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In this study we sought to examine how consumers perceive price unfairness when they learn that they have missed a price promotion after making a purchase, and explore the accompanying negative emotions and behavioral responses. The promotions that consumers learn they have missed could occur either before purchasing (i.e., pre-purchase promotion) or after purchasing (i.e., post-purchase promotion). By conducting a 2 (attribution of responsibility: internal vs. external attribution) × 2 (time of the missed promotion: pre-purchase vs. post-purchase promotion) experiment with 202 participants, we found that greater perceived price unfairness (PPU) is generated when consumers attribute missing the promotion to the sellers’ actions. Additionally, PPU is more likely to induce anger than disappointment and regret. The time of the missed promotion alters the impact of PPU on regret. Lastly, consumers who experience high levels of anger and disappointment tend to complain and spread negative word of mouth while those who experience high regret tend to be inactive.
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Price promotion has been regarded as an effective way to increase sales by encouraging new consumers to buy different brands or by stimulating loyal consumers to buy more. However, because price promotions are offered frequently and temporarily, they are often missed by consumers who consequently respond negatively. For example, results of recent research have shown that when consumers learn that they have just missed a promotion before purchasing, they would forgo the purchase and even switch to other brands (e.g., Arkes, Kung, & Hutzel, 2002; Tykocinski, Pittman, & Tuttle, 1995; Zeelenberg, Nijstad, van Putten, & van Dijk, 2006). While the issue of how consumers react to missing a promotion before purchasing has been discussed in prior studies, the issue of how they respond to missing a promotion after purchasing is relatively less explored. The promotions, which consumers may learn after purchasing that they have missed, could occur either before their purchasing, that is, prepurchase promotion, or after their purchasing, that is, postpurchase promotion. Whether or not – and how – gaining this knowledge will generate negative effects is an important issue which should be addressed.

When consumers learn that they have missed a promotion after purchasing, perceived price unfairness (PPU) may occur if they consider the higher price they pay is unacceptable or unreasonable. Because PPU is a subjective judgment from a buyer’s perspective, its intensity may be influenced by an individual’s evaluation of the transaction. Previous researchers have indicated that how consumers search for a causal explanation for price unfairness (Maxwell, 1999; Xia, Monroe, & Cox, 2004) and how they compare their price with different reference prices, such as prepurchase or postpurchase prices, may influence the intensity of PPU (Bolton, Warlop, & Alba, 2003; Xia et al., 2004). When consumers learn that they have missed a promotion after purchasing, they are likely to investigate the cause of missing a promotion as well as compare the price they paid with the promotion price. Thus, in order to examine the cause of missing the promotion on PPU, the impact of attribution of responsibility (seller’s responsibility and self-responsibility) and the time of missing the promotion (prepurchase and postpurchase) are explored.

Furthermore, how PPU affects consumers’ emotions and their behavioral responses is also an important issue. A growing body of research indicates that anger would be elicited when people encounter unfair situations (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Peine, Heitmann, & Herrmann, 2009). Xia et al. (2004) further indicate that, in addition to anger, negative emotions such as disappointment or regret may also be induced after consumers perceive price unfairness. Thus, in this study we sought to explore which emotions are elicited
when consumers perceive price unfairness. In addition, because emotions impact subsequent behaviors (Lazarus, 1991; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004), we also explored which postpurchase behaviors are generated when consumers learn that they have missed a promotion.

Our research contributes to existing work in this subject area by examining the impact of missing a promotion after purchasing and providing a relatively comprehensive framework for consumers’ reactions. By applying the concept of PPU in this study, the research scope of missing a promotion has been broadened and the application of PPU has been extended. The findings should help managers in the retail sector and service industry understand consumers’ responses and develop better promotion strategies.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES**

