2×2 ANOVA of repurchase intentions revealed a main effect of pride ($F(1, 116) = 7.14, p < .01$) and self-regulatory goals ($F(1, 116) = 4.57, p < .05$). Repurchase intentions were lower in the high-pride conditions ($M = 4.58$) than in the low-pride conditions ($M = 4.96$), and they

were lower in the prevention conditions ($M = 4.62$) than in the promotion conditions ($M = 4.92$). More important, these main effects were qualified by a significant pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction ($F(1, 116) = 11.87, p < .01$) (see fig. 1). In support of hypothesis 1a, planned contrasts showed that participants with high prevention pride were less likely to repurchase ($M = 4.19$) than those with high promotion pride ($M = 4.98; F(1, 116) = 15.58, p < .001$). In support of hypothesis 1b, participants with low promotion ($M = 4.87$) and those with low prevention pride ($M = 5.05$) were equally likely to repurchase, irrespective of their self-regulatory goals ($F < 1$).

To test whether this effect is independent of satisfaction (hypothesis 2), we performed a 2×2 ANCOVA on repurchase intentions, in which satisfaction was a significant covariate ($F(1, 115) = 8.24, p < .01$) and did not interact with any of the experimental factors. In support of hypothesis 2, all of the significant relationships documented in the 2×2 ANOVA, including the predicted pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction ($F(1, 115) = 11.48, p = .001$), remained significant. Again, participants with high prevention pride reported lower repurchase intentions ($M = 4.18$) than participants with high promotion pride ($M = 4.89; F(1, 115) = 13.26, p < .001$). No effects were evident for participants with low pride ($M_{prevention} = 5.12$ vs. $M_{promotion} = 4.90; F(1, 115) = 1.26, p > .25$). This shows that pride and self-regulatory goals influence consumers' repurchase decisions over and above consumer satisfaction.

Study 1 indicates that, rather than all positive emotions being generally conducive to repurchase, the effect of pride on consumers' repurchase intentions is contingent on their self-regulatory goals. Consumers with high prevention pride are less likely to repurchase than those with high promotion pride; in contrast, no such difference arises for low-pride consumers. Also, these effects are independent of consumer satisfaction.

STUDY 2: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN REGULATORY FOCUS AND THE PRIDE-REPURCHASE LINK


Study 2 tests whether the findings of study 1 generalize to chronic individual differences in self-regulatory goals. It thus allows us not only to replicate the results of study 1 but also to extend them to situations where differences in self-regulatory goals are chronic.

Method

A total of 204 undergraduate students (171 females, 133 males) participated in return for class credit. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the conditions in a two-group design (high vs. low pride). Participants first completed the 11-item Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ; Higgins et al. 2001), which consists of two orthogonal subscales assessing chronic-promotion and chronic-prevention goal orientation. The responses were averaged to calculate

STUDY 1

IMPACT OF PRIDE AND SELF-REGULATORY GOALS ON REPURCHASE INTENTIONS



distinct promotion and prevention scores. Higher scores on the separate subscales indicate greater chronic-promotion and chronic-prevention goal orientations. In the present study, both subscales were reliable ($\alpha_{promotion} = .62; \alpha_{prevention} = .73$) and uncorrelated ($r = .10, p > .15$). Next, participants were introduced to the same stimuli and measures used in study 1 ($r_{pride} = .67, r_{satisfaction} = .52, \alpha_{repurchase\ intentions} = .87$), with the only difference that manipulations for regulatory goals were not included in the scenarios. As in study 1, the pride manipulation was effective (see table 2).

Results and Discussion

To test whether pride and chronic individual differences in regulatory goals influence repurchase intentions in the hypothesized directions, we used the procedure proposed by Higgins et al. (2001). Participants were classified into more chronic promotion or chronic prevention oriented on the basis of a median split on the difference between their RFQ promotion and RFQ prevention scores (the median was $-.07$). As expected, the chronic promotion focus group had a higher promotion orientation than the chronic prevention focus group ($M = 3.97$ vs. $M = 3.47; t(202) = -7.58, p < .001$). Similarly, the chronic prevention focus group had a higher prevention orientation than the chronic promotion focus group ($M = 4.21$ vs. $M = 3.31; t(202) = 10.66, p < .001$).

