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ABSTRACT

This study suggests that induced antecedent moods may, in a systematic manner, influence subsequent levels of loyalty intention within consumer scenarios. Furthermore, this research finds that there exists differential responses to induced mood states by gender, which fall in line with research on the underlying gender differences in cognitive processing, levels of risk aversion, motivation, and the experience of emotion while shopping. Past studies in this area have shown only a mild connection between induced antecedent mood state and loyalty intentions, which may be due in part to the issue of an emotion by gender interaction. This paper reinforces previous work and extends this relationship to include gender as moderator. With a better understanding of the way in which different mood states influence customer loyalty intentions, a new approach to managing customer mood-states emerges.

INTRODUCTION

Researchers and theorists have set out to describe the connection between a retailer’s ability to incite mood states such as delight (or dissatisfaction) and enhanced (or deteriorated) customer loyalty towards that business. Much of the existing work in this area has focused primarily on the ‘consumption emotion,’ or the state brought on by interacting directly with a product or service (Dubé and Menon, 2000; Arnold and Reynolds, 2009). However, it is often the case that customers enter a retail scenario already set in some mood state; incidental antecedent moods may be entirely unrelated to the retail scenario (e.g., a customer just ended a phone call with an angry spouse before entering the store) or directly caused by preceding service scenarios (e.g., a customer is walking from store-to-store through a mall or shopping center, and the delight of a wonderful shopping experience in one store remains active as the customer enters the next one). A discussion regarding the effects of mood states upon customer loyalty must also consider these more nonspecific, diffuse and incidental effects of mood state on customer loyalty intentions. Furthermore, the effect of mood states on behavior interact with the cognitive differences seen across genders (Kellaris and Mantel, 1994; Martin, 2003; Klinteberg et al., 1987), and gender is considered one of the major characteristics relevant to understanding consumer behavior (Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran, 1991). Therefore, the
primary purpose of the current research is to display the way in which incidental mood state and gender interact to effect customer loyalty intentions.

Moods are affective states that include emotions (Luomala and Laaksonen, 2000), however mood states are differentiated from ‘emotional states’ in that moods persist over a length of time at lower levels of intensity than a singular emotional episode. One can envision an ‘emotional state’ as a few brief and intense seconds of surprise (e.g., someone has a large dog lunging towards them), while a ‘mood state’ might be a persistent negative feeling that lasts at a low level over many hours. Antecedent moods may unintentionally influence subsequent experiences and perceptions despite the absence of a clear referent event of origin (Davidson, 1994; Ekman, 1994), and are of particular interest because of their ability to alter subjective experience without a person’s conscious consideration or appreciation of this impact. Mood states have been shown to influence a wide range of consumer behaviors (Lee and Sternthal, 1999; Swinyard, 1993; Barone et al., 2000), to play a role in customer satisfaction (Andreassen and Lindestad, 1993; Bagozzi et al., 1999; Stauss and Neuhas 1997), and to serve as an affective antecedent to customer loyalty (Dick & Basu, 1994).

Importantly, mood states can be fairly difficult to articulate (Luomala and Laaksonen, 2000), which creates problems for any study in which mood is measured with self-report and then correlated with scales of consumer intention. Therefore, mood induction methodology (Velten 1968) is an ideal option in the study of mood effects upon the consumer, as it does not rely on the measurement of mood through self-report. As antecedent mood states may alter consumer perceptions (Burke and Edell, 1989) and can be incidental in nature, induced mood can be categorized as a form of emotional priming. Priming effects hold deep roots in the modern psychological understanding of judgment and decision-making (Bargh, 2006). In fact many recent studies on consumer behavior have utilized this type of laboratory-based methodology to explore questions ranging from choice in the grocery store (Dijksterhuis et al., 2005) to shopping engagement (Kettle and Haubl, 2011).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Customer Delight, Satisfaction & Dissatisfaction

