

RYAN HAMILTON and ALEXANDER CHERNEV*

How do vertical product line extensions influence a retailer's price image? Conventional wisdom suggests that adding an upscale or downscale item to a product line has a directionally consistent impact on price image, such that upscale extensions increase price image and downscale extensions decrease price image. In contrast, this research argues that vertical extensions can have the opposite effect, such that upscale extensions can decrease rather than increase price image, and vice versa for downscale extensions. The authors further propose that the impact of vertical extensions on price image is a function of consumer goals and, in particular, whether consumers have the intent of browsing or buying. The authors test these predictions in a series of five empirical studies that offer converging evidence in support of the proposed theory.

Keywords: price image, vertical extensions, consumer goals, browsing, buying

The Impact of Product Line Extensions and Consumer Goals on the Formation of Price Image

Product line extensions, both upscale and downscale, are common occurrences in retail settings. For example, Best Buy recently added the upscale Magnolia home theater line to complement its lower-priced electronics offerings. Similarly, JCPenny has added the high-end Sephora brand, priced much higher than the rest of its cosmetics line. Even Wal-Mart has experimented with adding a few upscale items to its assortments. Downscale extensions are even more common, with many retailers augmenting their product lines with low-priced offerings, often in the form of private labels, to increase the overall sales volume.

Previous research on vertical extensions has investigated how extending a retailer's product line affects a firm's profitability (Draganska and Jain 2005), competitive entry (Schmalensee 1978), and brand positioning (Horsky and Nelson 1992). Another body of research has investigated

how vertical extensions can influence which option consumers choose (Simonson and Tversky 1992) and the likelihood that they will defer choice (Boatwright and Nunes 2001). Although prior research has examined the influence of vertical product line extensions on both company performance and consumer decision making, there has been little research investigating how vertical extensions influence the impressions consumers form of a retailer and, in particular, of a retailer's price image.

Conventional wisdom suggests that vertical extensions have a directionally consistent impact on price image, such that upscale extensions increase price image and downscale extensions decrease price image. This assumption is consistent with psychological theories of impression formation (e.g., Anderson 1965; Troutman and Shanteau 1976), which assert that the overall impression of a set of items is sensitive to changes in the mean of the set (Levin 1974). Because adding higher- or lower-priced extensions leads to a directionally consistent change in the mean price, it can be argued that vertical extensions should also lead to a directionally consistent shift the price image.

The assumption that vertical extensions have a directionally consistent impact on price image is consistent with the price image management strategies that many marketers use. Thus, it has been proposed that to lower its price image, a retailer should include low-priced options in its product portfolio (A.T. Kearney 2005). In line with this

*Ryan Hamilton is Assistant Professor of Marketing, Goizueta Business School, Emory University (e-mail: ryan_hamilton@bus.emory.edu). Alexander Chernev is Associate Professor of Marketing, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University (e-mail: ach@northwestern.edu). The authors thank the two anonymous *JMR* reviewers, Bob Blattberg, Aparna Labroo, Kelly Goldsmith, Jiewen Hong, and Oleg Urminsky for their helpful comments and suggestions. This research was generously supported by a research grant from the Marketing Science Institute. Ziv Carmon served as associate editor for this article.

strategy, Whole Foods has begun promoting low-priced vertical extensions as a part of a plan to lower its price image (Barbaro 2006). Similarly, in the United Kingdom, Burger King recently introduced a £85 (\$170) Kobe beef and foie gras hamburger in an effort to create a more upscale image (*The Sun* 2008). The assumption that vertical extensions are likely to have a directionally consistent impact on a retailer's price image was further confirmed by a survey conducted among the participants in an advanced MBA marketing seminar. In evaluating the intuitive impact of vertical extensions on price image, we found that 98% (N = 60) of the participants believed that a store that carried downscale extensions would have a lower price image than a similar store that carried upscale extensions.

In this research, we question the wisdom of the popular belief that product line extensions have a directionally consistent impact on price image. In particular, we show that vertical extensions can have the opposite effect on price image, such that upscale extensions can decrease rather than increase price image, and vice versa for downscale extensions. We propose that the impact of vertical extensions on price image is a function of consumer goals and, in particular, whether consumers have the intent of browsing or buying. We test these predictions in a series of five empirical studies that offer converging evidence in support of the proposed theory and identify its boundary conditions.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Consumers form complex networks of associations with the stores at which they shop (Martineau 1958; Myers 1960) and the brands that they buy (Gardner and Levy 1955; Keller 1998). Although these amorphous bundles of associations can include almost any kind of information—from quality perceptions (Berry 1969) to assessments of corporate social responsibility (Brown and Dacin 1997)—marketing researchers have previously singled out the price dimension, or price image, for special consideration (e.g., Alba et al. 1994; Buyukkurt 1986; Simester 1995; Van Heerde, Gijbrecchts, and Pauwels 2008).

Price image is important to retailers because it can influence many of the perceptions that consumers form and the decisions they make. For example, it has been shown that price image has a direct impact on the prices consumers expect to pay at a particular store, such that consumers expect prices to be higher at a store with a high price image than at a store with a low price image (Thaler 1985). Price image also has been shown to influence consumer decision making, including purchase deferral decisions, such that stores with a high price image are associated with a greater likelihood of finding a better price elsewhere, leading to higher rates of purchase deferral than at stores with a lower price image (Srivastava and Lurie 2001). In addition, price image has been found to influence consumers' choice among retailers, such that consumers typically opt for stores with a lower price image when they are keen to save money (Bell and Lattin 1998; Singh, Hansen, and Blattberg 2006; Urbany, Dickson, and Sawyer 2000; Van Heerde, Gijbrecchts, and Pauwels 2008).

Previous research has primarily focused on how consumers evaluate the prices of individual items (e.g., Monroe 1973) rather than on how they evaluate the overall price

level of a retailer. Although a great deal is known about how consumers perceive individual prices (e.g., Adaval and Monroe 2002; Janiszewski and Lichtenstein 1999; Mazumdar and Monroe 1990), how they integrate these price perceptions into an overall price image has received much less attention. The relatively small body of work on price image formation has focused primarily on the role of nonprice factors, such as price-match guarantee policies (Srivastava and Lurie 2001, 2004) and store ambience (Brown 1969; Buyukkurt and Buyukkurt 1986). Previous research into the impact of prices on price image has focused on the influence of individual prices within a category (Alba et al. 1994; Alba et al. 1999; Buyukkurt 1986), without explicitly examining the impact of the retailer's assortment on price image.