There is increasing interest in recent research in examining how consumers behave when they learn they have missed a promotion before purchasing. Results of this research have indicated that because consumers would consider missing the promotion to be a loss (Tykocinski et al., 1995), feel regret (Arkes et al., 2002), or devalue the promotion offer (Zeelenberg et al., 2006), they are unlikely to act on purchasing. A less explored question and the focus of this research is what happens when consumers learn they have missed a promotion after purchasing. In such a situation, consumers indeed experience a loss because they have paid a higher price than others. Thus, we have attempted to demonstrate how consumers perceive price unfairness and how they respond emotionally and behaviorally. Based on a Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) framework by Belk (1975), we have constructed a research framework by examining how missing promotion situations (stimulus) influence PPU and negative emotions (organism), which in turn affect consumers’ behaviors (responses). The research framework is shown in Figure 1.
Perceived price unfairness (PPU) is the perception of inequity when the perceived inputs and outcomes in a transaction are seen as inconsistent with the perceived inputs and outcomes of a referent (Oliver & Swan, 1989). PPU is particularly strong if people perceive the transaction or the process of completing the transaction to be unacceptable, unjust, or illegitimate (Bolton et al., 2003). Because consumers are likely to monitor the price for a particular product which they are buying (Cooke, Meyvis, & Schwartz, 2001), PPU will probably be induced when consumers learn they have missed a promotion and already paid a higher price than the promotion price.

The following hypotheses were proposed:

**Effects of attribution on PPU** When people face negative or unexpected events, it is likely that they make inferences about the events' occurrence by either attributing the outcome to self-responsibility, known as internal attribution, or to outside factors, known as external attribution (Heider, 1958). As people are affected by a fundamental attribution bias, they usually underestimate the influence of individual factors and overestimate the influence of other human agents (Heider). For example, if consumers attribute the reason why they have to pay a higher price to sellers' intentions, they tend to meticulously evaluate whether sellers take advantage of consumers (Maxwell, 1999; Xia et al., 2004). However, if consumers believe the reason they have to pay a higher price is associated with themselves, they tend to be self-regulated and perceive a lower degree of unfairness. Thus, when consumers infer that missing a promotion results from sellers' intentions rather than self-responsibility, it is expected that they will perceive a higher degree of unfairness.

**H1:** Consumers who attribute responsibility for missing a promotion to the sellers will perceive higher price unfairness than those who attribute it to themselves.

**Effects of time of the missed promotion on PPU** There are two kinds of promotion that consumers may have missed when making a purchase. There is a promotion which has occurred before their purchasing, that is, pre-purchase promotion, and a promotion which will occur after their purchasing, that is, post-purchase promotion.

From a psychological rationale, for people facing a sequence of events, later occurrences usually evoke more comparison than earlier ones (Miller & Gunasegaram, 1990). Because all the information about earlier events has been gleaned and incorporated into their decisions, later events, which usually have additional information that has not yet been incorporated, are more mutable. As a result, stronger reactions are usually generated toward later events than earlier ones, although the magnitude of comparisons may be equivalent. For example, Miller and Gunasegaram found that people tend to blame the negative outcomes of later events more than those of earlier events. Cooke et al. (2001) also noted that learning negative information after a purchase results in greater dissat-
isfaction and regret than from information learned before a purchase. In the same way, if consumers learn that they have missed a promotion after purchasing, the postpurchase promotion should induce more PPU than a prepurchase one.

**H2:** Consumers who miss a postpurchase promotion will perceive higher price unfairness than those who miss a prepurchase promotion.

**Effects of PPU on negative emotions** When people become aware of price unfairness after purchasing, negative emotions are usually induced (Tsai & Lee, 2007). Researchers in prior studies have indicated that when people perceive disadvantage or inequity, they would express anger elicited from the unfavorable results (Barclay et al., 2005; Bougie, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2003). Thus, when consumers perceive the price they have paid is unfair, the intensity of their anger would be enhanced.

**H3a:** When consumers perceive higher PPU, they will feel more anger.

In addition to anger, disappointment and regret may also be expressed by people. Both emotions influence people’s behaviors and are the result of counterfactual thinking (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). According to Ortony, Clore, and Collins (1988), disappointment originates from negative disconfirmation experience which is the result of a counterfactual comparison between the obtained and expected outcomes. Disappointment is stronger if people feel that the obtained outcome is worse than their expectations (Zeelenberg, van Dijk, Manstead, & van der Pligt, 2000). Hence, when consumers perceive greater price unfairness, their expectations that they would receive a reasonable deal has been more seriously violated, which may cause a higher level of disappointment.

