

Bond University  
Research Repository



## The impact of regulatory focus and word of mouth valence on search and experience attribute evaluation

Roy, Rajat; Naidoo, Vik

*Published in:*  
European Journal of Marketing

*DOI:*  
[10.1108/EJM-06-2016-0367](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-06-2016-0367)

*Licence:*  
Other

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*  
Roy, R., & Naidoo, V. (2017). The impact of regulatory focus and word of mouth valence on search and experience attribute evaluation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(7-8), 1353-1373.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-06-2016-0367>

### 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.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

## **The impact of regulatory focus and word of mouth valence on search and experience attribute evaluation**

Version:	Pre-publication version
Citation reference	<a href="https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/EJM-06-2016-0367">https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/EJM-06-2016-0367</a>
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Regulatory focus, search attribute, experience attribute, word of mouth, attitude, intention
Cite as Roy, R. & Naidoo, V. 2017. The impact of regulatory focus and word of mouth valence on search and experience attribute evaluation. <i>European Journal of Marketing</i> . 51(7/8): 1353-1373.	

## The impact of regulatory focus and word of mouth valence on search and experience attribute evaluation

### Abstract

**Purpose** – This paper investigates the direct and interactive effects of regulatory focus (promotion versus prevention), attribute type (search versus experience) and word of mouth valence (positive versus negative) on consumption decision for a service and a product.

**Design/methodology/approach** – Three empirical studies (two laboratories and a field experiment) using ‘university’ and ‘mobile phone’ as the research setting were used to test the key hypotheses.

**Findings** – Promotion (prevention) focused subjects preferred experience (search) attributes over their counterparts while making consumption decision. This preference was further reinforced for both promotion and prevention focused people under positive word of mouth. Under negative word of mouth, in comparison to their counterparts, promotion focused people still retained their preference for experience attributes, while prevention focused subjects reversed their preference and maintained status quo.

**Research limitations/implications** – Future research may validate and extend our findings by looking into the underlying process or studying additional word of mouth variables that may moderate the current findings.

**Practical implications** – Our findings will help managers devise a range of marketing strategies in the areas of advertising and product positioning, especially for products/services that are showcased in terms of experience and search attributes.

**Originality/value** – The current research is novel as no prior research has proposed and tested the two-way interaction between regulatory focus and search/experience attributes, or its further moderation by word of mouth valence.

**Keywords:** Regulatory focus, search attribute, experience attribute, word of mouth, attitude, intention

**Article Classification:** Research paper

## The impact of regulatory focus and word of mouth valence on search and experience attribute evaluation

### Introduction

It has been well established in the marketing literature that regulatory orientation of consumers systematically influences their product evaluation and choices (Roy and Ng, 2012; Chatterjee *et al.*, 2011; Lee and Aaker, 2004; Chernev, 2004; Pham and Avnet, 2004). In particular, these studies show that when the regulatory focus of a consumer is matched with a certain type of product attribute, it results in higher persuasion and purchase intention. The literature defines two kinds of regulatory orientation (e.g., Higgins, 1997): first, a state that involves self-regulation towards achievement/advancement in life and involves a ‘promotion focus’ versus ‘prevention focus’, which involves self-regulation towards safety/security needs in life. A range of product attributes like hedonic versus utilitarian, imagery versus concrete, performance versus safety etc. have been known to moderate the effect of regulatory focus on product decisions (Roy and Phau, 2014; Chernev, 2004; Lee and Aaker, 2004). In recent times, researchers have recommended greater inquiries into how search and experience product attributes influence consumption (Hyo-Jin *et al.*, 2014; Brakus *et al.*, 2014). Given the role of regulatory focus in influencing choice of attributes, the current work explores how this motivational state may influence choice of search and experience attributes in product decisions (Gap 1).

On the other hand, a disparate stream of the marketing literature on word of mouth communication has identified significant influence of this focal construct on product choice and evaluations (De Matos and Rossi, 2008). In particular, word of mouth communications is known to help consumers with product/service evaluation, decision making and reduction of risk related to purchase (De Matos and Rossi, 2008; Bansal and Voyer, 2000). The literature

1  
2  
3 also identifies that depending on the level of satisfaction and commitment with a  
4  
5 product/service, consumers not only engage in word of mouth activity (e.g. how often and the  
6  
7 quantity of information passed), but also decide on the word of mouth “valence”; i.e. engage  
8  
9 in positive or negative word of mouth (De Matos and Rossi, 2008; Sweeney *et al.*, 2005;  
10  
11 Harrison-Walker, 2001). A limited number of studies till date have shown that the impact of  
12  
13 regulatory focus on product decisions can be moderated by the word of mouth valence  
14  
15 (Pentina *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*, 2010), albeit with interesting differences.  
16  
17

18  
19 Zhang *et al.* (2010) finds when regulatory focus is matched with promotion  
20  
21 (prevention) consumption goals, positive (negative) word of mouth is more persuasive than  
22  
23 negative (positive) word of mouth. However, Pentina *et al.* (2015) reports that positive word  
24  
25 of mouth can increase message persuasiveness and behavioural intention for prevention  
26  
27 focused people, while there was no effect of positive review for promotion focus. Similarly,  
28  
29 Lim and Chung (2011) report that negative (but not positive) word of mouth has an impact on  
30  
31 evaluation of attributes in decision making, although they do not study the role of regulatory  
32  
33 focus in their study. Given these mixed findings, the current work posits that the relationship  
34  
35 between regulatory focus and word of mouth valence can be moderated by attribute type  
36  
37 (search versus experience), and proposes a novel three-way interaction (Gap 2).  
38  
39

40  
41 While the effect of word of mouth valence on message persuasiveness shows a  
42  
43 positivity (negativity) bias for promotion (prevention) focused people (Zhang *et al.*, 2010),  
44  
45 these researchers confirm that further research gaps remain. For example, they do not study  
46  
47 the effect of word of mouth valence on product attitude and choice, a variable that is  
48  
49 important for regulatory focus literature (Motyka *et al.*, 2014) (Gap 3). Further, the limited  
50  
51 research that connects regulatory focus and word of mouth (Pentina *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*,  
52  
53 2010) fail to consider the recent theoretical developments in the regulatory focus literature,  
54  
55 and just propagate their hypotheses based on match between regulatory foci and valence of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 information. For example, both Pentina et al. (2015) and Zhang et al. (2010) argue that  
4 promotion (prevention) foci are more sensitive to positive (negative) information as it helps  
5 them to achieve (avoid) positive versus negative outcomes. While the extant literature  
6 broadly supports this, the findings have to be reviewed in light of new theoretical  
7 developments in the regulatory focus area (e.g. Scholer and Higgins, 2013; Scholer *et al.*,  
8 2010). For example, these studies suggest that both promotion and prevention focused people  
9 are capable of risky and risk averse decisions, depending on their state of progress towards  
10 the goal. Based on these latest findings, the present work builds nuanced hypotheses for this  
11 study (Gap 4).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 In addressing these research gaps, this study uses both laboratory and field  
24 experiments. Study 1 tests the influence of regulatory focus on attribute choice, study 2 uses a  
25 field experiment to test the moderating effect of word of mouth. Finally, study 3 uses a  
26 laboratory experiment and a different product category to replicate the findings from study 2.  
27 In the next section, the relevant literature is reviewed first leading to the hypotheses, and then  
28 followed with three studies that are used to test them. The findings are then discussed along  
29 with managerial implications and directions for future research.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **Theoretical background**

### 42 *Search experience and credence (SEC) attributes*

43  
44  
45  
46 In the marketing literature, goods and services have often been described as a bundle of  
47 attributes. In line with this, products and services can be described in terms of multiple  
48 attributes (Ekelund *et al.*, 1995). The economics of information (EOI) literature (Nelson,  
49 1970) also conceptualizes goods and services at attribute level, mainly in terms of search,  
50 experience, and credence attributes. Therefore, combining perspectives from the marketing  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and EOI literature, goods and services are more appropriately described in terms of search,  
4  
5 experience, and credence attributes as most products or services can consist of one or a  
6  
7 combination of these attributes.  
8  
9