When acquiring price information, consumers tend to be motivated by one of two goals: browsing or buying. Consumers with a browsing goal are interested in gathering information for possible future use but not for the immediate purpose of picking one option to put into their shopping basket (Claxton, Fry, and Portis 1974; Putsis and Srinivasan 1994; Urbany, Dickson, and Wilkie 1989). Browsing often involves making a judgment, in which the objective is to construct an overall assessment of an alternative or set of alternatives (Johnson and Russo 1984). In contrast, consumers with a buying goal seek information for use in an immediate purchase decision. A buying goal typically culminates in a choice: selecting one alternative from a consideration set (Bettman, Luce, and Payne 1998; Johnson and Russo 1984).

Browsing and buying goals are likely to lead to differences in consumers' breadth of focus when evaluating price information. Browsing often entails allocating attention across many options rather than focusing on any one option in particular (Moe 2003; Putsis and Srinivasan 1994; Urbany, Dickson, and Wilkie 1989). In contrast, a buying goal tends to lead to a narrow allocation of attention, ultimately focusing consumers on the to-be-purchased alternative (Moe 2003; Putsis and Srinivasan 1994).

Prior research suggests that differences in the breadth of focus are likely to lead to different patterns of information processing when forming impressions. Thus, it has been shown that when people have a relatively broad focus, they form impressions that are often best described by a simple averaging model, in which each piece of information is given equal weight (e.g., Anderson 1965; Levin 1974). In contrast to a broad focus, a focus on a single option has been shown to increase the likelihood that this option will be evaluated by comparing it with the other options in the set (Carmon, Wertenbroch, and Zeelenberg 2003; Dhar and Simonson 1992; Fiske 1980; Mackenzie 1986; Wyer and Watson 1969). Research on context effects has demonstrated that when people focus on one option, other options under consideration serve as reference points that influence the evaluation of the focal option (Janiszewski and Lichtenstein 1999; Martin, Seta, and Crelia 1990). A narrow focus also has been found to increase the weight or importance of the focal option in an overall impression (Fiske 1980; Mackenzie 1986; Wyer and Watson 1969).

Building on previous research, we argue that the activation of a browsing or buying goal will lead to differences in how consumers form price images. In particular,

we propose that a browsing goal is likely to lead to the integration of price information because the broader focus associated with a browsing goal has been shown to lead to a more equal weighting of information in impression formation (Anderson 1965; Levin 1974). As such, a browsing goal will lead to price images that are more sensitive to the average price of a consideration set. In this context, adding an extension is likely to shift the overall price image in a direction consistent with the shift in the average price of the set. Thus, an upscale extension will tend to increase the overall price image, whereas a downscale extension will likely decrease it.

Conversely, because buying goals are associated with a narrower focus, consumers with a buying goal are more likely to center their attention a single alternative. The evaluation of this focal option will be sensitive to comparisons made with other options in the set. Thus, a buying goal is likely to focus a consumer on one option and to increase the likelihood that the focal option will be contrasted with other options, including vertical extensions. When a choice is made in the context of an upscale extension, the result will be a contrast effect: a lower perceived price of the focal option caused by the addition of the high-priced extension. Following the same logic, a downscale extension is likely to serve as a low-end reference point, thus increasing the perceived price of the focal option. The intuition for these predictions is consistent with prior research showing that an option is perceived as less expensive in the context of higher prices and more expensive in the context of lower prices (Aval and Monroe 2002; Janiszewski and Lichtenstein 1999; Krishna et al. 2006). Because focal options tend to be overweighted in an overall impression (Fiske 1980; Mackenzie 1986; Wyer and Watson 1969), the result is a contrast effect: a lower price image when there is an upscale extension and a higher price image when there is a downscale extension.

To summarize, we propose that the impact of product line extensions on price image is a function of consumers' goals. In particular, we propose that consumers with a browsing goal are more likely to integrate the price of the extension with the prices of the other available options—a scenario in which the change in the price image will be directionally consistent with the extension type, such that upscale extensions lead to a higher price image and downscale extensions lead to a lower price image. Alternatively, consumers with a buying goal are more likely to contrast the price of their focal option with the price of the extension—a scenario in which the shift in price image can be directionally opposite to the extension type, such that upscale extensions can lower the overall price image and downscale extensions can increase it. We test these predictions in a series of five experiments.

EXPERIMENT 1

The goal of Experiment 1 was to test the impact of product line extensions on price image as a function of consumer goals. In particular, we examined the validity of the proposition that a browsing goal leads to a directionally consistent shift in price image, such that upscale extensions increase price image and downscale extensions decrease it. We further tested the proposition that a buying goal

leads to a directionally opposite shift in price image, such that upscale extensions decrease rather than increase price image and downscale extensions increase it.

Method

Seventy-three students from a large midwestern university were recruited to participate in a computer-based study on consumer preferences. Participants were given a scenario representing a fairly typical shopping experience—namely, one in which they enter a store to buy a particular item (a DVD movie) but are first exposed to items in a different category (DVD players) as they traverse the store. Thus, participants were first shown a set of four DVD players before being shown a DVD movie from the same store.

Participants were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 2 (product line extension: upscale versus downscale) \times 2 (goal: browse versus buy) factorial design. We manipulated product line extensions by including one DVD player in each set that was either high priced or low priced. In both extension conditions, three of the four DVD players remained the same: Sony (\$98.99), Samsung (\$96.99), and Sylvania (\$99.99). In the upscale extension condition, the fourth option was a Panasonic (\$279.99), and in the downscale extension condition, the fourth option was a Coby (\$34.99). In addition to a brand name and a price, all options included a picture and a rating on a five-star scale. The three moderately priced brands were all rated 3.5 stars. The upscale extension was rated 5 stars, and the downscale extension was rated 2 stars. We included the rating information to discourage participants in the downscale extension condition from choosing the downscale extension but instead to choose one of the moderately priced options. (Indeed, no participants chose the extensions—neither the high-priced Panasonic in the upscale condition nor the low-priced Coby in the downscale condition).