**H3b:** When consumers perceive higher PPU, they will feel more disappointment.

Regret is a feeling about their wrong choice after people conduct counterfactual comparisons between the obtained outcome and that which would have occurred if they had chosen differently (Bell, 1983). Results of previous research show that unfair price perceptions result in dissatisfaction with the transaction (Oliver & Swan, 1989). When the dissatisfaction with the transaction is higher, consumers are more motivated to conduct counterfactual comparisons between their actual choice and the alternative ones (Xia et al., 2004). Therefore, when consumers perceive greater price unfairness, the intensity of regret would increase.

**H3c:** When consumers perceive higher PPU, they will feel more regret.

When consumers learn they have missed a promotion after purchasing, they may compare the price they paid with the lower promotion price which occurred either before or after their purchasing. Results of previous research suggest that the intensity of regret depends on purchasing timing. Because postpurchase information has a greater impact than prepurchase information, consumers who discover a better alternative after purchasing feel more regret than those who have one before purchasing (Cooke et al., 2001). We expect that, based on extant
research on the effects of purchasing timing, the time of missing a promotion will alter the impact of PPU on regret. When consumers perceive low price unfairness, they believe that the transaction or the process of transaction is reasonable and acceptable (Bolton et al., 2003). Thus, they normally do not initiate a price comparison (Xia et al., 2004). In contrast, when consumers perceive high price unfairness, they conduct more comparisons. Specifically, consumers who miss postpurchase promotions are more likely to give more weight to the comparisons than those who miss a prepurchase promotion. Therefore, we infer that the impact of PPU on regret would be enhanced in the situation of a postpurchase promotion.

**H3d:** The time of missing a promotion will alter the impact of PPU on regret.

**Effects of negative emotions on behaviors** When negative emotions have been elicited, people tend to develop behavioral coping strategies in an adaptive way (Lazarus, 1991). Three behavioral responses that are widely discussed in postpurchase literature are complaint, negative word of mouth (WOM), and inaction inertia (e.g., Campbell, 1999; Soscia, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Complaint is the explicit way in which consumers communicate their discontent to service providing firms. Negative WOM communication is expressed by informally spreading unpleasant experiences, product denigration, or private complaining through interpersonal networks (Anderson, 1998). Inaction inertia refers to a situation in which people are not likely to take action to change the transaction relationship with the sellers or others (Tykocinski et al., 1995).

Disappointment stemming from the disconfirmed expectations is typically associated with blaming others or circumstances (Yi & Baumgartner, 2004). In order to cope with disappointment, consumers may complain to sellers (Xia et al., 2004). They may also spread negative WOM, which allows them to express their disconfirmation experience or warn others (Xia et al., 2004). In addition, since disappointment is a negative emotion, people may accept the negative outcome and be unlikely to take any further action (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Thus, we infer that consumers experiencing disappointment would react with inaction.

**H4a:** When consumers feel mainly disappointment, they will tend to complain and spread negative WOM but take no further action (inaction inertia).

Because people feel angry when they have a feeling of being disadvantaged and when they consider that others should take responsibility for the negative outcome, they tend to seek revenge (Bougie et al., 2003). Angry consumers usually adopt aggressive coping behaviors to alter the situation, such as complaining to firms or asking for compensation (Xia et al., 2004). They also may vent their discontent through their interpersonal network (Soscia, 2007), so they are not likely to react with inaction.

**H4b:** When consumers feel mainly anger, they will tend to complain, spread negative WOM, and not remain inactive or inert.
In the case of regret, which is a self-blame emotion, people believe that the wrong choice originates with themselves (Zeelenberg et al., 2000). Thus, they do not complain to the sellers. However, because regret stems from a process of counterfactual comparison, people like to share their failure experience through their interpersonal network (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). Additionally, because regret is accompanied by discomfort, regretful people wish to escape from failure situations (Arkes et al., 2002). Thus, they will tend to take no action.