10 Search, experience and credence (SEC) attributes in the literature have been  
11  
12 conceptualized based on whether consumers are able to evaluate these attributes before,  
13  
14 during or after consumption, and the level of information available to assist or deter  
15  
16 consumers in their attribute appraisals. A direct translation from EOI literature describes  
17  
18 search attributes as those which consumers are able to determine accurately before purchase;  
19  
20 experience attributes can only be evaluated during consumption; while credence attributes  
21  
22 cannot be evaluated even after consumption (Srinivasan and Till, 2002). Taking an  
23  
24 information processing perspective, SEC attributes can also be defined based on  
25  
26 increasing/decreasing levels of information availability or cost/difficulty consumers would  
27  
28 experience while obtaining and evaluating attribute information about products or services  
29  
30 (Lim and Chung, 2011).  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Following this approach, search attributes are those for which relevant information  
36  
37 can be obtained prior to consumption; information on experience attributes are not known  
38  
39 unless the product is consumed, and for credence attributes, information is not known either  
40  
41 prior to or even after the consumption. An appropriate example of search attribute from the  
42  
43 banking sector could be the 'interest rate', information which can easily be ascertained by  
44  
45 consumers from published sources. Experience attribute similarly would be 'convenient  
46  
47 location', information which can only be experienced during consumption, while for a  
48  
49 credence attribute like 'integrity of the bank', information cannot be ascertained either prior  
50  
51 to or even after consuming the service (Lim and Chung, 2011).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In the market place, the way consumers acquire search, experience or credence  
4 information can have implications for decision making. Consumers may seek information  
5 about search attributes from second hand sources like advertising, as search attributes are  
6 relatively easy to verify for accuracy (Hsieh *et al.*, 2005). When compared to search attributes  
7 whose information can easily be verified from second hand sources, experience attributes are  
8 verified normally from first hand experiences. For example, consumers tend to rely more on  
9 others' recommendations on experience attributes rather than search attributes (Park and Lee,  
10 2009). However, the matter of distinction between different attribute types is based on  
11 consumers' perceptions. Indeed, this perception can be influenced when marketers attempt to  
12 make more information available on experience attributes (e.g., online reviews about first  
13 hand experiences) in an attempt to transform them into search attributes, although such  
14 transformation can never be fully achieved (Yang and Mai, 2010).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 There is some evidence that claims hedonic consumption to be more influenced by  
30 experience attributes because it involves close interaction with the product attributes in order  
31 to experience them (Eliashberg and Sawhney, 1994). The need to experience an attribute also  
32 suggests subjective nature of its qualities and the greater need to use one's senses to evaluate  
33 the product or service (Weathers *et al.*, 2007). In comparison, search attributes tend to be of  
34 more objective quality and normally more credible compared to experience attributes  
35 (Weather *et al.*, 2007, Jain and Posavac, 2004). Normally consumers are more sceptical of  
36 subjective and experiential information in advertising than objective and search information  
37 (Ford *et al.*, 1990). Amongst all the SEC attributes, consumers are most sceptical of credence  
38 attributes (Srinivasan and Till, 2002). For the current work we focus on search and  
39 experience attributes only as extant literature argues that credence attributes may not be  
40 directly relevant to product decisions since consumers cannot evaluate them even after usage  
41 (Yang and Mai, 2010; Hsieh *et al.*, 2005; Wright and Lynch, 1995). Research shows that  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 consumers' reliance on SEC attributes for making product decisions can be a function of  
4  
5 consumer characteristics (Klein, 1998). In a related manner, the marketing literature also  
6  
7 argues that the choice of product information (e.g., attributes) in consumption can also be  
8  
9 guided by an individual's motivational state like regulatory focus (Chatterjee *et al.*, 2011; Lee  
10  
11 and Aaker, 2004; Chernev, 2004).  
12

### 13 *Regulatory focus*

14  
15 According to the regulatory focus theory there are two different types of goals, namely the  
16  
17 promotion and prevention (Higgins, 1997). Promotion goals are geared towards nurturance  
18  
19 related needs in life, and concerns itself with advancement, accomplishment and aspirations  
20  
21 (Avnet and Higgins, 2006; Aaker and Lee, 2006). Promotion system is further focused on  
22  
23 ensuring gains or achieving a positive outcome. On the other hand, prevention goals involve  
24  
25 protection, safety and responsibility needs and are more concerned with the absence of losses  
26  
27 or negative outcomes (Avnet and Higgins, 2006; Aaker and Lee, 2006).  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 In the pursuit of nurturance needs, a state of advancement matters most to the  
33  
34 promotion focus, which in other words is a state of positive deviation (i.e., a gain) from a  
35  
36 neutral or status quo state (Scholer and Higgins, 2013). When circumstances indicate that  
37  
38 things are going fine, these people are highly motivated to engage in stimulation and  
39  
40 incentive seeking activities (Friedman *et al.*, 2007). Promotion focus, is also less sensitive to  
41  
42 negative deviations from the neutral state (Scholer and Higgins, 2013). Evidence shows that a  
43  
44 state of promotion focus can deviate attention from negative or risky information in decision  
45  
46 making (Shin *et al.*, 2014; Sengupta and Zhou, 2007). For example, in support of this  
47  
48 Sengupta and Zhou (2007) show that while making a product decision, a promotion focus can  
49  
50 encourage preferences for experiential attributes (e.g., luxury in car) at the expense of safety  
51  
52 features (e.g., braking features in car).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 A prevention focus on the other hand, emphasizes desired end states such as  
4  
5 responsibility and safety (Higgins, 1997). Under this state, what matters most is the need to  
6  
7 maintain absence of negative outcomes, and hence a safe or neutral state may be preferable in  
8  
9 comparison to a negative state (Scholer and Higgins, 2013). When circumstances indicate  
10  
11 that the environment is problematic, these people are even willing to engage risky tactics to  
12  
13 return to a safe state (Khajehzadeh *et al.*, 2015; Scholer and Higgins, 2013; Friedman and  
14  
15 Förster, 2001). Prior research shows that people under prevention focus tend to engage higher  
16  
17 cognitive resources when the effects of failure can be significant (Baumeister *et al.*, 2001).  
18  
19 For example, when faced with a loss in financial decision making, prevention focus people  
20  
21 have been known to deliberately adopt a risky strategy to return to a safe state, i.e. a state of  
22  
23 status quo (Scholer and Higgins, 2013; Scholer *et al.*, 2010).  
24  
25  
26

### 27 28 *Regulatory fit*

29  
30 The promotion and prevention system are inclined to pursue a goal with approach and  
31  
32 avoidance strategies respectively. Approach strategies fit better with a focus to ensure gains,  
33  
34 while avoidance strategies fit better with guard against losses (Avnet and Higgins, 2006).  
35  
36 Normally more eagerness is involved in pursuit of gains while more vigilance is involved in  
37  
38 the avoidance of losses (Lee and Aaker, 2004; Chernev, 2004). When promotion and  
39  
40 prevention focused individuals adopt strategies that are consistent with their regulatory goals,  
41  
42 they experience ‘regulatory fit’ (Aaker and Lee, 2006). As a result of the ensuing fit, people  
43  
44 experience higher persuasion and purchase intentions while making product decisions.  
45  
46  
47

48 Evidence from the domain of persuasion research shows that people experience a ‘fit’  
49  
50 when they evaluate product attributes that are relevant to a person’s regulatory focus  
51  
52 (Chatterjee *et al.*, 2011; Lee and Aaker, 2004). Product features that support hedonic claims  
53  
54 (e.g., great taste in yoghurt), emphasizes desirable outcome (e.g., fruit juice that helps to get  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 energized), are experiential (e.g., speed of a car), appeal to the promotion system of  
4 advancement, and are therefore more influential on promotion focused individuals (Roy and  
5 Ng, 2012; Lee and Aaker, 2004; Chernev, 2004). On the other hand, product features that  
6 support utilitarian claims (e.g., useful bacteria in yoghurt), prevents undesirable outcome  
7 (e.g., fruit juice that prevents clogging of arteries) and are safety related (e.g., ABS brakes in  
8 car), appeal to the prevention system of security, and are therefore more influential on  
9 prevention focused individuals (Roy and Ng, 2012; Lee and Aaker, 2004; Chernev, 2004).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **Hypotheses development**