A two-way ANOVA with repurchase intentions as the dependent variable revealed a significant pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction ($F(1, 200) = 10.65, p = .001$). Within the high-pride condition, participants with chronic prevention orientation reported having lower repurchase intentions ($M = 3.99$) than participants with chronic promotion orientation ($M = 4.82; F(1, 200) = 19.74, p < .001$). As expected, no differences were found for low-pride participants ($M_{prevention} = 4.89$ vs. $M_{promotion} = 4.91, F < 1$). Consistent with study 1, the effect of pride on repurchase

TABLE 2
STUDY 2: MEANS AS A FUNCTION OF PRIDE AND SELF-REGULATORY GOALS

	Low pride		High pride	
	Prevention goals	Promotion goals	Prevention goals	Promotion goals
Pride	3.96 (1.50)	4.29 (1.39)	5.52 (1.29)	5.84 (.89)
Satisfaction	5.61 (.77)	5.41 (.81)	5.65 (1.26)	5.95 (.79)
Repurchase intentions	4.89 (.84)	4.91 (.93)	3.99 (.96)	4.82 (.78)

NOTE.—All variables range from 1 to 7. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. $N = 51$ for each cell.

intentions is contingent on consumers' chronic regulatory focus, but only among consumers with high pride (hypotheses 1a and 1b).

To test the prediction of hypothesis 2 that the influence of pride and self-regulatory goals on repurchase intentions is independent of consumer satisfaction, we performed a 2×2 ANCOVA on repurchase intentions with satisfaction as a significant covariate ($F(1, 199) = 25.66, p < .001$). In support of hypothesis 2, the predicted pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction remained significant ($F(1, 199) = 6.74, p = .01$), again reflecting the same pattern of means.

Jointly, studies 1 and 2 show that situational and chronic individual differences in self-regulatory goals influence the emotion-behavior link in a similar manner. In high pride, situational or chronic prevention orientation is associated with lower intention to repurchase than is situational or chronic promotion orientation; no differences arise in low pride. Again, these effects are independent of consumer satisfaction.

STUDY 3: DIFFERENCES IN CONSUMERS' INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

Study 3 tests whether the phenomenon observed in the prior studies reflects differences in consumers' information requirements. Because consumers with high prevention pride are inclined to adopt precautionary measures to avoid mistakes (Higgins et al. 2001), they should be sensitive to the possibility of losing attractive outcomes by failing to consider other providers. Hence, they should consider obtaining information on alternative providers as a necessary means to avoid losses. Conversely, because consumers with high promotion pride focus on taking advantage of the opportunities that arise, they should consider having information about a satisfactory provider as a sufficient means to immediately achieve their goals. In addition, because consumers with low pride attribute their success to a specific provider rather than to themselves, they should be likely to consider having information on a satisfactory provider as a sufficient means to achieve their desired ends regardless of their self-regulatory goals.

An additional objective of study 3 is to provide a direct test that the effects uncovered in the prior studies do not

reflect the influence of other factors such as negative self-conscious emotions. Specifically, one could argue that, in the high-prevention-pride condition, negotiating a discount to avoid paying extra money may have triggered negative self-conscious emotions (e.g., embarrassment) in addition to pride, thereby reducing repurchase intentions. Finally, we used in study 3 a new product category to increase generalizability.

Method

A total of 192 undergraduate students (107 females, 85 males) participated in return for course credit and were randomly assigned to a 2 (high vs. low pride) \times 2 (promotion vs. prevention goals) between-subjects design. Participants read a shoe-purchasing scenario. Pride and self-regulatory goals were manipulated as in study 1. The scenario for the high-pride/promotion (prevention) condition is reported below:

You are planning to buy a new pair of shoes. You start looking for it today. You find a nice pair of shoes at the Foot & Co. shoe store and you decide to buy these shoes. Although some shoes are on sale with a \$25 discount, the specific shoes that you like are not. These shoes are priced at \$100. You realize that you could gain [avoid losing] money if the shoes you like were also on sale. You decide to approach the salesperson. The salesperson indicates that the price is nonnegotiable. Yet, due to your good negotiation skills, you successfully manage to gain [avoid losing] \$25.

In the low-pride/promotion (prevention) condition, the last sentences read: "Like the other shoes in the store, the specific shoes that you like are on sale. These shoes, regularly priced at \$100, have a \$25 discount. You realize that you could gain [avoid losing] money if you buy the shoes now. You decide to approach the salesperson. The salesperson is willing to help you, and you buy the shoes. With this purchase you gained [avoided losing] \$25."