**H4c**: When consumers feel mainly regret, they will tend to spread negative WOM, not complain, and/or take no action (inaction inertia).

**METHOD**

**Stimuli and Design**

This study was a 2 (attribution of responsibility: internal vs. external) x 2 (time of the missed promotion: prepurchase vs. postpurchase promotion) between-subjects experiment. In the external attribution condition, participants were told that the reason they missed the promotion was that the sellers did not inform them about it when they made the purchase. In the internal attribution condition, the reason was that they were too busy to remember the promotion. Participants in the prepurchase promotion condition were told that they had missed a promotion which had occurred before purchasing, while those in the postpurchase promotion condition were told that they had missed the promotion which had occurred after purchasing.

**Participants**

A total of 202 undergraduate and graduate students participated in this study. Participants, of whom 54.5% were male and 45.5% were female, were randomly assigned to one of the four cells in the experiment. Each cell contained at least 40 participants.

**Procedure**

The participants were invited into a lab and presented with a hypothetical scenario. They were asked to assume that they have already purchased an MP3 player in an electronic store. Afterwards, they learn that a promotion has occurred (or will occur) before (or after) their purchase. The reason they have missed or will miss the promotion is that the seller did not inform them about it or they are too busy to remember the promotion. After reading the scenario, the participants were asked a number of questions pertaining to PPU, negative emotions, behavioral reactions, and demographic information. After 30 minutes of the experimental task, participants were debriefed and dismissed.
MEASUREMENTS

The variables were measured by using a 7-point Likert scale for responses ranging from strongly agree (7) to strongly disagree (1). PPU was measured by four items: “The price I paid is unfair”, “The price I paid is unacceptable”, “I feel the price I paid is unreasonable”, and “I feel the price I paid is higher than that paid by others” (Campbell, 2007). Anger was measured by two items, adopted from Barclay et al. (2003): “I feel angry” and “I feel mad”. Disappointment was measured by two items, adopted from Zeelenberg and Pieters (2004): “I feel disappointed” and “I feel unfulfilled”. Regret was assessed by two items, adapted from Yi and Baumgartner (2004): “I am regretful” and “I should have purchased earlier or later”.

Items for behavioral responses were adopted from Zeelenberg and Pieters (2004). Complaint was measured by two items: “I will complain to the seller” and “I will ask for compensation from the seller”. Negative WOM was measured by two items: “I will talk with my friends and acquaintances about this experience” and “I will discourage others from purchasing at this store”. Inaction inertia was measured by “I accept what happens to me” and “I would not complain or spread negative WOM”.

RESULTS

MANIPULATION CHECKS

The manipulation of attribution of responsibility was checked by two 7-point Likert items, in which participants were asked to rate the levels of the sellers’ responsibility and self-responsibility with regard to missing the promotion. Participants in the external attribution condition rated the sellers’ responsibility ($M = 4.71$) higher than self-responsibility ($M = 3.72$) ($t = 3.42, p = 0.00$). Participants in the internal attribution condition rated self-responsibility ($M = 4.74$) higher than the sellers’ responsibility ($M = 3.77$) ($t = -5.35, p = 0.00$). Manipulation of the time of missing the promotion was checked by the question, “When did you buy the product?” All the participants gave correct responses.