### 21 *Regulatory focus and choice of SEC attributes*

22  
23 In the context of experience versus search attributes, we argue that promotion focused people  
24 will prefer the former while their counterpart will rely on the later in product decisions. A  
25 promotion system is more focused on the experiential side of consumption (Jia *et al.*, 2012;  
26 Keller, 2006), and engages more subjective (e.g., affect and imagery) information in decision  
27 making (Das 2016; Lin and Chen 2015; Roy and Phau, 2014; Pham and Avnet, 2004). As the  
28 promotion system is about making advancement in life, these people also like to try newly  
29 launched products that engage more experiential attributes (Herzenstein *et al.*, 2007). For  
30 example, Brakus *et al.* (2014) posit that successfully launched new products (e.g., the new  
31 Beetle car) focus more on providing experiential attributes (e.g., novel shapes and colors).  
32 Experience attributes which are more subjective and need to be experienced first-hand for  
33 making product decisions (Weathers *et al.*, 2007), should therefore appeal more to the  
34 promotion system.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 On the other hand, the prevention system is about making careful and deliberate  
53 decisions that relies on the practical side of consumption, like functional products (Chernev,  
54 2004). The prevention system also engages more objective information in decision making  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that can be easily verified (Roy and Phau, 2014; Pham and Avnet, 2004). A focus on  
4  
5 avoiding negative outcomes also causes these people to avoid ambiguous situations like  
6  
7 experiencing newly launched products in the market (Herzenstein *et al.*, 2007). Given that  
8  
9 search attributes are more substantive, credible and hence can easily be verified (Lin and  
10  
11 Chen, 2015; Weather *et al.*, 2007, Jain and Posavac, 2004), they should appeal to the cautious  
12  
13 nature of prevention focused people. Based on the above we hypothesize:  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 *H1: Promotion focused individuals will exhibit higher (a) attitude and (b)*  
19  
20 *behavioural intention towards experience attributes in comparison to prevention-*  
21  
22 *focused counterparts.*  
23  
24

25  
26 *H2: Prevention focused individuals will exhibit higher (a) attitude and (b)*  
27  
28 *behavioural intention towards search attributes in comparison to promotion-focused*  
29  
30 *counterparts.*  
31  
32

### 33 *Regulatory focus, attribute types and word of mouth*

34  
35 We now turn to the specific context of word of mouth's moderating influence on regulatory  
36  
37 foci's choice of search and experience attributes. Positive word of mouth is about sharing  
38  
39 satisfactory product experience, and may therefore signal opportunities to promotion focused  
40  
41 individuals who are more geared towards achieving gain state (Zhang *et al.*, 2010; Lockwood  
42  
43 *et al.*, 2002). Positive word of mouth should also indicate to promotion focus people that  
44  
45 everything is fine and should further encourage their incentive seeking activities (Friedman *et*  
46  
47 *al.*, 2007). Evidence shows that promotion focus people engage with positive word of mouth  
48  
49 by sharing them in an online environment (Das, 2016; Shin *et al.*, 2014). In the context of  
50  
51 product decision, providing positive online reviews strengthened promotion focus'  
52  
53 behavioural intentions (Pentina *et al.*, 2015). Since H1 argues that promotion focus will have  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 a preference for experience attributes over their counterparts, presence of positive word of  
4  
5 mouth will therefore only reinforce preference for the experience attributes.  
6  
7

8 As argued before, a promotion focus has the tendency to overlook risky or negative  
9  
10 information in decision making while pursuing their agenda of advancement goals in life  
11  
12 (Sengupta and Zhou, 2007). Further they also seem resistant to any negative information they  
13  
14 come across in decision making. For example, after having a negative experience such as  
15  
16 service failure, the induction of a promotion focus minimized the likelihood of spreading  
17  
18 negative word of mouth (Shin *et al.*, 2014). Specifically, after exposure to negative word of  
19  
20 mouth (such as online review), promotion focus peoples' attitude and intentions were not  
21  
22 affected by the message arguments (Pentina *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, induction of promotion  
23  
24 focus will reduce the impact of negative word of mouth on their preference for experiential  
25  
26 attributes. This leads to:  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 *H3: Promotion focused individuals will exhibit higher attitude and behavioural*  
32  
33 *intention towards experience attributes in comparison to prevention-focused*  
34  
35 *counterparts under (a) positive word of mouth and (b) will retain these preferences*  
36  
37 *under negative word of mouth.*  
38  
39

40 A positive word of mouth may also appeal to prevention focused individuals,  
41  
42 especially by reducing uncertainty in decision making. A psychological motive underlying  
43  
44 positive word of mouth is to signal expertise to others (Wojnicki and Godes, 2011). Further,  
45  
46 expert judgments have been known to reduce uncertainty and risks associated with the  
47  
48 decision making process (Cooke, 1991). In this sense, positive word of mouth will therefore  
49  
50 alleviate decision risks by confirming to prevention people that the strategy pursued by them  
51  
52 will not lead to negative outcome. Recent work supports this line of argument and shows that  
53  
54 in the context of product decisions, positive word of mouth is considered by the cautious  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 natured prevention focus as more persuasive to act on (Pentina *et al.*, 2015). Based on these  
4  
5 findings, positive word of mouth should therefore reinforce the preference for search  
6  
7 attributes amongst these individuals as posited in H2.  
8

9  
10 A likely negative outcome puts prevention focus on guard and causes them to engage  
11  
12 more cognitive resources (Baumeister *et al.*, 2001). Prevention focus is also keen to get back  
13  
14 to a safe or status quo state when a situation highlights the risk of imminent failure, even if it  
15  
16 means pursuing a risky strategy (Khajehzadeh *et al.*, 2015; Scholer and Higgins, 2013;  
17  
18 Scholer *et al.*, 2010; Scholer *et al.*, 2008). Similarly, when asked to focus on failures,  
19  
20 prevention focus people showed increased motivation to pursue strategies for avoiding  
21  
22 failures (Lockwood *et al.*, 2002). In the current context, negative word of mouth is more  
23  
24 likely to raise fears of failure in prevention focus, if this strategy is pursued (Lockwood *et al.*,  
25  
26 2002). Further, as negative word of mouth is more diagnostic (Lim and Chung, 2011), it is  
27  
28 likely to influence cognitively driven prevention focus people. In response, prevention focus  
29  
30 may actually alter their earlier preference for a specific product attribute (e.g., search), in  
31  
32 order to achieve a safe or status quo state. This leads to:  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 *H4: Prevention focused individuals will exhibit higher attitude and behavioural*  
38  
39 *intention towards search attributes in comparison to promotion-focused counterparts*  
40  
41 *under (a) positive word of mouth and (b) these preferences will reverse under*  
42  
43 *negative word of mouth.*  
44  
45

46  
47 We now report three studies that tests hypotheses 1 to 4. In particular, study 1 engages  
48  
49 a laboratory experiment to test H1 and H2, while study 2 and 3 engages a field and a  
50  
51 laboratory experiment to test H3 and H4, albeit with a service and a product.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Study 1

Two hundred and twenty-eight students (135 males; average age 21 years) were recruited across two large Pacific Coast universities to participate in a 2 (Regulatory focus: promotion versus prevention) x 2 (attribute type: search versus experience) between subjects' design laboratory experiment.

*Pre-test:* Two separate pre-tests were conducted with students, who did not participate in the main studies. In the first pre-test (n = 35), students were given the definition of search, experience and credence attributes, and then asked to classify a list of six university related attributes. The choice of university as the context is guided by usage of services in the word of mouth and SEC research (Lim and Chung, 2011). The attribute choice was based on extant literature (Gray *et al.*, 2003). A list of attributes like 'ranking', 'industry connected teaching', 'theory based teaching from textbook', 'research output', 'friendly environment' and 'young and upcoming university' were tested. We selected the features that the majority (i.e. 70% or more) of students classified as a specific type. Based on the results, 100% students classified 'friendly environment', 'young and upcoming', and 92% classified 'industry connectedness' as experience attributes. On the other hand, 100% classified 'ranking', 'theory based teaching from textbook' and 77% classified 'research output' as search attributes.

In a second pre-test, we once again asked a different pool of student subjects (n = 39) who did not participate in the main studies, as how they perceived each of these six features on a scale of 1 to 7 with end points 1 = search attribute, and 7 = experience attribute. In line with the regulatory focus literature discussed above, we also asked the subjects if these features varied in terms of hedonic versus utilitarian, subjective versus objective and performance versus reliability dimensions.