We manipulated consumer goals by the nature of the task participants completed regarding the DVD players. Participants in the buying goal condition were asked to select one of the four available options. In contrast, respondents in the browsing goal condition did not make a choice but instead were asked “to take a moment to consider these DVD players.” After viewing the prices of the DVD players, participants were shown a recently released DVD priced at \$16.99 and were asked to choose whether to buy the movie now or go to nearby stores looking for a better price. We expected the decision to defer purchase to reflect the participants' price image of the store. If, based on the DVD player price information, they formed a high price image of the store, they would be more likely to defer purchase, reasoning that they would be more likely to find a better price elsewhere (Srivastava and Lurie 2001). Participants were also asked to rate the likelihood that they would be able to find the movie elsewhere for a lower price, using a nine-point rating scale ranging from 1 = “I could definitely not find a better price” to 9 = “I could definitely find a better price.”

Results

We predicted that the impact of vertical extensions on price image would be moderated by consumer goals, such that for browsing goals, upscale (downscale) extensions

Figure 1

UPSCALE EXTENSIONS INCREASE PURCHASE DEFERRAL WHEN BROWSING BUT DECREASE PURCHASE DEFERRAL WHEN BUYING (EXPERIMENT 1)



Notes: Purchase deferral is the relative share of participants who chose to forgo buying at the current price and instead look for a better price at other stores. Rates of purchase deferral increase as price image increases.

would lead to higher (lower) price images, and for buying goals, upscale (downscale) extensions would lead to lower (higher) price images. The purchase deferral data summarized in Figure 1 are consistent with these predictions. In particular, when the set included an upscale extension, 72.2% ($N = 18$) subsequently chose to defer purchase of the movie at the given price. When the set of DVD players included a downscale extension, only 44.4% ($N = 18$) of participants deferred purchase. This pattern of purchase deferral was reversed when participants had a buying goal. Specifically, when the set included an upscale extension, 52.9% ($N = 17$) deferred purchase, compared with 75.0% ($N = 20$) who chose to defer when the set included a downscale option.

We tested the significance of these results using a logistic regression model that predicted likelihood of purchase deferral (i.e., buy now versus look for a better price elsewhere) as a function of product line extensions (upscale versus downscale) and consumer goals (browsing versus buying). Consistent with our predictions, the analysis revealed a significant interaction between extension type and consumer goal ($\chi^2(1) = 4.64, p < .05$).

Participants' perceptions of the likelihood of finding a better price elsewhere indicated that those with a browsing goal expected that they would be more likely to find a better price elsewhere when the store carried an upscale extension ($M = 7.1$) than when there was a downscale extension ($M = 6.3$). In contrast, participants with a buying goal indicated that they would be less likely to find a better price elsewhere when the set included an upscale extension ($M = 6.4$) than when it included a downscale extension ($M = 7.5$). This difference in the impact of the type of vertical extension and consumer goals on the likelihood of finding higher prices elsewhere was significant ($F(1, 72) = 4.35, p < .05$)—a finding consistent with our predictions.

Discussion

The data furnished by Experiment 1 lend support to the hypothesis that the impact of product line extensions on

price image is moderated by consumer goals. Participants with a browsing goal who saw a set containing an upscale extension formed a higher price image than did those who saw a set containing a downscale extension. In contrast, for participants with a buying goal, this pattern was reversed: Those who saw a set with an upscale extension actually formed a lower price image than those who saw a set with a downscale extension.

Overall, Experiment 1 tested the proposed theory by examining the outcome of a purchase decision based on price image. An alternative method of measuring price image involves asking consumers to rate the overall price level of a store and their store-specific price expectations. This approach is consistent with the notion that consumers expect prices to be higher at a store with a high price image than at a store with a low price image (Thaler 1985). Experiment 2 employs these more direct measures of price image to provide a convergent test of the proposed theory.

EXPERIMENT 2

The goal of Experiment 2 was to use an alternative measure of price image to provide further evidence for the proposition that the impact of product line extensions on price image is moderated by consumer goals. In addition, this experiment examined the impact of adding product line extensions on price image rather than just comparing scenarios in which upscale and downscale extensions were already present.

Method

Eighty students from a large midwestern university were recruited to complete a Web-based study on consumer preferences. Participants were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 3 (product line extension: upscale versus downscale versus no extension) \times 2 (goal: browsing versus buying) factorial design. Participants were asked to imagine that they were shopping at a nearby store for several different types of tea. Each participant saw either three or four brands (labeled Brand A, Brand B, and so forth) in three different categories of teas: green tea, black tea, and herbal tea. Participants in the no-extension condition saw a set of three prices in each category. For example, the three brands in the green tea category were \$3.55, \$3.65, and \$3.75 per package. In the vertical extension conditions, either a high-priced or a low-priced fourth brand was added to the set. Thus, for green teas, the upscale condition consisted of four teas priced at \$3.55, \$3.65, \$3.75, and \$7.39, and the downscale condition consisted of teas priced at \$3.55, \$3.65, \$3.75, and \$1.81.

We manipulated consumer goals by whether a particular option was identified as being considered for purchase. As in Experiment 1, participants in the browsing condition were simply asked to take a moment to consider the prices of the options they were shown. Participants in the buying goal condition were told that they were strongly considering buying a particular moderately priced option in each set (e.g., Brand B) and were asked to take a moment to consider the price of that option. For example, when participants saw the green teas, they were told that they were

considering purchasing the \$3.65 box of tea. This manipulation was conceptually similar to the choice manipulation in the first experiment but had the advantage of allowing us to dictate which option in the set participants would buy.

After viewing the three types of teas (either 9 or 12 prices in total), participants were asked to provide a single evaluation of the overall price level of the store. Using a slider anchored at “very low” and “very high,” participants rated the prices at this store relative to other stores selling similar items. Based on the position of the slider, we converted participants’ responses to a 100-point scale, ranging from 1 = “very low” to 100 = “very high.” As a second measure of price image, participants were asked about their price expectations at this store. A high price image would lead consumers to expect the price of an unobserved item to be high, and vice versa for a low price image. To measure price expectations, participants were told that an eight-pack of paper towels sells for approximately \$10 at other nearby stores, and they were asked how much they thought a similar pack of paper towels would cost at this store.

Results

We predicted that a browsing goal would lead to a higher price image of a store with upscale extensions than that of a store with downscale extensions. In contrast, a buying goal would lead to a lower price image of a store with upscale extensions than that of a store with downscale extensions. The results in Table 1 are consistent with these predictions.