Customer delight has been variously described as being a subset of customer satisfaction research (Johnston et al, 2004); as being a distinct construct that, while related to customer satisfaction, is separate and different (Berman, 2005); and as representing ‘100% satisfaction’ (Ngobo, 1999). The commonality between these varied definitions is the acknowledgement that customer delight is something beyond mere satisfaction, and that delight may include positive affective aspects such as joy and surprise (Berman, 2005) that are not characteristic of mere satisfaction. In theory, delighted customers should be more loyal than simply satisfied customers (Hallowell, 1996), because the customer’s emotional involvement ties them to the product (Edwards, 2003), and much has been written about this potential relationship (see Fornell et al., 1996). The relationship between positive mood states and enhanced reported consumer satisfaction has already been developed by prior research (Prakash, 1984; Knowles et al., 1993) and it is often assumed that a satisfied customer is surely a loyal customer. However, in several studies of customer loyalty intentions, antecedent mood has been found to explain only a very small amount of variance in loyalty intentions (de Ruyter and Bloemer, 1999; White and Yu, 2005).

One of the ongoing debates within the satisfaction/delight research surrounds the linear relationship between customer dissatisfaction, satisfaction, and delight (Coyne, 1989; Fornell et al., 1996; Ngobo, 1999; Berman, 2005). Specifically, the relationship between dissatisfaction, satisfaction, and delight variables may not occur linearly on a metric continuum. Kano (1984) illustrates this by breaking satisfaction/delight into three realms: Must-Be Requirements; Satisfier Requirements; and Attractive Requirements. Essentially, the must-be requirements are those basic consumer expectations that must be met in order to avoid dissatisfaction or outrage. Satisfier requirements are
those that are necessary to exceed expectations (satisfy the customer). Attractive requirements are those that are not expected by customers and therefore tend to delight the customer. Satisfied customers, because they have had their expectations met, may show some level of loyalty, but do not tend to become ambassadors of the brand. Although satisfaction may fall at some theoretical midpoint between delight and dissatisfaction, the specific relationship between these three concepts remains uncertain.

Mood Induction

The development of mood induction procedures (MIPs) is fundamental in the study of mood states and their effect on perception, cognition and behavior. Mood induction techniques include several methods meant to invoke a mood-state within the laboratory setting, in order to study the impact of mood in real time. These fairly simple techniques have been shown to successfully alter everything from future outlook (Schwarz and Clore, 1983), to levels of creativity (Andaman and Blaney, 1995), as well as basic interpretations of ambiguous circumstances (Bisson and Sears, 2007). One of the earliest MIPs developed was the Velten Mood induction (Velten, 1968), which involves the participant reading off a series of self-referent emotional statements from a set of cards. The Velten induction technique has been used extensively over the years, though demand characteristics of the technique may lead to inconsistency (Kenealy, 1986). Therefore more recently, a variety of indirect induction methods have been developed and utilized towards the same end, to include musical mood inductions (Clark, 1983), visual inductions via emotional video clips (Gross and Levensen, 1995), and autobiographical recall of emotional scenarios (Brewer et al., 1980).

Larsen and Sinnett (1991) concluded that the Velten MIP does have a genuine effect on mood, which is independent of demand characteristics. However, when experimental demand has the potential to threaten the validity of a study, MIPs with more indirect content than the Velten MIP are preferable. In other words, since mood induction may be considered a form of non-conscious priming, an indirect and subtler induction method (or one utilizing a cover story) is preferable. For this reason, autobiographical recall was chosen for the current study.

Autobiographical recall (aka 'Imagination MIP') is an induction procedure in which participants are asked to vividly recollect emotional moments from their own lives, and also asked to write down associated perceptions and feelings to further evoke the desired mood-state. The autobiographical procedure has been found to be highly effective in inducing mood states, whereby participants asked to recall positive autobiographical events have subsequently experienced significantly better moods, and participants who recall negative autobiographical events experienced a worsened mood, as compared to those who recall neutral life events. Mood validation scales on this method have shown highly significant mood effects at \( p < .01 \) (Forgas, 1995; Forgas et al., 2005). Westermann et al., (1996) have further established through meta-analysis a mean weighted effect of .359 for the induction of positive moods, and .522 for negative moods with autobiographical recall MIPs. Additionally, there is an underlying assumption that additive effects exist upon combining more than one MIP (see Bower, 1981), especially if one procedure serves as a backdrop to the more cognitively involved procedure (for example, an emotional image viewed while completing an autobiographical emotion task). For this reason, an additive background visual MIP (pretested for display of the intended mood-state) was provided within the current study alongside the autobiographical task to bolster induction effects.