HYPOTHESES TESTING

The main effect of attribution of responsibility on PPU was tested by analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results demonstrate that participants who attributed missing the promotion to the sellers ($M = 5.76$) perceived significantly greater price unfairness than those who attributed it to themselves ($M = 4.90$) ($F(1, 200) = 34.00, p = 0.00$). Thus, H1 is supported. In addition, with regard to the impact of the time of the missed promotion, although participants in the postpurchase promotion condition ($M = 4.99$) perceived greater price unfairness than those in the prepurchase promotion condition ($M = 4.94$), there was no significant difference ($F(1, 200) = 0.09, p = 0.77$). Therefore, H2 is not supported.
To test the causal model about the impact of PPU on negative emotions and behavioral responses, structural equation modeling (SEM) with maximum likelihood estimation was conducted by using AMOS 5.0. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used first to assess items' correspondence with respective latent variables. The reliability statistics of perceived price unfairness, anger, disappointment, regret, complaint, negative WOM, and inaction inertia, were 0.90, 0.71, 0.76, 0.76, 0.78, 0.67 and 0.65, respectively. All constructs ranged from 0.65 to 0.90, which were close to and higher than Nunnally's (1967) cutoff of 0.7. By following the procedure proposed by Fornell and Larcker (1981), convergent and discriminant validity is ensured in this study by showing that the average variance extracted (AVE) of all constructs was between 0.56 and 0.85. These were greater than the squared correlations between any pair of constructs. Based on CFA which was performed with all the constructs for the research structural model, the overall fit of SEM was satisfactory (e.g., $\chi^2 = 95.00, p = 0.00, \text{GFI} = 0.95, \text{AGFI} = 0.88, \text{CFI} = 0.98, \text{and RMSEA} = 0.05$) (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized path</th>
<th>Standardized path coefficients</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3a: Perceived price unfairness $\rightarrow$ Anger</td>
<td>0.852***</td>
<td>7.627</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: Perceived price unfairness $\rightarrow$ Disappointment</td>
<td>0.651***</td>
<td>8.194</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c: Perceived price unfairness $\rightarrow$ Regret</td>
<td>0.661***</td>
<td>7.306</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Disappointment $\rightarrow$ Complaint</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Disappointment $\rightarrow$ Negative WOM</td>
<td>0.364***</td>
<td>3.782</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Disappointment $\rightarrow$ Inaction inertia</td>
<td>-0.501**</td>
<td>-3.707</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: Anger $\rightarrow$ Complaint</td>
<td>0.823***</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: Anger $\rightarrow$ Negative WOM</td>
<td>0.584***</td>
<td>4.418</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c: Regret $\rightarrow$ Negative WOM</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c: Regret $\rightarrow$ Inaction inertia</td>
<td>0.744**</td>
<td>2.935</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model fit: $\chi^2 (62) = 95.00, p = 0.00, \text{GFI} = 0.95, \text{AGFI} = 0.88, \text{CFI} = 0.98, \text{RMSEA} = 0.05$

Note: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

The results show that, as we had anticipated, PPU was positively related to anger ($\beta = 0.852, p = 0.00$), disappointment ($\beta = 0.651, p = 0.00$), and regret ($\beta = 0.661, p = 0.00$). When participants perceived higher price unfairness, they experienced more anger, disappointment, and regret. H3a - H3c are supported.

Furthermore, that the time of missing the promotion alters the impact of PPU on regret was tested by two-way ANOVA. The results show the significant interaction effect ($F(1, 198) = 10.14, p = 0.00$). In the high PPU condition, participants who missed postpurchase promotion ($M = 6.54$) felt significantly more regret than those who missed a prepurchase promotion ($M = 5.83$) ($t = 4.98$, P < 0.001).
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In the low PPU condition, there was no significant difference between both conditions ($t = -0.52, p = 0.61$). Thus, H3d is supported.

In respect of the impact of negative emotions on behavioral responses, the results in Table 1 reveal that disappointment had a positive impact on negative WOM ($\beta = 0.364, p = 0.00$) and a negative impact on inaction inertia ($\beta = -0.501, p = 0.00$), but had no influence on complaints ($\beta = 0.008, p = 0.93$). This means that when participants felt higher disappointment, they tended to express negative WOM and take some action but did not complain to the sellers. Thus, H4a is partly supported. In addition, anger had positive effects on complaints ($\beta = 0.823, p = 0.00$), and negative WOM ($\beta = 0.584, p = 0.00$), which indicates that higher anger causes complaints and negative WOM. Hence, H4b is supported. Finally, regret had a positive impact on inaction inertia ($\beta = 0.744, p = 0.00$) but no impact on negative WOM ($\beta = -0.055, p = 0.58$). This means that when participants felt mainly regret, they tended to take no action and not to spread negative WOM. Thus, H4c is partly supported.