The data show that the impact of product line extensions on price image was indeed a function of consumer goals, as indicated by the significance of the corresponding interaction ($F(2, 74) = 7.31, p < .005$). Planned contrasts revealed that in the buying goal condition, an upscale product line extension was associated with lower price image ratings than a downscale extension (38.2 versus 59.7; $F(1, 74) = 18.86, p < .001$). In contrast, in the browsing goal condition, an upscale extension was associated with higher price image ratings than a downscale extension (53.4 versus 47.6), though the difference was not statistically significant ($F(1, 74) = 1.26$). In both the buying and the browsing conditions, the price image ratings in the no-extension condition fell between those of the upscale and those of the downscale conditions.

The price estimation data revealed a similar pattern. As we predicted, the moderating impact of consumer goals on how product line extension influenced price image was significant ($F(2, 74) = 5.20, p < .01$). Planned contrasts revealed

that in the browsing goal condition, an upscale extension resulted in an increase in the expected prices, whereas a downscale extension resulted in a decrease in the expected prices (\$10.50 versus \$8.49; $F(1, 74) = 7.09, p < .01$). In contrast, in the buying goal condition, the presence of a product line extension had the opposite effect, leading to a marginally significant decrease in the price image in the presence of an upscale extension and an increase in the price image in the presence of a downscale extension (\$9.04 versus \$10.41; $F(1, 74) = 3.52, p < .10$). In the buying and browsing conditions, the price estimations in the no-extension condition fell between those of the upscale and those of the downscale conditions. These price estimation data lend further support to our predictions.

Discussion

The results of Experiment 2 provide further support for the proposed moderating influence of consumer goals by examining participants’ ratings of price image and their price expectations. Both of these more proximal measures of price image were consistent in supporting the proposed theoretical account. This experiment also compared the impact of consumer goals and vertical extensions on price image relative to a scenario with no extensions. We found that in both the browsing and the buying goal conditions, participants’ evaluations of the store with no extensions fell somewhere between their evaluations of the stores with the upscale or downscale extensions.

Taken together, the results of the first two experiments show that contrary to conventional wisdom, upscale extensions can lead to lower price images, and downscale extensions can lead to higher price images. Experiment 3 examines the process by which a consumer converts a set of prices into a price image. We proposed that consumers with a browsing goal have a broad focus, integrating all the available price information and evaluating a set with an upscale extension as more expensive than a set with a downscale extension. In contrast, when consumers have a buying goal, they focus on one option and compare its price with the prices of the other options in the set. This comparison process leads to a contrast effect, such that the presence of an upscale extension makes a focal option seem less expensive than the presence of a downscale extension. Experiment 3 provides a more direct test of this theory by examining participants’ evaluations of prices of individual options as a function of vertical extensions and consumer goals.

Table 1
UPSCALE EXTENSIONS INCREASE PRICE IMAGE WHEN BROWSING BUT DECREASE PRICE IMAGE WHEN BUYING (EXPERIMENT 2)

	Asked to Consider (Browsing Goal)			Asked to Choose (Buying Goal)		
	Upscale Extension	No Extension	Downscale Extension	Upscale Extension	No Extension	Downscale Extension
Price image rating (1–100)	53.4	49.0	47.6	38.2	47.5	59.7
Expected prices (relative to \$10 price at a nearby store) (\$)	10.50 (N = 12)	9.50 (N = 13)	8.49 (N = 14)	9.04 (N = 13)	10.00 (N = 13)	10.41 (N = 15)

EXPERIMENT 3

The goal of Experiment 3 was to examine the process by which a price image is formed based on a set of prices. In particular, this experiment tests the proposition that consumers with a browsing goal form a price image by integrating all the available price information, whereas consumers with a buying goal form a price image by contrasting a focal option with a vertical extension.

Method

One hundred twenty-eight students from a large mid-western university were recruited to participate in an online study on consumer decision making. Participants were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 2 (product line extension: upscale versus downscale) \times 2 (goal: browsing versus buying) mixed design, in which we manipulated consumer goal between subjects and product line extension within subjects. Participants visited three pairs of stores, each in a different retail category. One store in each pair carried an upscale extension (referred to here as the upscale store), and one carried a downscale extension (the downscale store).

The first pair of stores sold tote bags: The upscale store sold backpacks priced at \$53.60, \$59.90, \$65.40, and \$121.80, and the downscale store sold side bags priced at \$53.60, \$58.70, \$66.30, and \$28.30. The second pair of stores sold office supplies: The upscale store sold fax machines priced at \$91, \$95, and \$182, and the downscale store sold scanners priced at \$90, \$95, and \$37. The third pair of stores sold small appliances: The upscale store sold blenders priced at \$32.95, \$35.65, \$38.45, and \$79.15, and the downscale store sold toasters priced at \$32.40, \$36.75, \$37.90, and \$14.85. All participants saw the same prices across each pair of stores. We counterbalanced the order of the upscale and downscale stores across store pairs, such that for the tote bag stores and the office supply stores, participants saw the upscale stores first, and for the small appliances stores, participants saw the downscale store first.

The consumer goal manipulation was similar to that in Experiment 2. In the buying goal condition, one of the moderately priced options was singled out as being strongly considered for purchase, whereas in the browsing goal condition, participants were simply asked to consider the prices of the options. Participants were asked to rate either the set of prices as a whole (browsing goal) or the price of the particular option selected for purchase (buying goal). Thus, in the backpack store, participants in the browsing goal condition were asked to rate the prices of backpacks at this store, and participants in the buying goal condition were asked to rate the price of Brand B, the brand they were considering buying. All ratings were made on the same nine-point scale, anchored at 1 = "very low" and 9 = "very high."

After participants evaluated the prices in the two stores, they were asked to choose between them for a return purchase. When using store choice to infer price image, it is important to note that though it is generally assumed that consumers prefer stores with a lower price image (Bell and Lattin 1998; Urbany, Dickson, and Sawyer 2000), this is not always the case. Sometimes, consumers are less interested in saving money than they are in meeting some other

need, such as getting the best service or the highest-quality products (Chernev 2006; Dhar and Simonson 1999). When consumers are in such a "spending mode," they may actually prefer a store with a high price image to a store with a low price image. To fully map the connection between price image and store choice in this experiment, we manipulate consumers' spending mode (saving versus spending).

In the saving mode condition, participants were simply asked to choose one of the stores—a manipulation based on the notion that saving money is the likely default state for the research participants. In contrast, participants in the spending mode condition were told that they were not buying for themselves but rather for their boss, who had specifically told them that price is no object. In this context, we expected that participants in a saving mode would choose the store with the lower price image, whereas participants in a spending mode would choose the store with the higher price image.