Gender, Mood and Information Processing in the Retail Environment

Gender is also known to interact with mood effects (Kellaris and Mantel, 1994; Martin, 2003) and information processing (Klinteberg et al., 1987; Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran, 1991), while mood states in turn can also alter information processing differentially by gender (Blackhart et al., 2001). People in positive moods are more likely to process information in a heuristic fashion (Mackie and
Worth, 1989), however the ‘heuristic’ utilized may vary by gender. The current study suggests that emotional states can affect levels of customer loyalty, but in different manners by gender. This hypothesis is rooted in theory regarding gender differences in shopping behavior, motivations and cognitive processing.

Men and women are known to process information differently (Meyers-Levy, 1989; Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran, 1991), and are thought to have fairly different cognitive structures that organize and guide consumer perceptions (Cross & Madson 1997; Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran, 1991; Meyers-Levy and Sternthal, 1991). This suggests that the shopping behavior of men and women is inherently different (Grewal et al., 2003; Otnes and McGrath, 2001), and gender is considered to be one of the major characteristics relevant to appreciating consumer behavior (Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran, 1991). Furthermore, mood states are known to affect each gender’s information processing style in a different manner. For example, negative mood states have been shown to flip the processing style of men (but not women) to a more reflective and motivated style (Martin, 2003) and psychophysiological research has suggested that men and women show significantly different brain activation during judgments made while in a negative mood (Blackhart et al., 2001). Positive mood states also have been shown to have differential effects on the processing styles of men and women in their response to advertising (Martin, 2003). Three main differences between the genders drive our hypotheses in relation to the effect of mood states on customer loyalty; namely gender differences in shopper variety-seeking, emotional engagement with shopping, and tendencies towards risk aversion.

Variety Seeking

While many lay people assume that women tend to be more loyal customers than men (Lin 2008), it has been shown that women are actually prone to seek out a wider assortment of options and novelty than men as consumers (Shim, 1996; Shim and Kotsiopulos, 1993). Consumer behavior research cites both sociological and biological reasons for these types of gender differences, including the standard ‘hunter’ versus ‘gatherer’ mindset argument (Bem, 1981; Moschis, 1985; Reinisch et al., 1979). In fact, less than one in ten men report seeking novelty in surveys regarding their shopping behavior and shopping preferences (Bakewell and Mitchell, 2004). More specific studies on assortment seeking in shopping scenarios have shown that, while women may be the more service-loyal sex, men actually show greater loyalty when it comes to retail settings (Lin, 2008).

Emotional Engagement

Men and women also differ in the emotional rewards they associate with shopping, in that men do not report experiencing the high levels of emotional engagement that women experience from the activity of browsing and selecting items in retail settings (Brody and Hall, 2003). Women as a group traditionally skew much higher on the Recreational Shopper Identity scale, which indicates a connection to shopping that goes beyond mere enjoyment and potentially enters aspects of the self-concept (Guiry, 2006). Additionally, gender-schema theories (Bem, 1981) suggest that men, more so than women, tend to experience shopping within the framework of success and achievement (Firat and Dholakia, 1998). From this perspective, men view shopping as a competition which they are attempting to ‘win’ through efficient and swift decision-making, while women experience greater levels of satisfaction from the general activity of shopping itself (Otnes and McGrath, 2001) and derive more enjoyment than men simply from the act of selecting between alternative options (Mattila, 2010). Male retail loyalty may therefore actually be an artifact of the achievement they experience in feeling they have made quick and accurate decisions.
Risk Aversion

Dick & Basu (1994) cite confidence as one of the cognitive antecedents leading to customer loyalty. Studies suggest that men tend to have higher levels of confidence in their decisions (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974) and in their ability to process information than women within the context of achievement tasks (Kempf et al., 1997) and as noted above, shopping may be experienced as an achievement task by men. Women tend to not only have lower levels of confidence in their own ability to process information; women also tend to be more risk-averse than men (Eckel, 2008), and perception of risk has been known to influence loyalty (Yen, 2010). There is ample evidence of gender differences when it comes to choice under risk (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007; Gneezy et al., 2009). Importantly, while there exists no significant difference in levels of risk aversion for men in positive versus negative mood states, positive mood has been shown to significantly reduce risk aversion in women (Andersen et al., 2008). This is perhaps another indication of why women tend to seek out wider assortments while shopping when in a positive mood.