After reading the scenario, participants were first asked to assess both the necessity of obtaining information on other providers and the sufficiency of having information on the current provider in order to make a decision in the future.

TABLE 3
STUDY 3: MEANS AS A FUNCTION OF PRIDE AND SELF-REGULATORY GOALS

	Low pride		High pride	
	Prevention goals	Promotion goals	Prevention goals	Promotion goals
Manipulation check for self-regulatory goals	3.05 (1.11)	5.57 (1.11)	3.14 (1.18)	5.70 (1.19)
Pride	4.08 (1.48)	4.20 (1.34)	5.82 (.87)	5.72 (1.08)
Satisfaction	5.30 (1.03)	5.48 (.86)	5.7 (.91)	5.77 (.83)
Negative self-conscious emotions	2.07 (1.01)	2.27 (1.02)	2.35 (1.19)	2.26 (1.01)
Sufficiency	4.72 (1.07)	4.60 (.84)	3.51 (.90)	4.5 (1.14)
Necessity	3.29 (1.08)	3.28 (.79)	4.80 (1.01)	3.42 (.91)
Repurchase intentions	4.90 (.99)	4.81 (.75)	3.83 (1.12)	4.84 (1.10)

NOTE.—All variables range from 1 to 7. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. $N = 48$ for each cell.

Each measure consisted of four seven-point items anchored at not at all/very much. The order of the items measuring necessity and sufficiency was systematically varied across participants, and no order effect was found. The items measuring necessity were ($\alpha = .79$): “To what extent is visiting many shoe stores necessary for making a good decision?” “Do you think that you must look in several different stores before choosing where to buy shoes?” “How important is it to obtain information on other shoe stores to make a good purchase in the future?” and “Before deciding where to buy shoes, do you feel that it is required to check multiple stores?” The items measuring sufficiency were ($\alpha = .77$): “Do you think that on a similar occasion going to Foot & Co. is sufficient in order to make a good decision?” “Do you feel that you can make a good decision by simply considering the Foot & Co. store after this experience?” “To what extent is having information on the Foot & Co. store enough to choose where to buy shoes?” and “Is visiting the Foot & Co. store something that you feel is suitable to make a good purchase in the future?” Both scales were negatively correlated with each other ($r = -.28, p < .001$), and a factor analysis resulted in a two-factor solution (variance explained was 61%) with the predicted factor loadings.

Next, participants reported their repurchase intentions ($\alpha = .81$), completed manipulation checks for pride ($r = .65$) and regulatory focus, and reported their satisfaction ($r = .65$) on the same scales as in studies 1 and 2. An extra item was added to check the regulatory focus manipulation ($r = .73$): “Obtaining the \$25 discount was, in your opinion, a way to (1 = move away from a negative outcome; 7 = move toward a positive outcome)”. Finally, negative emotions were assessed by three seven-point items ($\alpha = .64$), anchored at not at “all guilty/very guilty,” “not at all embarrassed/very embarrassed,” and “not at all ashamed/very ashamed.”

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Checks. The manipulation regarding self-regulatory goals was effective ($M_{\text{prevention}} = 3.09$ vs. $M_{\text{promotion}} = 5.64$; $F(1, 188) = 235.20, p < .001$), as was the manipulation regarding pride ($M_{\text{low pride}} = 4.14$ vs. $M_{\text{high pride}} = 5.77$; $F(1, 188) = 86.19, p < .001$). No other effects were significant for all measures (see table 3).

Satisfaction. Replicating studies 1 and 2, a 2×2 ANOVA on satisfaction yielded only a main effect of pride ($M_{\text{low pride}} = 5.39$ vs. $M_{\text{high pride}} = 5.77$; $F(1, 188) = 8.20, p < .01$).

Negative Self-Conscious Emotions. As expected, there were no differences between conditions on participants' self-reports of negative self-conscious emotions (all F 's < 1). Overall, participants did not report feeling negative self-conscious emotions ($M_{\text{overall}} = 2.24$).

Repurchase Intentions. The results of a 2×2 ANOVA on repurchase intentions replicated the findings obtained in the prior studies (see table 3). In particular, the expected pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction was significant ($F(1, 188) = 14.39, p < .001$). Repurchase intentions were lower in the high-prevention-pride condition than in the high-promotion-pride condition ($M = 3.83$ vs. $M = 4.84$; $F(1, 188) = 24.31, p < .001$), and there were no differences in the low-pride conditions ($F < 1$). Thus, as in the previous studies, hypotheses 1a and 1b are supported. Consistent with hypothesis 2, this interaction remained significant after controlling for satisfaction ($F(1, 187) = 17.89, p < .001$), again reflecting the same pattern of means.