Results

We predicted that participants with a browsing goal would be more likely to form a lower price image of the downscale store than would participants with a buying goal. The choice data summarized in Table 2 are consistent with these predictions. For participants in a saving mode, who chose the store they thought had a lower price image, the preference for returning to the downscale store for additional purchases was stronger among those with a browsing goal (66.7%) than among those with a buying goal (50.6%). As we predicted, this pattern of preferences was reversed among participants in a spending mode, who chose the store they thought had a higher price image. In this condition, 43.4% of participants with a buying goal preferred the downscale store, compared with only 27.5% of participants with a browsing goal.

We tested the significance of these results using a logistic regression, predicting choice of store (i.e., upscale store

Table 2
BROWSING INCREASES PREFERENCE FOR DOWNSCALE STORE RELATIVE TO BUYING (EXPERIMENT 3)

	<i>Saving Mode</i>		<i>Spending Mode</i>		<i>Combined</i>	
	<i>Browsing Goal (%)</i>	<i>Buying Goal (%)</i>	<i>Browsing Goal (%)</i>	<i>Buying Goal (%)</i>	<i>Browsing Goal (%)</i>	<i>Buying Goal (%)</i>
Tote bags	75.9	62.1	29.4	41.7	73.0	60.0
Office supplies	65.5	55.2	32.4	45.7	66.7	54.7
Small appliances	58.6	34.5	20.6	42.9	69.8	46.9
Total	66.7 (N = 36)	50.6 (N = 29)	27.5 (N = 34)	43.4 (N = 29)	69.8 (N = 70)	53.9 (N = 58)

Notes: The percentages in this table represent choice shares of the downscale store relative to the upscale store. In saving mode, choice indicates the store with the lower price image; in spending mode, choice indicates the store with the higher price image. We combined these data to reveal the total proportion of respondents in both saving and spending mode conditions who indicated by their choice that the downscale store had the lower price image.

versus downscale store) as a function of consumer goal (browsing versus buying), spending mode (save versus spend), and retailer category (tote bags, office supplies, and small appliances). Consistent with our experimental predictions, the analysis revealed a significant interaction between goal and spending mode ($\chi^2(1) = 10.45, p < .005$): In a saving mode, participants with a browsing goal were more likely to choose the downscale store than participants with a buying goal ($\chi^2(1) = 4.68, p < .05$). In contrast, in a spending mode, participants with a browsing goal were less likely to choose the downscale store than participants with a buying goal ($\chi^2(1) = 5.85, p < .05$). The analysis revealed no significant interactions between retailer category and the other experimental factors (all $ps > .35$), suggesting that the reported effects were consistent across the different types of stores.

This experiment also examined how participants evaluated the price information, providing insight into the process by which participants formed a price image. In particular, we expected that participants in the browsing goal condition, who were asked to rate the set of prices as a whole, would evaluate the set as having higher prices when there was an upscale extension than when there was a downscale extension. Conversely, participants in the buying goal condition, who were asked to evaluate the price of a focal option, were expected to evaluate the focal option as having a higher price in the presence of a downscale option than in the presence of an upscale option.

The price ratings data are consistent with these predictions. We analyzed ratings data using separate 2 (vertical extension: upscale store versus downscale store) \times 2 (spending mode: save versus spend) \times 3 (retailer category: tote bags, office supplies, and small appliances) analyses of variance in each goal condition, with spending mode as a between-subjects factor and vertical extension and retailer category as within-subjects factors. In the browsing goal condition, participants exhibited integration when evaluating the set of available prices, such that when the set included an upscale extension, the rating was higher ($M = 6.0$) than when the set included a downscale extension ($M = 4.6$; $F(1, 316) = 105.9, p < .001$). In contrast, participants in the buying goal condition revealed a contrast effect when evaluating the single option considered for purchase: When the set included an upscale extension, the item was rated as less expensive ($M = 4.5$) than when the set included a downscale extension ($M = 6.5$; $F(1, 327) = 204.8, p < .001$).

Discussion

The results of this experiment offer insight into the process by which consumers convert price information into price images. Specifically, these findings lend support to the proposed account by demonstrating that price images formed were consistent with the integration of price evaluations when participants had a browsing goal. However, when participants had a buying goal, the price images were consistent with a contrast effect driven by comparing the focal option with the rest of the set.

In the experiments reported so far, the focal option has always been one of the moderately priced options in the set rather than the vertical extension. The theoretical account

we proposed implies that if an extension is focal (rather than a moderately priced option), the previously observed contrast effect should be reversed. In other words, if a consumer focuses on a vertical extension, the evaluation of the extension relative to the moderately priced options will drive the price image. Because the evaluation of an upscale extension is likely to be high and the evaluation of a downscale extension is likely to be low, the result will be a directionally consistent shift in price image rather than the contrast effect found in the previous studies. Thus, focusing on an upscale option will lead to a higher price image, whereas focusing on a downscale option will lead to a lower price image.

In Experiment 4, we test this boundary condition on the previously observed contrast effect by directly manipulating which option or options are focal. When consumers have a broad focus, they tend to incorporate more of the available price information into their impressions, resulting in a directionally consistent impact of vertical extensions on price image (i.e., an upscale extension leads to a higher price image). With a narrow focus, the price image they form will depend on which option is focal. When consumers focus on one of the moderately priced options, the result is a contrast effect (i.e., an upscale extension leads to a lower price image). However, when consumers focus on a vertical extension, the price image is consistent with the direction of the extension (i.e., an upscale extension leads to a higher price image).

EXPERIMENT 4

The goal of Experiment 4 was to examine a boundary condition on the proposed effect by testing whether the observed contrast effect is reversed when consumers focus on the vertical extension rather than on a moderately priced item. This experiment also tests attentional focus as a driver of the impact of vertical extensions on price image. In particular, this experiment manipulated participants' focus directly rather than indirectly through consumer browsing and buying goals.

Method

One hundred eight students from a large midwestern university were recruited to participate in an online study on consumer decision making. Participants were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 2 (product line extension: upscale versus downscale) \times 3 (focus: broad focus versus narrow focus on a moderate option versus narrow focus on the extension) mixed design, in which we manipulated focus between subjects and product line extension within subjects. Participants visited two hardware stores, in which they saw the prices of three or four items in each of four product categories: bolt cutters, hand saws, faucets, and staple guns (14 prices in total). One store was an upscale store (i.e., it included upscale extensions), and the other was a downscale store (i.e., it included downscale extensions). We counterbalanced the order such that some participants visited the upscale store first and some participants visited the downscale store first.