H1: Women will report lower levels of loyalty intentions when in an antecedent state of delight, as compared to an antecedent state of dissatisfaction.

To reiterate, a state of delight may induce women’s heuristic processing style, reduce concern about risk in decision-making, and in turn could lower levels of loyalty and increase behaviors such as brand switching. Meanwhile, the male information processing style in retail scenarios seems to be one of speed and efficiency, and because men do not often find shopping to be an emotionally rewarding activity, delight may actually serve as strong indication to men that they have effectively ‘won’ the task of making a good consumption choice. Once a man feels he has made the right choice while shopping, the likelihood that he will continue to stick with that choice should increase. In other words, because men are typically not found to derive emotional enjoyment from the activity of shopping, the especially strong positive emotion associated with a state of delight may actually be an unexpected and highly relevant cue to men that they’ve chosen correctly. These differences serve as the basis for the first hypothesis:

H2: Men will report higher intentions of loyalty when in an antecedent state of delight, as compared to an antecedent state of dissatisfaction.

Due to the differences in risk aversion across genders cited above, dissatisfaction and negative mood states may lead women to experience enhanced uncertainty in one’s decisions, and a preference for brands already deemed ‘safe’ would be a likely response for this highly risk-averse gender demographic. As mood states do not affect levels of risk aversion as heavily in men, a negative mood should not enhance loyalty for them in the same manner that it does for women. In this way, customer loyalty may primarily be about hedging risk for women, because sticking with familiar products or brands creates less potential for unexpected negative results. This assumption of opposing response to mood states by gender serves as the basis for the final hypotheses regarding the differences between men and women:

H3a: Women will report lower intentions of loyalty than men towards known brands when in an antecedent state of delight.

H3b:  Women will report greater loyalty intentions towards known brands than men when in an antecedent state of dissatisfaction.

Participants

A total of one hundred and sixteen college students in a southeastern school participated for course credit. Utilizing this kind of homogeneous sample enhances internal validity and control, and is considered a viable option when doing experimental research that is grounded in universalistic theory (Stephens, 2011).
In other words, it is expected that the hypothesized differences in response by gender will remain the same regardless of who the particular respondent might be. Furthermore, student samples do have requisite experience as consumers, and they are not asked within this study to respond outside of their knowledge set or role-play at some higher level of expertise.

A post-experimental questionnaire included funneled debriefing to determine whether participants had guessed at the true purpose of the study, and data from participants who offered accurate guesses were removed from the analysis (n = 6), leaving n = 110 participants. The breakdown by participant gender included 54 male and 56 female participants, in the age range of 19 to 28 years.

Procedure

As noted by Goritz and Moser (2006) regarding the administration of Web-based MIPs, attention must be paid to participant compliance in order for mood effects to be properly elicited. Therefore, though the experiment was conducted within a computer-based survey, all participants were individually scheduled and greeted by a research assistant as participants ran through the experiment at a private computer station. Individually, each subject was administered the experimental materials using a Qualtrics computer-based survey platform. Each participant was randomly assigned in a double-blind manner by the program to one of three possible mood-induction scenarios, to include ‘Satisfaction’ (n = 38), ‘Dissatisfaction’ (n = 37) and ‘Delight’ (n = 35). The Satisfaction condition was included as a non-emotional comparison group for the Delight and Dissatisfaction conditions.

The autobiographical mood induction was modeled after prior research (Forgas, 1995), in which participants are asked to recall and write about a time in their life when they felt either delight, satisfaction or dissatisfaction, depending on which scenario a participant was randomly assigned. The delight and dissatisfaction prompts included more overtly emotional descriptors such as recalling a time of ‘overwhelming joy and surprise’ or ‘unhappiness and things going worse than ever expected,’ respectively, while the satisfaction prompt was more benign; asking for recall of a time when things went ‘just as expected.’ Both the delight and dissatisfaction conditions specifically requested an interpersonal scenario, as both of these emotional constructs are thought to differ from satisfaction on this particular dimension (Verma, 2003).