1  
2  
3 We conducted a one sample 't' test to compare each attribute with respect to the scale  
4 mid-point of 4. Consistent with findings from the first pre-test, students rated the experience  
5 attributes 'friendly environment' ( $t(38) = 12.64, p < 0.001$ ), 'young and upcoming' ( $t(38) =$   
6  $12.25, p < 0.001$ ), and 'industry connectedness' ( $t(38) = 9.89, p < 0.001$ ) as significantly  
7 higher than the test value. Similarly, the search attributes like 'ranking' ( $t(38) = -14.74, p <$   
8  $0.001$ ), 'theory based teaching from textbook' ( $t(38) = -12.44, p < 0.001$ ) and 'research  
9 output' ( $t(38) = -8.06, p < 0.001$ ) were rated significantly lower than the scale mid-point.  
10  
11 The attributes did not differ in terms of hedonic versus utilitarian, subjective versus objective  
12 and performance versus reliability dimensions (all  $ps > 0.1$ ). Based on these pre-tests, two  
13 separate university descriptions were created (Appendix 1).  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 *Procedure and measures:* Upon arriving in the laboratory, participants were randomly  
27 assigned to one of the four conditions. The experiment was conducted in seemingly two  
28 unrelated studies. The first part was about regulatory focus manipulation in which students  
29 were asked to write an essay about hopes and aspirations versus duties and obligations. This  
30 was based on a procedure developed and widely used in the regulatory focus literature (Pham  
31 and Avnet, 2009). In the second part, students were asked to imagine that they were  
32 considering a university for educational purposes, and were given the description of a  
33 fictitious university called 'Capital University'. The description of the university was based  
34 on 'search' or 'experience' attributes, as described earlier (see Appendix 1).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 After the subjects completed the regulatory manipulation, they were asked to also  
48 undertake a manipulation check. Similarly, after reading the university descriptions, they  
49 completed a second manipulation check. Following this, a number of dependent variables  
50 like attitude and intention to study at the university were recorded. This was followed by  
51 'involvement' and other demographic variables like age and gender. Involvement was  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 measured since evidence shows that it can influence product evaluation (Vakratsas and  
4  
5 Ambler, 1999).  
6  
7

8 Attitude towards the university was measured with seven-point scale item using  
9  
10 variables adapted from the literature (e.g., Bennett, 2007): “The university makes me  
11  
12 interested”, “I perceive this university’s reputation to be favourable”, “I feel this university is  
13  
14 trustworthy”, “I trust this university to provide good quality education” (Cronbach’s alpha =  
15  
16 .956). Similarly, intention was measured with seven-point scale items adapted from the  
17  
18 literature (e.g., Bennett 2007): “I would like to find out more information about this  
19  
20 university, “I would probably be influenced towards going to this university”, and “I will  
21  
22 probably consider this university for my studies”, (Cronbach’s alpha = .929). Involvement  
23  
24 was measured with the item “While reading about the Capital university, you were”, with  
25  
26 semantic differential endpoints like “not all involved/involved” and “not at all  
27  
28 interested/interested”.  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 Data analysis and results

34  
35 *Manipulation check:* Manipulation check for regulatory focus comprised of a single item  
36  
37 about what participants considered after completing the essay, with end points like 1=  
38  
39 something I ought to do and 7 = something I want to do (Pham and Avnet, 2009). The  
40  
41 manipulation check for university type asked participants about how the university was  
42  
43 described with end points like 1 = search attributes, and 7 = experience attributes.  
44  
45  
46

47 Results of one-way ANOVA with regulatory manipulation check item showed that subjects  
48  
49 in the promotion condition focused on something they wanted to do as against prevention  
50  
51 focus who leaned towards something they ought to do (Ms of 5.84 versus 2.55,  $F(1,227) =$   
52  
53  $874.78, p < 0.001$ ). Similarly, participants’ response to the description of the university based  
54  
55 on search attributes differed significantly from the description based on experience attributes  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Ms of 1.20 versus 6.03,  $F(1,227) = 2715.71, p < 0.001$ ). The manipulation for regulatory  
4  
5 focus and attribute type thus seems to be successful.  
6  
7

8 *Covariate:* Result of a two-way ANOVA with regulatory focus and attribute type showed a  
9  
10 main effect on involvement. Subjects in the experience attribute condition were more  
11  
12 involved in comparison to those in search attribute condition (Ms of 5.65 versus 5.02,  
13  
14  $F(1,227) = 83.2, p < 0.001$ ). Further, subjects in the prevention condition seemed to be more  
15  
16 involved as compared to their promotion focused counterparts (Ms of 5.41 versus 5.25,  
17  
18  $F(1,227) = 4.36, p < 0.05$ ). Involvement was included as a covariate for further analyses.  
19  
20  
21

22 *Main effects:* A 2 X 2 ANCOVA with attitude as the dependent variable showed a main  
23  
24 effect of regulatory focus; subjects in the promotion focus exhibited higher attitude in  
25  
26 comparison to their prevention focused counterparts (Ms of 4.56 versus 4.34,  $F(1,227) =$   
27  
28  $14.38, p < 0.001$ ). No other main effect was found to be significant. A similar ANCOVA was  
29  
30 performed with 'intention' as the dependent variable. Results once again showed a main  
31  
32 effect of regulatory focus ( $F(1, 223) = 6.49, p < 0.05$ ) as well as attribute type ( $F(1, 223) =$   
33  
34  $50.33, p < 0.001$ ). Prevention focused subjects showed higher intention over their  
35  
36 counterparts (Ms of 4.36 versus 4.25). Further, overall the subjects showed higher intention  
37  
38 towards the experience attributes as against the search attributes in the product description  
39  
40 (Ms of 4.49 versus 4.12).  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 *Interaction effects:* As predicted by H1, the two-way interaction between regulatory focus  
46  
47 and attribute type was significant for both attitude ( $F(1,223) = 3507.59, p < 0.001$ ) and  
48  
49 intention ( $F(1,223) = 2374.71, p < 0.001$ ). Results of compared contrast analyses showed  
50  
51 promotion subjects exhibited a higher attitude (Ms of 6.12 versus 2.92,  $t(224) = 50.58, p <$   
52  
53  $0.001$ ) as well as intention (Ms of 6.17 versus 2.98,  $t(224) = 37.34, p < 0.001$ ) when the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

university was described in terms of experience attributes over their prevention counterparts. The findings support H1a and b.

On the other hand, prevention focused subjects showed higher attitude towards the university when it was described in terms of search attributes as compared to their promotion focused counterparts (Ms of 5.83 versus 2.97,  $t(224) = -44.51, p < 0.001$ ). Similar to attitude, prevention focused subjects also showed higher intention towards the university with search attributes over promotion focused subjects (Ms of 5.80 versus 2.30,  $t(224) = -40.28, p < 0.001$ ). These results therefore support H2a and H2b. All means from study 1 are reported in tables 1 and 2.

-----  
Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here  
-----

The results obtained from the first study therefore support the key hypotheses that promotion (prevention) focused subjects preferred the experience attributes (search attributes) over their counterparts, while making a consumption decision. With these observations, we proceeded with the second study to test hypotheses 3 and 4.

**Study 2**

The second study engaged a 2 (Regulatory focus: promotion versus prevention) x 2 (attribute type: search versus experience) x 2(word of mouth received: positive versus negative) between subject design in a field experiment. Four hundred and forty-nine students (192 males, mean age 25 years) participated in this study. The student participants were sourced from three highly-reputed higher education recruitment fairs held in the Asia-Pacific region

1  
2  
3 (e.g. [www.topmba.com/events](http://www.topmba.com/events)) and randomly allocated to one of the eight experimental  
4  
5 conditions.

6  
7  
8 *Procedure and measures:* Similar to study 1, the participants' regulatory focus was  
9  
10 manipulated by asking them to write essays, following which they read descriptions of the  
11  
12 fictitious university described in terms of search and experience attributes. After reading  
13  
14 these descriptions, subjects were further asked to imagine that they met a close friend who  
15  
16 said positive (negative) things about the university. Manipulation check items were placed  
17  
18 after the regulatory focus and university manipulation, and the same single item measures  
19  
20 were used from the first study. Following this, students completed key dependent variables  
21  
22 like 'attitude' (Cronbach's alpha = .972) and 'intention' (Cronbach's alpha = .931) which  
23  
24 engaged the same scales from study 1. Further, towards the end of the experiments,  
25  
26 participants completed involvement items, and reported their demographics.  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 Data analysis and results

32  
33 *Manipulation check:* One-way ANOVA showed that subjects in promotion focus leaned  
34  
35 towards something they wanted to do, as against prevention focus who leaned towards  
36  
37 something they ought to do (Ms of 5.68 versus 2.11,  $F(1,448) = 2193.31, p < 0.001$ ).  
38  
39 Similarly, subjects under the search attribute condition perceived the university description to  
40  
41 be based on search attributes in comparison to the experience attributes (Ms of 2.13 versus  
42  
43 5.82,  $F(1,448) = 2037.58, p < 0.001$ ). Once again, the regulatory focus and university  
44  
45 manipulation seems to be successful.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 *Covariate:* Results of one-way ANOVA showed that subjects demonstrated higher  
51  
52 involvement with the search attribute as against the experience attribute (Ms of 5.69 versus  
53  
54 5.47,  $F(1,448) = 30.82, p < 0.001$ ). Similar to study 1, prevention focused subjects seemed to  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 be more involved as compared to their counterparts (Ms of 5.65 versus 5.52,  $F(1,448) = 9.93$ ,  
4  
5  $p < 0.01$ ). Involvement was thus held as a covariate in further analyses.  
6  
7