We manipulated the option(s) on which participants focused by changing the visual arrangement of the price

information. In the broad focus condition, participants saw displays in which all options were the same size and no option was especially prominent. In the two narrow focus conditions, participants saw displays in which one of the options was much larger than the others and was marked as a "featured item." Across conditions, the featured item was either one of the moderately priced options or the vertical extension. This manipulation is based on previous research that suggests that making one option perceptually salient could activate a narrow focus by drawing attention to a particular item (Hamilton, Hong, and Chernev 2007; see also Pieters and Wedel 2004; Rosbergen, Pieters, and Wedel 1997). After participants saw all four product categories, first at one store and then at the other, they were asked to select the store they expected to have the lower prices on other, unobserved items.

Results

We predicted that a broad focus would lead to a larger choice share for the downscale store than would a narrow focus on moderately priced items. We also predicted that a narrow focus on moderately priced items would lead to a smaller choice share of the downscale store than a narrow focus on vertical extensions. The store choice data are consistent with these predictions. In the broad focus condition, in which none of the options was perceptually focal, 87.2% of participants chose the downscale store. In the two narrow focus conditions, price image depended on which option was perceptually focal. When one of the moderately priced options in each set was focal, only 73.3% of participants chose the downscale store. When the vertical extension was perceptually focal, 88.2% of participants chose the downscale store.

A one-tailed logistic regression analysis revealed that choice of store is indeed a function of the focus condition ($\chi^2(2) = 5.1, p < .05$). In particular, participants were less likely to choose the downscale store when they had a narrow focus on a moderate option than when they had a broad focus ($\chi^2(1) = 3.0, p < .05$). In the two narrow focus conditions, participants were more likely to choose the downscale store when one of the moderately priced options was focal than when the extension option was focal at both stores ($\chi^2(1) = 3.7, p < .05$).

Discussion

This experiment provides support for the notion that broad or narrow focus drives the impact of consumer goals on price image formation. The data show that when participants had a broad focus, they formed price images that were directionally consistent with the vertical extension, as we found in the previous experiments. When participants were focused on one of the moderately priced options, they formed price images that were directionally opposite to the vertical extension (i.e., a contrast effect). This experiment also provides insight into a boundary condition of the proposed impact of vertical extensions and consumer goals on price image formation by showing that this contrast effect is reversed when consumers focus on the vertical extension rather than on a moderately priced item. Furthermore, by manipulating focus directly through perceptual salience

rather than indirectly through consumer goals, this experiment provides additional support for the role of attentional focus in driving the integration and contrast effects proposed in the theoretical account.

In this experiment, we manipulated consumer focus through perceptual salience of price information. An alternative method for examining the role of focus in moderating the observed contrast effect is to measure which option consumers focus on rather than manipulating it. In particular, when consumers with a buying goal select an item from a set, they are likely to focus on the chosen item when forming a price image. According to the theory proposed in this research, consumers who choose few vertical extensions (opting instead for moderately priced options) are likely to exhibit a stronger contrast effect than those who choose more vertical extensions. In other words, consumers who choose the fewest vertical extensions during a shopping trip are the most likely to form a high price image of a downscale store and a low price image of an upscale store. Experiment 5 tests this prediction by examining whether participants with a buying goal choose extensions or moderately priced options when forming a price image.

EXPERIMENT 5

The goal of this experiment was to test the proposition that when consumers have a buying goal, the impact of product line extensions on price image is a function of which option consumers contrast with the rest of the set. In particular, we examine how price image is influenced by whether participants with a buying goal choose a moderately priced option or a vertical extension.

Method

Ninety-five students from a large midwestern university participated in an experiment on consumer preferences in exchange for course credit. Participants were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 2 (product line extension: upscale versus downscale) \times 2 (goal: browsing versus buying) mixed design, in which we manipulated consumer goal between subjects and product line extension within subjects. Participants shopped in two virtual grocery stores for a list of the same nine items: laundry detergent, canned tuna, maple syrup, ketchup, apple juice, frozen pizza, pasta sauce, rice, and cat food. For each category on the shopping list, participants were shown pictures of three, four, or five branded packages, arranged as if they were on store shelves with the price displayed prominently below each item (36 prices in total).

The first store participants saw was an upscale store (i.e., it included upscale extensions), and the second was a downscale store (i.e., it included downscale extensions). To illustrate, in the pasta sauce category, the upscale store had the following assortment: Barilla (\$3.59), Prego (\$3.36), Ragu (\$3.42), and Isola (\$7.12). The downscale store carried the first three brands at the same prices but replaced the upscale extension with a downscale extension, Hunt's (\$1.39).

The consumer goal manipulation was a choice/no-choice task similar to that in Experiment 1. Participants in the buying goal condition were asked to select the option they

would buy in each of the nine categories in each store. In contrast, participants in the browsing goal condition did not make a choice but instead were asked to take a moment to consider the prices before moving on to the next category. After participants had shopped for each of the nine items, first at one store and then at the other, they were asked to select the store they expected to have the lower prices on items for which they had not yet seen prices.

Results

The store choice data are consistent with the findings of the previous experiments. Among participants with a browsing goal, 79.3% (N = 29) chose the downscale store, compared with only 48.5% (N = 66) of participants with a buying goal ($\chi^2(1) = 7.28, p < .01$). These results support the hypothesis that the impact of vertical extensions on price image is moderated by consumer browsing and buying goals.

This experiment also allowed for a test of the proposition that the contrast effect observed in the buying goal condition depends on which options command the focus of consumers' attention. In particular, we predicted that participants who chose fewer vertical extensions would form lower price images of the upscale store than participants who chose more vertical extensions. We examined the 18 choices these participants made (one choice in each category \times nine categories \times two stores) and divided them into five groups based on how frequently they chose a vertical extension. These groups consisted of (1) those who never chose a vertical extension; (2) those who chose only one extension; and those who chose (3) two extensions, (4) three or four extensions, and (5) five or more extensions.

The store choice data summarized in Figure 2 show that, in general, choice of the downscale store increased as participants chose more vertical extensions. Specifically, among the participants who included no vertical extensions in any of their 18 choices, not a single participant chose the downscale store. Consistent with predictions, the percentage of participants indicating that the downscale store had

a lower price image increased as the number of extensions chosen increased.