To bolster the induction through the addition of a background visual MIP (Gross and Levenson, 1995), a line drawing depicting a person experiencing a congruent mood-state accompanied each autobiographical recall prompt. A pretest of stimuli was administered (n = 20) to determine whether each of the drawings were perceived to have a basic emotional match with each of the induction states, and these materials were found to have 100% inter-rater agreement on the emotional match. The mood induction itself was presented as an ‘Emotional Memory Task,’ in which participants were explicitly asked to recall a particular emotional state as vividly as possible. The style of induction was designed to mirror the wording used successfully by Forgas et al., (2005). In order to diminish experimental demand, the prompt was phrased so as to avoid use of the exact emotional terms intended for induction (‘delight,’ ‘satisfaction,’ and ‘dissatisfaction’); for example the delight prompt read “Your task is to think of a specific event that has occurred in your life, that made you feel extremely happy because someone had made the effort to surprise you in an unanticipated way; a surprise which brought you overwhelming joy and satisfaction.”

Additionally, the mood induction task itself was framed with the use of a basic cover story, which suggested that the purpose of the autobiographical recall task was to create content for a ‘memory task’ to be completed at a later time during the survey. This cover story was also meant to motivate prolonged activation of the mood-state content, in anticipation of a later memory test. Although the true purpose of the study in the larger sense was not revealed at this time, the intention of invoking a mood-state was fairly explicit. In administering a mood induction, when participants are directly
instructed to recall a mood, the induction method tends to produce larger effect sizes (Westermann et al., 1996). It should be noted that manipulation check are not typically done alongside mood induction methodology, for several reasons. First, it is generally accepted that self-report of mood conflicts with the notion of a diffuse or non-conscious effect (see Nisbett and Wilson, 1977 on introspective access, Bargh and Chartrand (2000), on priming methodology). Introducing a self-report on emotional status furthermore increases experimental demand and potentially degrades the effect of an induced state by bringing it into conscious consideration.

Upon completion of the mood induction, participants were thanked for their work on the Emotional Memory Task, and reminded that they may be asked to return to this task later in the study. Participants were then prompted to begin a ‘second study’ on consumer opinions, in which subjects were asked to complete a likert-based scale questionnaire. The ‘Brand Switcher’ scale (Raju, 1980) was taken from the “Marketing Scales Handbook,” by Bruner & Hensel (1992), and was chosen to reflect the previously hypothesized connection between antecedent mood and its impact on customer loyalty intentions. ‘Brand Switcher’ is a seven-item, seven-point rating meant to measure self-reported preference for either sticking with familiar brands or trying new brands, across several general shopping scenarios. In the past, this scale has been utilized to measure brand loyalty intentions, and the use of this scale follows conventional methodology regarding this construct (for a review of attitudinal measures of loyalty intentions, (see Mellens et al., 1996). The scale is included as an appendix, and is reported to have reliability of .832 with student samples. The scale was scored such that higher scores indicate higher levels of loyalty intentions. High reliability of the scale was furthermore shown with the current experimental sample as well, with Cronbach’s Alpha at .799, which is an acceptable level to assume internal consistency of the scale. Upon completion of the questionnaire, participant demographic information was collected and all were debriefed.

RESULTS

A two-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted, to explore the impact of induced mood (Delight, Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction) and gender on loyalty intentions, as measured by the Brand Switcher Scale. Results are displayed in Table 1. This design allowed for examination of the main effects of primed mood manipulation, gender, and the interaction between the mood manipulation and gender on loyalty intentions. Means for each grouping of the ANOVA are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Between-Subjects Effects</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.195</td>
<td>3.149</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion * Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.937</td>
<td>5.850</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .146 (Adjusted R Squared = .105)
Dependent Variable: Brand Switcher Scale (Raju, 1980)

Analysis of variance shows a main effect of the mood condition (F(2, 104) = 3.149, p < .05) which suggests that the mood induction effectively influenced loyalty intentions, however the effect size is only moderate (partial eta squared = .047) and due to the disordinal nature of the interaction the effectiveness of the prime is essentially contingent upon gender. No significant main effect of gender
was shown (F(1, 104) = .188, \( p = .666 \)) between subjects. Importantly, the gender-by-mood condition interaction was significant (F(2, 104) = 5.93, \( p < .005 \)), with a strong effect size (partial eta squared = .101; see Figure 1 for a graphical display of customer loyalty intentions).