DISCUSSION

In this study we have examined how consumers perceive price unfairness when they learn they have missed a promotion after purchasing. We found that consumers perceive a higher level of price unfairness if the responsibility for missing the promotion is attributed to the sellers rather than to themselves. In addition, although the results of this study do not indicate that the actual timing of the missed promotion causes differential PPU, it could alter the impact of PPU on regret. In line with previous studies about purchase timing, postpurchase price as a reference price has received more attention than prepurchase price. The impact of PPU on regret is indeed enhanced when a postpurchase promotion is missed.

Results of this study further demonstrate that, once consumers perceive greater PPU, anger is the strongest negative emotional response, compared to disappointment and regret. Angry consumers tend to react aggressively by complaining to sellers, asking for compensation, or spreading negative WOM, whereas disappointment causes negative WOM and regret causes consumers to be inactive. Overall, when consumers experience the negative emotions associated with blaming others, such as anger and disappointment, they tend to cope by social interaction, such as complaining to the firms or sharing the experience with others. However, regret, as a self-blame emotion, would cause people to accept the negative outcome and to not take any further action.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

There are several theoretical implications. Firstly, whereas the negative impact of missing a promotion which has occurred before purchasing has been found in
previous studies, the findings of this study demonstrate that missing a promotion after purchasing also has a negative impact. These findings add to existing literature about missing a promotion. Secondly, a comprehensive framework which includes the antecedents and the consequences of missing promotions is provided. We investigated how consumers judge the missed promotion by using the concept of PPU, and further uncovered the process from PPU to negative emotional and behavioral responses. Thirdly, we identified new antecedents of PPU when we applied PPU to the situation which defined when consumers learn of missing a promotion. While the antecedents of PPU are widely discussed in previous studies (e.g., Bechwati et al., 2009; Xia et al., 2004), we further indicate that PPU would be enlarged by missing a promotion as well as the individual’s attribution of responsibility.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are several managerial implications for price promotion strategy. Firstly, firms should arrange compensation mechanisms for consumers who learn that they have missed promotions after purchasing. Consumers perceive price unfairness when they learn they have missed a promotion, a situation which elicits negative emotions and behavioral responses. The use of compensation mechanisms, such as a refund policy, coupons, or gifts, would lessen these negative effects.

Secondly, firms should explicitly announce the reasons for promotions in order to prevent damaging or incorrect attributions of responsibility. Our findings indicate that consumers perceive higher price unfairness when they attribute missing a promotion to sellers’ deliberate intentions. Therefore, if consumers accept the reasons firms have a promotion (e.g., anniversary sale, off season offer), their PPU can be reduced.

Thirdly, firms should offer multiple communication channels (e.g., toll free number, interpersonal contact) to encourage consumers to express their negative emotions. Our results indicate that consumers would complain to firms only when they feel significantly angry. This means that when consumers feel disappointed or regretful, they spread negative WOM or are passive, rather than communicating with firms. Such behaviors could damage firms’ reputation or cause them to lose new or loyal consumers. Thus, we suggest that firms should make an effort to deal with consumers’ negative responses by utilizing effective communication tactics.

Fourthly, firms should train their frontline service staff to recognize angry consumers and deal with their anger immediately. The results show that angry consumers are likely to complain and spread negative WOM. Thus, it is important for staff to understand what the angry consumers are saying and feeling, before they begin to complain and take action.
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

There are several limitations in this study. These provide opportunities for future research. Firstly, we examined only the impact of attribution of responsibility and the time of the missed promotion on PPU. However, different demography, personalities, and purchase purposes may result in a different attribution of responsibility and price comparison processes (Lee & Kim, 2009; Maxwell, 1999). Consumers also react differently to high-priced, luxury products or hedonic product types (Martín-Ruiz & Rondán-Cataluña, 2008). Thus, the impact of these factors could be examined in future research in which customers’ reactions could be targeted more effectively. Secondly, we focused on behavior responses and did not explore consumers’ overall satisfaction with the store, loyalty to the store, and willingness to repurchase and switch behaviors. An insight into consumers’ responses can be broadened in future studies by incorporating these factors.
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