8 *Main effects:* Results of a three way ANCOVA with attitude as the dependent variable  
9  
10 showed main effects of regulatory focus ( $F(1, 440) = 714.25$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and word of mouth  
11  
12 ( $F(1, 440) = 11449.66$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Promotion focused individuals exhibited higher attitudes  
13  
14 compared to their counterparts (Ms of 4.21 versus 3.63), while the positive word of mouth led  
15  
16 to higher attitude compared to the negative word of mouth (Ms of 5.33 versus 2.33).  
17  
18  
19

20 A similar three way ANCOVA was performed with intention as the dependent  
21  
22 variable. Results once again showed that promotion focused subjects had higher intention  
23  
24 compared to their counterparts (Ms of 4.02 versus 3.66,  $F(1, 440) = 127.73$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).  
25  
26 Similar to attitude, higher intention was reported under positive as compared to negative  
27  
28 word of mouth (Ms of 5.32 versus 2.48,  $F(1, 440) = 4790.13$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).  
29  
30  
31

32 *Interaction effects:* The two-way interaction between regulatory focus and university type  
33  
34 was significant ( $F(1, 440) = 836.73$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This interaction was however, qualified by a  
35  
36 significant three-way interaction between regulatory focus, university type and word of  
37  
38 mouth ( $F(1,440) = 510.94$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Planned contrast analyses were conducted to compare  
39  
40 the attitudes under positive and negative word of mouth conditions.  
41  
42  
43

44 Aligned with H3a, under positive word of mouth, promotion focused individuals  
45  
46 showed higher attitude (Ms of 5.73 versus 4.60,  $t(441) = 21.82$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and intention (Ms  
47  
48 of 5.73 versus 4.76,  $t(441) = 11.65$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) towards the university described in terms of  
49  
50 experience attributes over their counterparts. H3a is thus supported. In support of H3b, it was  
51  
52 found that under a negative word of mouth condition, promotion focused subjects still  
53  
54 preferred the university with [experience](#) attributes in terms of attitude (Ms of 3.40 versus  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1.59,  $t(441) = 33.51, p < 0.001$ ) and intention (Ms of 3.19 versus 1.58,  $t(441) = 18.56, p <$   
4  
5 0.001) when compared to prevention focused people.  
6  
7

8 Under positive word of mouth, prevention focused subjects on the other hand,  
9  
10 preferred the university with search attributes over their promotion focused counterparts in  
11 terms of both attitude (Ms of 6.28 versus 4.67,  $t(441) = -29.77, p < 0.001$ ) and intention (Ms  
12 of 6.41 versus 4.31,  $t(441) = -24.09, p < 0.001$ ); thereby supporting H4a. Interestingly as  
13 predicted by H4b, under negative word of mouth prevention focused subjects demonstrated a  
14 preference reversal. This time around [promotion focused people showed higher attitude](#) (Ms  
15 of 3.32 versus 1.85,  $t(441) = 30.34, p < 0.001$ ) and purchase intention (Ms of 3.13 versus  
16 1.70,  $t(441) = 18.40, p < 0.001$ ) for the university described in terms of [search](#) attributes in  
17 comparison to their counterparts. All the means are reported in tables 3 and 4, [while figures](#)  
18 [1, 2 and 3, 4 show the three-way interaction for ‘attitude’ and ‘intention’ respectively.](#)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 -----

32  
33 Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

34  
35 [Insert Figures 1 and 2 about here](#)

36  
37 [Insert Figures 3 and 4 about here](#)

38  
39 -----

40  
41 The above findings from study 2 show that promotion (prevention) focus preference  
42 for experience (search) attributes is sustained under positive word of mouth. However,  
43 exposure to a negative word of mouth has different implications for promotion versus  
44 prevention focused subjects. Based on the findings, promotion focused people seem to be  
45 more tolerant of negative word of mouth, and still retain their preferences for more subjective  
46 attributes e.g. experience attributes in decision making. This supports their outlook for more  
47 experiential attributes in decision making even under risky situation (Sengupta and Zhou,  
48 2007). On the other hand, although normally prevention focused people would be risk averse;  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 their reaction to a situation that connotes failure can motivate them to adopt a strategy to  
4  
5 achieve a safe state. Once again the extant literature supports such findings (Scholer and  
6  
7 Higgins, 2013; Scholer *et al.*, 2010). In line with this, results from this study show that  
8  
9 negative word of mouth may highlight the risk of a failure to prevention focused people  
10  
11 (Lockwood *et al.*, 2002), and under this situation, they may be willing to reverse their  
12  
13 preferences in order to reach a safe state. In our third study we extend the findings from study  
14  
15 2, to a consumer product.  
16  
17

### 18 19 **Study 3**

20  
21  
22 471 students (238 females, mean age 26.5 years) from a large Pacific coast university  
23  
24 participated in 2 (Regulatory focus: promotion versus prevention) x 2 (attribute type: search  
25  
26 versus experience) x 2 (word of mouth received: positive versus negative) between subject  
27  
28 laboratory experiment. The participants were randomly allocated to one of the eight  
29  
30 experimental conditions.  
31  
32

33  
34 *Pre-test:* Once again a pre-test with 34 students who did not take part in the main study was  
35  
36 conducted to decide the relevant search and experience attributes for a mobile phone.  
37  
38 Following a description of search and experience attributes, participants were asked to  
39  
40 categorize a number of phone attributes such as screen size, light weight, ease of usage,  
41  
42 elegant design, high mega pixel camera, true to life videos, battery life, warranty etc. into  
43  
44 specific category. We selected the features that majority of students classified as a specific  
45  
46 type. Based on the results, 97%, 100% and 97% categorized screen size, light weight and  
47  
48 mega pixel as search attributes. Similarly, 97%, 94% and 100% categorized ease of usage,  
49  
50 elegant design and true to life videos as experience attributes. Once again, the attributes did  
51  
52 not differ in terms of hedonic versus utilitarian, subjective versus objective and performance  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 versus reliability dimensions (all  $ps > 0.1$ ). Based on this pre-test, we created search and  
4  
5 experience based descriptions for the mobile phone (Appendix 1).  
6  
7

8 *Procedure and measures:* Regulatory focus was manipulated using the same technique from  
9  
10 studies 1 and 2. For the third study we have used a different product category, mobile phone,  
11  
12 which has been used by previous research (Roy and Sharma, 2015). Students were asked to  
13  
14 imagine that they were shopping for a new mobile ‘Vertos’, following which they read one of  
15  
16 the two descriptions (Appendix 1). After reading these descriptions, subjects were further  
17  
18 asked to imagine that they met a close friend who said positive (negative) things about the  
19  
20 mobile phone. Manipulation check items were placed after the regulatory focus and phone  
21  
22 manipulation. Following this, students completed key dependent variables like ‘attitude’  
23  
24 (Cronbach’s alpha = .968) and ‘intention’ (Cronbach’s alpha = .945).  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Attitude towards the brand was measured by asking “How do you rate the brand  
30  
31 Vertos” with end points like 1 = “not interesting”, “unfavourable” “undesirable”, “poor  
32  
33 quality”, “bad”, “unpleasant”, and “worthless” and 7 = “interesting”, “favourable”,  
34  
35 “desirable”, “high quality”, “good”, “pleasant” and “valuable”. Purchase intention was  
36  
37 measured with four items, e.g. “I will be interested in the new Vertos”, “I will probably  
38  
39 consider the new Vertos”, “I will try out the new Vertos” and “I will probably buy the new  
40  
41 Vertos” with 1 = “strongly disagree” and 7 = “strongly agree” as the endpoints. Further,  
42  
43 similar to previous experiments, participants completed involvement items, and reported their  
44  
45 demographics towards the end.  
46  
47  
48