Sufficiency/Necessity. In support of our reasoning, the pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction significantly predicted both sufficiency ($F(1, 188) = 16.49, p < .001$) and

necessity ($F(1, 188) = 24.67, p < .001$). That is, examining the means across conditions (see table 3), participants in the high-prevention-pride condition were less likely to consider information on the current provider sufficient to make a decision than those in the high-promotion-pride condition ($M = 3.51$ vs. $M = 4.55$; $F(1, 188) = 26.56, p < .001$), whereas participants in the low-pride conditions were equally likely to consider information on the current provider sufficient ($M_{\text{prevention}} = 4.72$ vs. $M_{\text{promotion}} = 4.60$; $F < 1$). In contrast, participants in the high-prevention-pride condition were more likely to consider information on alternative providers necessary than those in the high-promotion-pride condition ($M = 4.80$ vs. $M = 3.42$; $F(1, 188) = 50.10, p < .001$), whereas there was no difference in the low-pride conditions ($M_{\text{prevention}} = 3.29$ vs. $M_{\text{promotion}} = 3.28$; $F < 1$). Partial correlation tests revealed a significant attenuation of the strength of the correlation between the pride \times self-regulatory goals interaction and repurchase intentions when sufficiency and necessity were controlled for ($r_{\text{partial}} = .11, p > .12$). This result indicates that consumers' information requirements (sufficiency vs. necessity) account for the influence of pride and self-regulatory goals on repurchase intentions.

The results of study 3 replicate those of studies 1 and 2 and, in addition, indicate that the effects of pride and self-regulatory goals on repurchase intentions are systematically associated with differences in consumers' information requirements. As expected, the observed behavioral effects are driven by pride and regulatory goals and not by negative self-conscious emotions.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Contrary to common thinking in marketing that positive emotions are generally conducive to favorable behavioral intentions, pride can reduce consumers' repurchase intentions. This research demonstrates that the type of self-regulatory goals that consumers have is a key factor moderating the impact of pride on repurchase intentions. Results from three studies show that consumers with high prevention pride are less likely to repurchase than those with high promotion pride, whereas no difference arises for low-pride consumers. This phenomenon generalizes across situational (studies 1 and 3) and chronic differences in regulatory focus (study 2), and the effects are independent of satisfaction (studies 1–3) and negative self-conscious emotions (study 3). Finally, this research shows that these effects are paralleled by differences in consumers' information requirements (sufficiency vs. necessity; study 3). The consistency of the findings across multiple measures of self-regulatory goals and different stimuli highlights the importance of specific emotions and regulatory focus effects in consumer behavior contexts.

These findings contribute to regulatory focus research in several ways. First, previous research has shown that regulatory focus influences the type and intensity of experienced emotions (Higgins, Shah, and Friedman 1997) and the reliance on affective information in persuasion (Pham

and Avnet 2004). Our results extend this by demonstrating that consumers' self-regulatory goals are also a key factor moderating the impact of emotions on behavior. Second, to our knowledge the present research is the first to show that consumers with high promotion pride and those with high prevention pride differ in the information they require in order to make a decision. Our research shows that, in high pride, consumers with a promotion focus consider current information as sufficient to make a decision, whereas consumers with a prevention focus consider that obtaining additional information is necessary to make a decision. This extends previous work that links the promotion and prevention systems with the use of distinct strategic means (eagerness vs. vigilance) to attain desired ends (Higgins et al. 2001) by showing that these two systems also differ in the type of information requirements (sufficiency vs. necessity) that they evoke.

The current research also has implications for recent theorizing on positive emotions. Research by Fredrickson (2001) suggests that positive emotions may broaden individuals' thought-action repertoires. Our results extend this by suggesting that this broadening effect may be contingent on consumers' regulatory goals and that narrowing may occur under a promotion focus. Further research is needed to examine whether this broadening versus narrowing effect emerges for other positive emotions and motivational principles beyond the ones studied here.

The findings reported in this research also speak to the pricing and promotions literature. Previous research has found that perceived responsibility for obtaining a discount elicits positive feelings (with pride being the dominant emotion) and enhances the likelihood of repurchase (Schindler 1998). Our research extends this by showing when and why the reverse effect can occur. We found that the impact of pride on repurchase intentions is contingent on consumers' regulatory focus and that this effect reflects differences in consumers' information requirements. Also, our findings indicate that this phenomenon is independent of satisfaction, underscoring the relevance of adopting a specific-emotion approach (e.g., Zeelenberg and Pieters 1999).