### Table 2
**Means Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delight</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Brand Switcher Scale (Raju, 1980)

Within the group of female participants, Tukey HSD suggests that those induced with delight significantly differ from the set of females induced with dissatisfaction (\( p = .054 \)) such that loyalty intention scores were highest when female participants experienced an antecedent mood induction of dissatisfaction (\( H1 \) supported). Conversely, within the group of male participants, those induced with delight significantly differ from the set of males induced with dissatisfaction (\( p = .045 \), respectively). In this case, loyalty intention scores were highest when male participants experienced an antecedent mood induction of delight (\( H2 \) supported). What this suggests is that across all tested mood states, there exists no significant main effect of gender on loyalty intentions, however, within the context of specific antecedent mood states there exist significant differences in loyalty intentions, and this difference pushes men and women in very different directions (see Table 3).
Table 3

Comparisons of Mood Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delight * Satisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delight * Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction * Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delight * Satisfaction</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delight * Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction * Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Brand Switcher Scale (Raju, 1980)
Tukey HSD: mean difference is significant at the .05 level

To further explore the mood by gender interaction, comparisons of simple effects (see Table 4) show distinct patterns between men and women in each mood condition. When comparing results within the delight condition, male loyalty intention scores were higher on average ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 1.13$) than those of female participants ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.88$; $F(1, 104) = 7.17$, $p = .01$). Within the dissatisfaction condition, when comparing between males ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.97$) and females ($M = 5.03$, $SD = 1.06$) the loyalty intention scores were higher for women at $F(1, 104) = 4.63$, $p = .03$. (supporting $H3a$ and $H3b$). This suggests that men and women diverge in their reported loyalty intentions when receiving the very same mood induction of delight (or dissatisfaction).

Table 4

Pairwise Comparisons of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delight</td>
<td>Male * Female</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Male * Female</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Male * Female</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Brand Switcher Scale (Raju, 1980)
Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference

DISCUSSION

In addition to these findings on conditions of delight and dissatisfaction, the subjects in the ‘Satisfaction’ group further inform this study’s findings. Satisfaction was included as a comparison condition because it is considered a fairly neutral, non-emotional state (Berman, 2005). The authors’ anticipated that this condition might yield some level of intermediary data between delight and dissatisfaction conditions due to the spectrum-based hypothesis of mood (Coyne, 1989). However, rather than placing squarely in between the two major conditions of interest, the satisfaction condition results hung together with the conditions yielding lowest levels of loyalty intention by gender (see table 3). More specifically, for female participants, loyalty intentions in an induced state of satisfaction did not differ significantly from those in a state of delight, while both satisfaction and delight conditions differed at the <.05 level from those in a state of dissatisfaction ($p = .029$ and $p = .054$, respectively). For male participants, this pattern was inverted, such that a state of induced satisfaction did not differ from induced dissatisfaction, while both of these conditions differed at the <.05 level from delight ($p = .018$ and $p = .045$, respectively). While a more conservative alpha may be preferred for post-hoc testing, certainly the pattern emerging is intriguing.

What could be the reason for this relationship with satisfaction? Much of the theoretical background on gender differences described in the literature review can be utilized to describe this pattern, in
terms of which mood state is more unanticipated within the retail scenario by gender. As noted earlier, women as a segment differ from men in that they tend to derive emotional enjoyment from the act of shopping (Brody and Hall, 2003). When women consider shopping scenarios, states of satisfaction may be close in nature with states of delight, because a state of dissatisfaction would be the unexpected emotional outlier. On the other hand, for men a state of dissatisfaction may actually be closer in nature to a state of satisfaction within shopping scenarios. As men do not tend to derive highly positive emotions from the act of shopping, it might be a state of delight that is most unexpected. While satisfaction can be viewed as a neutral but positive state of being, it may not be a strong enough cue for men to elicit loyalty intentions towards retailers—that kind of influence on men might require delight. Likewise, a satisfactory shopping experience may not be a surprising enough cue to shift a woman’s mood state in a way that redirects cognitive processes.