We tested the significance of these choice data using a logistic regression predicting choice of store (upscale store versus downscale store) as a function of the number of vertical extensions chosen (0 versus 1 versus 2 versus 3–4 versus 5+). Consistent with our hypotheses, the results reveal that the frequency of focusing on an extension option is a significant predictor of store choice ($\chi^2(1) = 13.48, p < .001$). As might be expected from a student population, the majority of the vertical extensions chosen were downscale extensions. The pattern of choices was similar and still significant when choice data was predicted by just the number of downscale items selected instead of using both upscale and downscale extensions.


Discussion

The results of this experiment show that the contrast effect previously observed when consumers have a buying goal is reversed when consumers choose vertical extensions instead of moderately priced options. The results show that as participants select fewer vertical extensions, they are less likely to form a low price image of a store that includes low-priced options. Testifying to the strength of the observed contrast effect, every single participant who never chose a vertical extension indicated that the store with upscale extensions was actually lower priced than the store with downscale extensions.

This experiment, as well as Experiments 3 and 4, used store choice as a measure of price image. Choice among retailers is an especially important dependent variable for several reasons. One of the primary reasons retailers are concerned about managing their price image is its anticipated effects on store choice (A.T. Kearney 2005; Urbany, Dickson, and Sawyer 2000; Van Heerde, Gijsbrechts, and Pauwels 2008). In addition, previous research has demonstrated that choice among retailers is a reliable measure of price image (Alba et al. 1994; Bell and Lattin 1998). Furthermore, choice among retailers provides a robust test of the proposed theory because it asks participants to make a relative price image judgment between two stores for which they have been given equivalent information. The results across these three store choice experiments are consistent in supporting the experimental hypothesis.

Figure 2

BUYING MORE VERTICAL EXTENSIONS INCREASES PREFERENCE FOR DOWNSCALE STORE (EXPERIMENT 5)



Notes: We asked participants to choose the store they thought had the lower prices overall.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

A common strategy for retailers trying to manage their price image is to add a few low-priced options when they want to convey a low price image and a few high-priced options when they want to appear more upscale (A.T. Kearney 2005; Barbaro 2006; *The Sun* 2008). Despite the intuitive appeal of this strategy, the research presented in this article indicates that this strategy may be effective only some of the time and, on occasion, may even backfire. We show that the impact of vertical extensions on price image is moderated by consumer goals. In particular, when consumers have a browsing goal, the result is a consistent shift in price image, such that upscale extensions lead to higher price images and downscale extensions lead to lower price images. When consumers have a buying goal, however, the

Table 3
THE IMPACT OF PRODUCT LINE EXTENSIONS AND
CONSUMER GOALS ON PRICE IMAGE (EXPERIMENTS 1–5)

	<i>Participants' Price Image Responses</i>	<i>Browsing Goal (%)</i>	<i>Buying Goal (%)</i>
Experiment 1	Purchase deferral (upscale store)	72.2	52.9
Experiment 2	Expected price (upscale store)	105.0	84.9
Experiment 3	Store choice (upscale store relative to downscale store)	69.8	53.9
Experiment 4	Store choice (upscale store relative to downscale store)	87.2	73.3
Experiment 5	Store choice (upscale store relative to downscale store)	79.3	48.5

Notes: We used different dependent variables to measure price image across studies. "Purchase deferral" reflects the percentage of participants who chose to look for a better price elsewhere rather than buy at the current price. "Expected price" reflects how much higher or lower (in percentage terms) than the average market price participants expected the price of a particular item to be. "Store choice" reflects the percentage of participants who revealed by their choices that the store with upscale extensions had a higher price image than the store with downscale extensions. Consistent across all experiments, the store with upscale extensions had a higher price image when participants had a browsing goal than when they had a buying goal.

result can be reversed, such that upscale extensions lead to lower price images, and vice versa.

The research in this article offers convergent evidence for the role of consumer goals in moderating the impact of vertical extensions on price image by using multiple dependent variables to measure price image. Across experiments, we measured price image using purchase deferral (Experiment 1), ratings (Experiment 2), price expectations (Experiment 2), and store choice (Experiments 3–5). These divergent dependent measures were consistent in supporting the proposed theoretical predictions (see Table 3). The findings were also reliable across a variety of retail contexts (e.g., electronics, small appliances, office supplies, home improvement, grocery) and price ranges.

Theoretical Contributions

The influence of goals on consumer behavior has become an important topic for marketing researchers. Previous research has investigated various specific consumer goals as drivers of preference formation and choice (e.g., Lee and Ariely 2006; Markman and Brendl 2000). However, the role of the common consumer goals of browsing and buying in judgment and decision making has received relatively little attention. This research contributes to the literature on consumer goals by showing that browsing and buying goals lead to differences in the way consumers allocate attention when forming impressions. In particular, we find that a browsing goal leads consumers to be less focused, allocate attention more broadly, and be more likely to make judgments (Johnson and Russo 1984). Conversely, a buying goal leads consumers to be more focused, to concentrate on fewer options, and to be more likely to make choices (Bettman, Luce, and Payne 1998; Johnson and Russo 1984).

This research also contributes to our understanding of price image formation by demonstrating the importance of

context in investigating how consumers form price images. Previous research into the impact of prices on price image has focused on how consumers form a price image using individual prices within a category, examining price image formation by stripping out the context in which prices are typically evaluated in a real-world setting (e.g., the prices of the rest of the offerings in a product category). In contrast to previous research, we examined the distribution of prices within a category (as opposed to just the price of a single chosen item) as a driver of price image. In this context, we show the influence of vertical extensions on price image—both when the extension is chosen by the consumer and when the extension simply forms a part of the context in which prices are evaluated.

This research also contributes to work done in the area of price perception by demonstrating when and how price perceptions can influence price image formation. In particular, previous research has shown that the local context can have a powerful impact on how consumers perceive prices. For example, the range of prices in the consideration set can influence price perception, such that when the range extends above (below) a focal item's price, that price seems less (more) expensive (Adaval and Monroe 2002; Janiszewski and Lichtenstein 1999). This work builds on these findings by showing that when consumers have a buying goal, these reference point effects can spill over from individual price perceptions to price image formation. However, the current research also shows that when consumers have a browsing goal, these range and reference point effects are reversed, and consumers instead tend to integrate the available price information into an overall impression.