#### 49 Data analysis and results

50  
51  
52 *Manipulation check:* Results of one-way ANOVA showed that subjects in promotion focus  
53  
54 leaned towards something they wanted to do, as against prevention focus who leaned towards  
55  
56 something they ought to do (Ms of 5.89 versus 1.97,  $F(1, 469) = 2311.57, p < 0.001$ ).  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Subjects in the search attributes condition perceived the mobile to be described in terms of  
4 search attributes in comparison to experience attributes (Ms of 2.2 versus 5.9,  $F(1,469) =$   
5  $2057.33, p < 0.001$ ). Both the regulatory focus and attribute manipulation thus seems to be  
6 successful.  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 *Covariate:* Results of a one-way ANOVA showed that promotion focused subjects seemed to  
13 be more involved as compared to their counterparts (Ms of 5.87 versus 5.77,  $F(1,469) = 4.34,$   
14  $p < 0.01$ ). There was no difference in involvement between search and experience attribute  
15 (Ms of 5.83 versus 5.81,  $F(1,469) = .114, p > 0.05$ ). Involvement was once again held as a  
16 covariate in further analyses.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 *Main effects:* Results of a three way ANCOVA with attitude as the dependent variable  
25 showed main effects of regulatory focus ( $F(1, 462) = 572.83, p < 0.001$ ), and word of mouth  
26 ( $F(1, 462) = 10308.58, p < 0.001$ ). Promotion focused individuals exhibited higher attitudes  
27 compared to their counterparts (Ms of 4.18 versus 3.63), while the positive word of mouth led  
28 to higher attitude compared to the negative word of mouth (Ms of 5.34 versus 2.60).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 A similar three way ANCOVA was performed with intention as the dependent  
37 variable. Results once again showed that promotion focused subjects had higher intention  
38 compared to their counterparts (Ms of 4.12 versus 3.60,  $F(1, 462) = 304.12, p < 0.001$ ).  
39 Similar to attitude, higher intention was reported under positive as compared to negative  
40 word of mouth (Ms of 5.32 versus 2.52,  $F(1, 462) = 6715.16, p < 0.001$ ).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 *Interaction effects:* The two-way interaction between regulatory focus and attribute type was  
49 significant for attitude ( $F(1, 462) = 749.684, p < 0.001$ ) and purchase intention ( $F(1, 462) =$   
50  $525.94, p < 0.001$ ). This interaction was however, qualified by a significant three-way  
51 interaction between regulatory focus, attribute type and word of mouth, once again for  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

attitude ( $F(1,462) = 477.46, p < 0.001$ ), followed by purchase intention ( $F(1,462) = 394.95, p < 0.001$ ). Planned contrast analyses were conducted to compare the results under positive and negative word of mouth conditions.

As predicted from H3a, under positive word of mouth, promotion focused individuals showed higher attitude (Ms of 5.72 versus 4.65,  $t(463) = 19.58, p < 0.001$ ) and intention (Ms of 5.73 versus 4.63,  $t(463) = 15.82, p < 0.001$ ) towards the mobile described in terms of experience attributes over their counterparts. H3a is thus supported. In support of H3b, it was found that under a negative word of mouth condition, promotion focused subjects still preferred the mobile with experience attributes in terms of attitude (Ms of 3.37 versus 1.62,  $t(463) = 30.96, p < 0.001$ ) and intention (Ms of 3.28 versus 1.54,  $t(463) = 24.22, p < 0.001$ ) when compared to prevention focused people.

Under positive word of mouth, prevention focused subjects on the other hand, preferred the mobile with search attributes over their promotion focused counterparts in terms of both attitude (Ms of 6.27 versus 4.64,  $t(463) = -28.67, p < 0.001$ ) and intention (Ms of 6.38 versus 4.48,  $t(463) = -26.11, p < 0.001$ ); thereby supporting H4a. Once again as predicted by H4b, under negative word of mouth prevention focused subjects demonstrated a preference reversal. This time around, promotion focused people showed higher attitude (Ms of 3.29 versus 1.85,  $t(463) = 28.30, p < 0.001$ ) and purchase intention (Ms of 3.25 versus 1.73,  $t(463) = 23.33, p < 0.001$ ) for the mobile described in terms of search attributes in comparison to their counterparts. All the means are reported in tables 5 and 6.

-----

Insert Tables 5 and 6 about here

-----

## General discussion

Across three studies, we used two different methodologies (laboratory and field experiments) and various dependent variables (attitude versus intention) to provide support for our key hypotheses. It is observed that promotion (prevention) focused subjects' preferred experience (search) attributes over their counterparts. This preference is further moderated by word of mouth valence received during decision making. Under positive word of mouth, both types of regulatory foci sustain their initial preferences, with negative word of mouth having more interesting implications. While promotion focus people retain their preferences under negative word of mouth, prevention focused people seem to exhibit a preference reversal in order to avoid any potential failure. *The findings seem to be robust and are replicated with a service (university) and a product category (mobile phone).*

### *Theoretical implications*

The current work has implications for the theory of regulatory focus and word of mouth. First of all, the current work addresses call for inquiries by researchers (such as Hyo-Jin *et al.*, 2014; Brakus *et al.*, 2014), to understand how search and experience attributes may influence consumption. Our findings show that choice of relevant search and experience attributes is influenced by whether the target attributes help to sustain a promotion (prevention) orientation. The use of 'university' as the context for our study is interesting as it addresses both advancement and security needs in life. Extant researchers recommend studying products that addresses both promotion and prevention goals in life (Zhang *et al.*, 2010).

The present study also contributes to a limited body of literature that connects regulatory focus with word of mouth (e.g. Zhang *et al.*, 2010; Chung and Tsai, 2009). Further, a number of studies (Pentina *et al.*, 2015; Lim and Chung, 2011) till date have

1  
2  
3 reported mixed findings regarding the influence of word of mouth on product decision  
4  
5 making for people with different regulatory orientation. The current study resolves this by  
6  
7 proposing and testing a novel three-way interaction to show that the choice of search versus  
8  
9 experience attributes is contingent on word of mouth valence. Existing studies that involve  
10  
11 regulatory focus and word of mouth further do not consider the latest literature (Scholer *at*  
12  
13 *et al.*, 2013), or fail to consider variables like ‘product attitude’ and ‘behavioral intention’, that  
14  
15 are relevant for decision making (Motyka *et al.*, 2014). The current study addresses these  
16  
17 gaps as well. Based on recent theoretical developments that show that both promotion and  
18  
19 prevention focus are capable of strategies that ensure desired end state (Khajehzadeh *et al.*,  
20  
21 2015; Scholer *et al.*, 2013), the current findings show that promotion focus and prevention  
22  
23 focus decision can be reinforced under positive word of mouth. Promotion focus is relatively  
24  
25 resistant to negative word of mouth, while their counterpart reverses their preference in order  
26  
27 to return to a safe state (Khajehzadeh *et al.*, 2015). Finally, the choice of dependent variables  
28  
29 for this study, e.g., ‘attitude’ and ‘intention’ seem to be more relevant for decision making  
30  
31 under a specific regulatory orientation (Motyka *et al.*, 2014).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *Managerial implications*

38  
39  
40 The current work has important managerial implications too. Firstly, from a marketing  
41  
42 perspective, managers may be able to strategically target their prospective consumers with  
43  
44 relevant product attributes. For example, our findings indicate that it may be more effective to  
45  
46 promote a product or service based on its search attributes to prevention focused people, as  
47  
48 these features may be more appealing to these people. On the other hand, product or service  
49  
50 that features experience attributes may appeal more to promotion focused subjects. Currently,  
51  
52 researchers like Das (2016) posit that retailers already have existing customer information as  
53  
54 a function of relationship management, and can probe further by asking few regulatory  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 orientation questions. Once the regulatory orientation of the customer is known, our findings  
4  
5 show that matching it with a specific product attribute can lead to effective targeting and  
6  
7 positioning.  
8  
9

10 Similarly, matching relevant target product features in advertisements with relevant  
11 regulatory focus may enhance its effectiveness. Further, scholars argue that a regulatory state  
12 can be triggered by environmental cues like product advertisements (Labroo and Lee, 2006).  
13 For example, a shampoo ad can trigger a promotion focus while a vitamin ad can induce  
14 prevention focus (Labroo and Lee, 2006). When the triggered regulatory focus is matched  
15 with another advertisement that sustains it, matching leads to fluent information processing  
16 (Labroo and Lee, 2006). Based on our findings, a product advertisement using experience  
17 (search) attributes following a promotion or prevention focus ad should lead to more fluent  
18 information processing and enhanced persuasion (Labroo and Lee, 2006). Advertisements  
19 can also feature positive word of mouth scenarios, to further reinforce attitudes that may  
20 result from matching of regulatory focus with the relevant product or service feature.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 In the marketing context, consumers often have negative consumption experiences  
36 (e.g., product failure) which could then be shared with others. Our findings show that the  
37 effect of negative word of mouth may be countered through induction of promotion focus.  
38 Specifically, while the extant literature shows that promotion focus can minimize the  
39 likelihood of spreading negative word of mouth (Shin *et al.*, 2014), our work additionally  
40 shows that promotion focus may counteract the effect of negative word of mouth on attitude  
41 and purchase intention to a certain extent. One of the practical applications of this finding for  
42 marketing managers could be that following a negative consumption experience, they would  
43 be better off inducing advancement and aspiration goals (e.g., promotion focus) rather than  
44 focusing on prevention goals, while promoting their product or service. Our findings show  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that promotion focus may be able to counteract some of the impact from the negative word of  
4  
5 mouth, at least relative to prevention focused people. Such findings can be strategically used  
6  
7 by managers who promote consumer products or even services like global education (Naidoo  
8  
9 and Wu, 2011).  
10