Future research could draw on the notion of regulatory fit (Higgins 2002) to explore the joint effects of chronic individual and temporarily induced differences in regulatory focus on behavior. For instance, one could argue that consumers' response to price promotions framed as opportunities to gain or to avoid paying extra money may differ according to their chronic regulatory focus. Specifically, consumers with chronic promotion pride may derive higher subjective value from price promotions framed as gains than as nonlosses.

In conclusion, the present research sheds light on an important and unexplored aspect of consumer behavior. We show that, in addition to their independent influences on behavior, positive emotions and motivational principles jointly influence both the decisions that consumers make and the patterns of information acquisition that they use to

reach these decisions. In this way, the present article shows how positive emotions may have negative returns.

[Dawn Iacobucci served as editor and Laura Peracchio served as associate editor for this article.]

REFERENCES

- Bagozzi, Richard P., Hans Baumgartner, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2000), "The Role of Emotions in Goal-Directed Behavior," in *The Why of Consumption*, ed. S. Ratneshwar, David Glen Mick, and Cynthia Huffman, London: Routledge, 36–58.
- Bougie, Roger, Rik Pieters, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Angry Customers Don't Come Back, They Get Back: The Experience and Behavioral Implications of Anger and Dissatisfaction in Services," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (Fall), 377–93.
- Fredrickson, Barbara L. (2001), "The Role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology: The Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions," *American Psychologist*, 56 (March), 218–26.
- Higgins, E. Tory (2002), "How Self-Regulation Creates Distinct Values: The Case of Promotion and Prevention Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12 (May), 177–91.
- Higgins, E. Tory, Ronald S. Friedman, Robert E. Harlow, Lorraine Chen Idson, Ozlem N. Ayduk, and Amy Taylor (2001), "Achievement Orientations from Subjective Histories of Success: Promotion Pride versus Prevention Pride," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31 (January–February), 3–23.
- Higgins, E. Tory, James Shah, and Ronald Friedman (1997), "Emotional Responses to Goal Attainment Strength of Regulatory Focus as Moderator," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72 (March), 515–25.
- Kline, Rex B. (1998), *Principles and Practices of Structural Equation Modeling*, New York: Guilford.
- Lerner, Jennifer S. and Dacher Keltner (2000), "Beyond Valence: Toward a Model of Emotion-Specific Influences on Judgment and Choice," *Cognition and Emotion*, 14 (July), 473–93.
- Macromedia Inc. (2001), Authorware 6.0 (computer software), San Francisco: Macromedia Inc.
- Nyer, Prashanth U. (1997), "A Study of the Relationships between Cognitive Appraisals and Consumption Emotions," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25 (Fall), 296–304.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1980), "A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17 (November), 460–69.
- (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pham, Michel Tuan and Tamar Avnet (2004), "Ideals and Oughts and the Reliance on Affect versus Substance in Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (March): 503–18.
- Rodriguez Mosquera, Patricia M., Antony S. R. Manstead, and Agneta H. Fischer (2000), "The Role of Honour-Related Values in the Elicitation, Experience, and Communication of Pride, Shame, and Anger: Spain and The Netherlands Compared," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26 (July), 833–44.
- Roese, Neal J., Taekyun Hur, and Ginger L. Pennington (1999), "Counterfactual Thinking and Regulatory Focus: Implications for Action versus Inaction and Sufficiency versus Necessity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77 (December), 1109–20.
- Schindler, Robert M. (1998), "Consequences of Perceiving Oneself as Responsible for Obtaining a Discount: Evidence for Smart-Shopper Feelings," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7 (4), 371–92.
- Szymanski, David M. and David H. Henard (2001), "Customer Satisfaction: A Meta-analysis of the Empirical Evidence," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29 (Winter), 16–35.
- Weiner, Bernard (1986), *An Attributional Theory of Motivation and Emotion*, New York: Springer.
- Zeelenberg, Marcel and Rik Pieters (1999), "Comparing Service Delivery to What Might Have Been: Behavioral Responses to Regret and Disappointment," *Journal of Service Research*, 2 (August), 86–97.
- Zeithaml, Valarie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1996), "The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality," *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (April), 31–46.