A combination of key account management and customer satisfaction/delight is necessary to best manage the varying groups of customers. Furthermore, the question arises: should an organization attempt to manage the pre-existing mood state in which a customers enter a store? Just how much of an effect can antecedent mood have on subsequent loyalty intentions once the customer walks in the door? If antecedent mood, irrelevant to the store, can influence loyalty intentions towards the store, concern for organization-induced customer delight may be even more vital.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MARKETING PRACTITIONERS

First, the significant main effect of mood on loyalty intentions should indicate to managers that a shopper’s mood matters. Sales people and other “front-line” employees should be trained to take note of a customer’s mood and adjust the sales approach accordingly. Various training methods could be employed to accomplish this task. Role-playing, company developed videos and supervisor oversight would all be useful in this regard. Second, along this same vein of thought, the mood/gender interaction shows that men and women respond differently with regard to current mood state. Once again, employees should be trained to alter their customer service approach according to gender and perceived antecedent customer mood. For example, female customers exhibiting a negative mood should not be encouraged to perform any switching behavior. Salespeople should try to make a female shopper comfortable by focusing on stable aspects of the store or brands that she is familiar with. On the other hand, men in the same mood might be encouraged to try something new. In this situation salespeople should focus on new aspects of the store and steer male shoppers towards new, exciting brands.

Finally, it should be noted that the study does not suggest that employees should try to put any group of customers into a bad mood for purposes of loyalty or otherwise. Rather, the implication is that a sales or service approach may be altered depending on perceived customer mood to maximize certain loyalty behavior. The salesperson can more strategically implement relationship-marketing behaviors and appreciate their value at key moments. For example, if an employee recognizes a frequent (female) customer entering the store in a negative mood, this mood may actually be a part of the reason she has decided to shop there. That is, people are known to attempt to regulate their moods through ‘retail therapy’ (Atalay and Meloy, 2011). The shopper may be visiting a particular store seeking to regulate her negative mood by turning to the familiar, and in this case the salesperson might do well by fostering those feelings of familiarity with the shopper (e.g., calling her by name, greeting her in a personal way) to help allow for the resolution of her negative mood via loyalty with a familiar store.
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

While this study points out new avenues in mood induction and customer loyalty intentions, it is not without its shortcomings. First, this study is an experiment, which artificially manipulates subject’s mood states. Of course, with complex emotions such as ‘delight,’ a range of affective experiences may be induced simultaneously, and it should not be presumed that a complex emotion could be induced in any ‘pure’ sense. Past studies of mood induction have found that in addition to the target mood, related emotions are typically induced (e.g. Atkinson and Polivy, 1976; Strickland et al., 1975). Polivy’s (1981) review points out that emotions tend to covary, and that investigations of “an emotion” with mood induction should really be researched closely as investigations of covarying emotional sets.

Future research should focus on replicating this study in a non-laboratory setting to see if the results found in the lab hold in the real world. Also, as this study was an experiment, the sample size was somewhat small. Research using larger sample sizes would add to the validity and robustness of the findings. With such a complex interaction, future studies will work to examine each individual aspect of this effect more closely. For example, research into hedonic vs. utilitarian differences with regard to shopping mood states could provide further support of the gender differences found in this initial study. Finally, the loyalty scale used in this study is not brand specific, rather it is meant to measure more general intentions of switching behavior, and brand specific effects should be investigated. Further insights would be gained by replicating results using different brand specific manipulations to see if brand class or product type plays a role in moderating results.
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Appendix 1.
Brand Switcher Scale
(Raju, 1980)

7-point Likert ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Higher scores indicate higher levels of loyalty intentions; reverse-scored items are starred (**).

1. I enjoy sampling different brands of everyday products for the sake of comparison.**
2. I would rather stick with a brand I usually buy than try something I am not very sure of.
3. If I like a brand, I rarely switch from it just to try something different.
4. I get bored with buying the same brands even if they are good.**
5. A lot of the time I feel the urge to buy something really different from the brands I usually buy.**
6. If I did a lot of flying, I would probably like to try all of the different airlines instead of flying one airline most of the time.**
7. I enjoy exploring several different alternatives or brands while shopping.**
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