### 11 12 **Limitations and future research**

13  
14  
15 The current work is not without limitations, some of which can provide scope for future  
16  
17 inquiry. First of all, we have induced regulatory focus situationally to study its impact on  
18  
19 evaluation and intention. Future work can engage [chronic regulatory focus](#) (Lockwood *et al.*,  
20  
21 [2002](#); Higgins, 1997) to study its influence on the dependent variables. [Although promotion](#)  
22  
23 [and prevention focus can be situationally salient, there are also ongoing individual](#)  
24  
25 [differences in the extent to which people are promotion and prevention oriented, also referred](#)  
26  
27 [to as chronic regulatory goals](#) (Lockwood *et al.*, 2002; Higgins, 1997). Secondly, our  
28  
29 hypotheses can be extended by providing insights into the underlying mechanism that  
30  
31 influence regulatory focus and word of mouth. For example, the effect of matching regulatory  
32  
33 focus with a specific product feature on evaluation is mediated through the variable “feeling  
34  
35 right”, as matching causes consumers to feel right about the decision undertaken by them  
36  
37 (Lee and Aaker, 2004). Future studies can therefore incorporate “feeling right” to study this  
38  
39 mediating mechanism.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Future studies can also manipulate the word of mouth quantity, or see if the source of  
47  
48 word of mouth giver (strong versus weak tie) has an additional influence. For example, while  
49  
50 Chung and Tsai (2008) establish that tie strength matters for prevention focus word of mouth  
51  
52 giver, future research can focus on how tie strength can influence the relationships discovered  
53  
54 in the current work. Further, based on [theoretical reasons](#) and our pre-tests, we could only  
55  
56 compare the effect of search and experience attributes, and we recommend that future study  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

may consider the role of credence attributes. While the student sample used for this research seems to be justified based on extant studies (Roy and Sharma, 2015; Lin and Chen, 2015; Roy and Phau, 2014), this sampling approach also represent a potential limitation. Future research may also incorporate views of actual consumers, and may try different product category to extend the findings of the present work. Finally, given that regulatory focus can differ across culture (Das, 2016), future work can extend the current findings in a cross cultural context.

## References

- Aaker, J. L. and Lee, A. Y. (2006), "Understanding regulatory fit", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 15-19.
- Avnet, T. and Higgins, E. T. (2006), "How regulatory fit affects value in consumer choices and opinions", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Bansal, H.S. and Voyer, P.A. (2000), "Word of mouth processes within a services purchase decision context", *Journal of Services Research*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 166-77.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C. and Vohs, K. D. (2001), "Bad is stronger than good", *Review of General Psychology*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 323-370.
- Bennett, R. (2007), "Advertising message strategies for encouraging young white working class males to consider entering British universities", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 60 No. 9, pp. 932-41.
- Brakus, J. J., Schmitt, B. H. and Zhang, S. (2014), "Experiential product attributes and preferences for new products: The role of processing fluency", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 11, pp. 2291-2298.
- Chatterjee, S., Roy, R. and Malshe, A. V. (2011), "The role of regulatory fit on the attraction effect", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 473-481.
- Chernev, A. (2004), "Goal-attribute compatibility in consumer choice", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 141-150.
- Chung C. M. Y. and Tsai, Q. (2009), "The effects of regulatory focus and tie strength on word-of-mouth behaviour", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 329 - 341.
- Cooke, R. (1991), *Experts in Uncertainty*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Das, G. (2016), "Influence of salespersons' nonverbal communication cues on consumer shopping behaviour", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 31, pp. 199-206.
- Das, G. (2016), "Understanding the role of regulatory focus in e-tailing activities", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 212-222.
- De Matos, A. and Rossi, C. (2008), "Word-of-mouth communications in marketing : a meta-analytic review of the antecedents and moderators", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 578-596.
- Ekelund, R. B., Franklin, G. M. and Rand, W. R. (1995), "Advertising and information: an empirical study of search, experience and credence goods", *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 33-43.



- 1  
2  
3  
4 Eliashberg, J. and Sawhney, M. S. (1994), “Modelling goes to Hollywood: predicting  
5 individual differences in movie enjoyment”, *Management Science*, Vol. 40 No. 9,  
6 pp.1151-1173.  
7
- 8 Ford, G. T., Smith, D. B. and Swasy, J. L. (1990), “Consumer skepticism of advertising  
9 claims: testing hypotheses from economics of information”, *Journal of consumer  
10 research*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 433-441.  
11
- 12 Friedman, R. S., Förster, J. and Denzler, M. (2007), “Interactive effects of mood and task  
13 framing on creative generation”, *Creativity Research Journal*, Vol. 19 No. (2-3), pp.  
14 141-62.  
15
- 16 Friedman, R. S. and Förster, J. (2001), “The effects of promotion and prevention cues on  
17 creativity”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 6, pp. 1001-13.  
18
- 19 Gray B. J., Fam, K. S. and Llanes, V.A. (2003), “Branding universities in Asian markets”,  
20 *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp.108-120.  
21
- 22 Harrison-Walker, L.J. (2001), “The measurement of word-of-mouth communication and an  
23 investigation of service quality and customer commitment as potential antecedents”,  
24 *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 60-75.  
25
- 26 Herzenstein M., Posavac, S.S. and Brakus, J. (2007), “Adoption of new and really new  
27 products: the effects of self-regulation systems and risk salience, *Journal of Marketing  
28 Research*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 251-260.  
29
- 30 Higgins, E. T. (1997), “Beyond pleasure and pain”, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 12,  
31 pp. 1280–1300.  
32
- 33 Hsieh, Y. C., Chiu, H. C. and Chiang, M. Y. (2005), “Maintaining a committed online  
34 customer: a study across search-experience-credence products”, *Journal of Retailing*,  
35 Vol. 81 No. 1, pp. 75-82.  
36
- 37 Hyo-Jin, J. J., Dant, R. P. and Gleiberman, A. M. (2014), “National versus local brands”,  
38 *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 48 No. 7/8, pp. 1511 – 1535.  
39
- 40 Jain, S. P. and Posavac, S. S. (2004), “Valenced comparisons”, *Journal of Marketing  
41 Research*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 46-58.  
42
- 43 Jia, H., Wang, Y., Ge, L., Shi, G. and Yao, S. (2012), “Asymmetric effects of regulatory  
44 focus on expected desirability and feasibility of embracing self-service technologies”,  
45 *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 209–225.  
46
- 47 Keller, P. A. (2006), “Regulatory focus and efficacy of health messages”, *Journal of  
48 Consumer Research*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 109–114.  
49
- 50 Khajehzadeh, S., Oppewal, H. and Tojib, D. (2015), “Mobile coupons: what to offer, to  
51 whom, and where?”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 5/6, pp. 851-873.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Klein, L. R. (1998) "Evaluating the potential of interactive media through a new lens: search  
5 versus experience goods", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 195-203.  
6
- 7 Labroo, A. A. and Lee, A. Y. (2006), "Between two brands: a goal fluency account of brand  
8 evaluation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 374-385.  
9
- 10 Lee, A. Y. and Aaker, J. L. (2004), "Bringing the frame into focus: the influence of  
11 regulatory fit on processing fluency and persuasion", *Journal of Personality and Social  
12 Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 2, pp. 205–218.  
13
- 14 Lim, B. C. and Chung, C. M. (2011), "The impact of word-of-mouth communication on  
15 attribute evaluation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 64 No. 1, pp. 18-23.  
16
- 17 Lin, C. H. and Chen, M. Y. (2015), "Being hooked by a brand story: a view of regulatory  
18 focus", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 5/6, pp. 692-712.  
19
- 20 Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H. and Kunda, Z. (2002), "Motivation by positive or negative role  
21 models: regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us", *Journal of personality  
22 and social psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 4, pp. 854- 864.  
23
- 24 Motyka, S., Grewal D., Puccinelli, N.M., Roggeveen, A.L., Avnet, T., Daryanto, A., de  
25 Ruyter, K. and Wetzels, M. (2014), "Regulatory fit: a meta-analytic synthesis", *Journal  
26 of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 394-410.  
27
- 28 Naidoo, V. and Wu. T. (2011), "Marketing strategy implementation in higher education: a  
29 mixed approach for model development and testing", *Journal of Marketing  
30 Management*, Vol. 27 Nos. 11/12, pp. 1117-1141.  
31
- 32 Nelson, P. (1970), "Information and consumer behaviour", *The Journal of Political Economy*,  
33 Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 311-329.  
34
- 35 Park, C. and Lee, T. M. (2009), "Information direction, website reputation and eWOM effect:  
36 A moderating role of product type", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 1, pp.  
37 61-67.  
38
- 39 Pentina, I., Bailey, A. A. and Zhang, L. (2015), "Exploring effects of source similarity,  
40 message valence, and receiver regulatory focus on yelp review persuasiveness and  
41 purchase intentions", *Journal of Marketing Communications*, (ahead-of-print), pp. 1-21.  
42
- 43 Pham, M. T. and Avnet, T. (2009), "Contingent reliance on the affect heuristic as a function  
44 of regulatory focus", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol.  
45 108 No. 2, pp. 267–278.  
46
- 47 Pham, M. T. and Avnet, T. (2004), "Ideals and oughts and the weighting of affect versus  
48 substance in persuasion", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 503–518.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Roy, R. and Sharma, P. (2015), "Scarcity appeal in advertising: exploring the moderating  
4 roles of need for uniqueness and message framing," *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 44 No.  
5 4, pp. 349-359.  
6
- 7 Roy, R. and Phau, I. (2014), "Examining regulatory focus in the information processing of  
8 imagery and analytical advertisements", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 371-  
9 381.  
10
- 11 Roy, R. and Ng, S. (2012), "Regulatory focus and preference reversal between hedonic and  
12 utilitarian consumption", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 81-88.  
13
- 14 Scholer, A. A. and Higgins, E. T. (2013), "Dodging monsters and dancing with dreams:  
15 Success and failure at different levels of approach and avoidance", *Emotion Review*,  
16 Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 254-258.  
17
- 18 Scholer, A. A., Zou, X., Fujita, K., Stroessner, S. J. and Higgins, E. T. (2010), "When risk  
19 seeking becomes a motivational necessity", *Journal of Personality and Social  
20 Psychology*, Vol. 99 No. 2, pp. 215-231.  
21
- 22 Scholer, A. A., Stroessner, S. J. and Higgins, E. T. (2008), "Responding to negativity: how a  
23 risky tactic can serve a vigilant strategy", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*,  
24 Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 767-774.  
25
- 26 Sengupta, J. and Zhou, R. (2007), "Understanding impulsive eaters' choice behaviors: the  
27 motivational influences of regulatory focus", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 44  
28 No. 2, pp. 297-308.  
29
- 30 Shin, D., Song, J. H. and Biswas, A. (2014), "Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) generation  
31 in new media platforms: The role of regulatory focus and collective dissonance",  
32 *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 153-165.  
33
- 34 Srinivasan, S. S. and Till, B. D. (2002), "Evaluation of search, experience and credence  
35 attributes: role of brand name and product trial", *Journal of Product & Brand  
36 Management*, Vol. 11 No. 7, pp. 417-431.  
37
- 38 Sweeney, J. C., Soutar, G. N. and Mazzarol, T. (2005), "The difference between positive and  
39 negative word-of-mouth—emotion as a differentiator", in *Proceedings of the ANZMAC  
40 2005 Conference: Broadening the Boundaries*, Perth, Australia: University of Western  
41 Australia, pp. 331-337.  
42
- 43 Vakratsas, D. and Ambler, T. (1999), "How advertising works: what do we really know?",  
44 *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 26-43.  
45
- 46 Weathers, D., Sharma, S. and Wood, S. L. (2007), "Effects of online communication  
47 practices on consumer perceptions of performance uncertainty for search and  
48 experience goods", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 83 No. 4, pp. 393-401.  
49
- 50 Wojnicki, A. C. and Godes, D.B. (2011), "Signalling Success: Strategically Positive Word of  
51 Mouth", working paper, Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Wright, A. A. and Lynch, J. G. (1995), "Communication effects of advertising versus direct  
5 experience when both search and experience attributes are present", *Journal of*  
6 *Consumer Research*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 708-718.  
7

8  
9 Yang, J. and Mai, E. S. (2010), "Experiential goods with network externalities effects : An  
10 empirical study of online rating system", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 63 No. 9,  
11 pp. 1050-1057.  
12

13 Zhang J.Q, Craciun, G. and Shin D. (2010), "When does electronic word-of-mouth matter? A  
14 study of consumer product reviews", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 63 No. 12, pp.  
15 1336-1341.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

List of Tables

*Table 1: Attitude as a function of regulatory focus and attribute type*

	Search attribute	Experience attribute
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>2.97</b> (0.37)	<b>6.12</b> (0.28)
<b>Prevention</b>	<b>5.83</b> (0.32)	<b>2.92</b> (0.38)

Figures in bracket denote standard deviation

*Table 2: Intention as a function of regulatory focus and attribute type*

	Search attribute	Experience attribute
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>2.30</b> (0.42)	<b>6.17</b> (0.50)
<b>Prevention</b>	<b>5.80</b> (0.51)	<b>2.98</b> (0.41)

Figures in bracket denote standard deviation

*Table 3: Attitude as a function of regulatory focus, attribute type and word of mouth*

	Positive WOM		Negative WOM	
	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>4.67</b> (0.38)	<b>5.73</b> (0.27)	<b>3.32</b> (0.23)	<b>3.40</b> (0.24)
<b>Prevention</b>	<b>6.28</b> (0.25)	<b>4.60</b> (0.26)	<b>1.85</b> (0.29)	<b>1.59</b> (0.25)

Figures in bracket denote standard deviation

*Table 4: Intention as a function of regulatory focus, attribute type and word of mouth*

	Positive WOM		Negative WOM	
	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>4.31</b> (0.52)	<b>5.73</b> (0.53)	<b>3.13</b> (0.39)	<b>3.19</b> (0.49)
<b>Prevention</b>	<b>6.41</b> (0.46)	<b>4.76</b> (0.37)	<b>1.70</b> (0.41)	<b>1.58</b> (0.31)

Figures in bracket denote standard deviation

	Positive WOM		Negative WOM	
	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>4.64</b> (0.38)	<b>5.72</b> (0.29)	<b>3.29</b> (0.25)	<b>3.37</b> (0.25)
<b>Prevention</b>	<b>6.27</b> (0.28)	<b>4.65</b> (0.26)	<b>1.85</b> (0.33)	<b>1.62</b> (0.29)

*Table 5: Attitude as a function of regulatory focus, attribute type and word of mouth*

Figures in bracket denote standard deviation


	Positive WOM		Negative WOM	
	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute	Search Attribute	Experience Attribute
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>4.48</b> (0.48)	<b>5.73</b> (0.42)	<b>3.25</b> (0.34)	<b>3.28</b> (0.37)
<b>Prevention</b>	<b>6.38</b> (0.36)	<b>4.63</b> (0.34)	<b>1.73</b> (0.41)	<b>1.54</b> (0.26)

*Table 6: Intention as a function of regulatory focus, attribute type and word of mouth*


Figures in bracket denote standard deviation

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 **List of figures**

10  
11 **Figure 1: Attitude as a function of regulatory focus and attribute type under PWOM**




33  
34  
35  
36  
37 **Figure 2: Attitude as a function of regulatory focus and attribute type under NWOM**






1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure 3: Intention as a function of regulatory focus and attribute type under PWOM**



**Figure 4: Intention as a function of regulatory focus and attribute type under NWOM**



## Appendix 1

### Study 1 and 2

#### University with search attributes

Imagine you are in your home country, and in the process of selecting an overseas university for your degree. You come across this university called “**Capital University**” located in a multicultural city of a developed country. The university’s faculty is known for their **high quality research output** and the institute is amongst the **globally ranked** ones. The academics are also known to engage **theory based teaching** straight from text books.

#### University with experience attributes

Imagine you are in your home country, and in the process of selecting an overseas university for your degree. You come across this university called “**Capital University**” located in a multicultural city of a developed country. The university’s faculty is known for their **friendly approach** and the institute is amongst the **young and upcoming** ones. The academics are also known to engage a teaching style that **connects theory to industry relevant practices**.

### Study 3

#### Mobile phone with search attributes

Imagine you are in the market for a new smartphone. As you were flipping through a consumer magazine you come across a brand called ‘Vertos’ launched by a leading smartphone manufacturer. The smartphone is highly rated for its **big screen size, light weight** and a **high mega pixel camera**. Overall, you liked the description.

#### Mobile phone with experience attributes

Imagine you are in the market for a new smartphone. As you were flipping through a consumer magazine you come across a brand called ‘Vertos’ launched by a leading

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

smartphone manufacturer. The smartphone is highly rated for its **ease of usage, elegant design**, and for **true to life videos**. Overall, you liked the description.