Managerial Implications

The research presented in this article offers important insights for retailers that want to manage their price image through vertical extensions. As we have shown, the influence of vertical extensions on price image is a function of consumers' browsing and buying goals. On the basis of our findings, we propose that retailers should anticipate or influence consumers' goal states when designing a price image strategy built on vertical extensions. Specifically, for any given category, retailers may be able to anticipate whether consumers are likely to focus narrowly on just a few options or broadly on many options when evaluating prices. Furthermore, when consumers have a narrow focus, retailers may also be able to anticipate or influence which option is focal.

A basic observation is that consumers are more likely to browse in some categories than in others. To illustrate, for some big-ticket items, such as durable goods, consumers are especially likely to engage in extensive browsing before buying (Claxton, Fry, and Portis 1974). Likewise, the placement of some categories in the store makes consumers likely to browse more frequently than they buy. For example, many retailers place flashy, attention-grabbing categories, such as televisions, in high-traffic areas of the store. This placement encourages shoppers to stop and peruse the selection, even if they purchase from these categories relatively infrequently. The research in this article suggests that

for categories such as these, for which consumers are relatively more likely to have a browsing goal, a retailer that wants to lower its price image should consider extending its assortments with low-priced options.

By the same logic, there are other categories, such as food staples (e.g., milk, eggs), in which consumers are more likely to have a buying goal than a browsing goal, making them more likely to focus narrowly on the options they purchase. Categories in which brand loyalty is especially high may also be more strongly associated with a buying goal than a browsing goal. Thus, if consumers already have a clear preference for a particular brand, there will be less need for them to search the available offerings. The research in this article suggests that in categories such as these, for which consumers are relatively likely to have a buying goal, a retailer seeking to lower its price image should consider extending their assortments with high-priced options.

In addition to anticipating consumer goals, this research indicates that retailers may also be able to influence price image by changing a consumer's focus. The visual manipulation we used in Experiment 4 is similar to tactics that retailers use in the store (e.g., shelf-talkers, end-cap displays), in catalogues, and on Web sites that draw attention to particular items. Strategically encouraging consumers to focus on particular prices may also allow retailers to better manage their price images.

Limitations and Directions for Further Research

This research has several limitations, which are important to remember when generalizing the results. This study used a student sample who made hypothetical choices from hypothetical retailers. Further research could try to replicate these findings in real-world settings. Field studies conducted in a retail environment are an especially promising way to test the theory proposed in this article. In general, by anticipating or influencing consumers' breadth of focus in a particular category, a retailer may be able to customize its vertical extension strategy to manage its price image. This prediction could be tested by retailers who systematically extend categories on the basis of consumers' likely browsing or buying states. Thus, a retailer that wants to lower its price image could add downscale extensions in browsing-likely categories and upscale extensions in buying-likely categories and examine the resultant impact on price image.

Another promising area for further research is to extend the findings of retailer price image research into the domain of other types of brands. This research concentrated on the price image of retailers, but our findings also may be applied to the broader notion of brand image (Gardner and Levy 1955; Keller 1998) because any entity with a brand image will also have a price image. Manufacturer brands can have high price images (e.g., Rolex watches, Evian water, Bose sound systems) or low price images (e.g., Bic pens, Keds sneakers, Shasta beverages), independent of the specific retailers through which they are sold. It has become common for manufacturers to vertically extend brand lines, both upscale (e.g., Levi's has launched a Vintage Clothing line that carries 501 jeans priced at more than \$500) and downscale (e.g., the Porsche Boxster was introduced at almost half the price of a 911). The findings reported in

this research make specific predictions about the impact of these vertical extensions on the price image of manufacturer brands, depending on whether consumers focus on the brand's entire product line or on one offering in particular.

REFERENCES

- ▶ Adaval, Rashmi and Kent B. Monroe (2002), "Automatic Construction and Use of Contextual Information for Product and Price Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (March), 572–88.
- ▶ Alba, Joseph W., Susan M. Broniarczyk, Terence A. Shimp, and Joel E. Urbany (1994), "The Influence of Prior Beliefs, Frequency Cues, and Magnitude Cues on Consumers' Perceptions of Comparative Price Data," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (September), 219–35.
- ▶ ———, Carl F. Mela, Terence A. Shimp, and Joel E. Urbany (1999), "The Effect of Discount Frequency and Depth on Consumer Price Judgments," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26 (September), 99–114.
- ▶ Anderson, Norman H. (1965), "Averaging Versus Adding as a Stimulus-Combination Rule in Impression Formation," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 70 (4), 394–400.
- ▶ A.T. Kearney (2005), *"No Insult" Pricing and Promotions*. Chicago: A.T. Kearney.
- ▶ Barbaro, Michael (2006), "Whole Foods Talks Dollars and Cents," *The New York Times*, (May 10), (accessed October 5, 2009), [available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/10/business/media/10adco.html>].
- ▶ Bell, David R. and James M. Lattin (1998), "Shopping Behavior and Consumer Preference for Store Price Format: Why 'Large Basket' Shoppers Prefer EDLP," *Marketing Science*, 17 (March), 66–88.
- ▶ Berry, Leonard L. (1969), "The Components of Department Store Image: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis," *Journal of Retailing*, 45 (Spring), 3–20.
- ▶ Bettman, James R., Mary Frances Luce, and John W. Payne (1998), "Constructive Consumer Choice Processes," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (December), 187–217.
- ▶ Boatwright, Peter and Joseph C. Nunes (2001), "Reducing Assortment: An Attribute-Based Approach," *Journal of Marketing*, 65 (July), 50–63.
- ▶ Brown, Francis E. (1969), "Price Image Versus Price Reality," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6 (May), 185–91.
- ▶ Brown, Tom J. and Peter A. Dacin (1997), "The Company and the Product: Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses," *Journal of Marketing*, 61 (January), 68–84.
- ▶ Buyukkurt, B. Kemal (1986), "Integration of Serially Sampled Price Information: Modeling and Some Findings," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (December), 357–73.
- ▶ ——— and Meral D. Buyukkurt (1986), "Perceived Correlates of Store Price Image: An Application of the Bootstrap," *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, Richard J. Lutz, ed. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 42–47.
- ▶ Carmon, Ziv, Klaus Werthenbroch, and Marcel Zeelenberg (2003), "Option Attachment: When Deliberating Makes Choosing Feel Like Losing," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (June), 15–29.
- ▶ Chernev, Alexander (2006), "Differentiation and Parity in Assortment Pricing," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (September), 199–210.

- ▶ Claxton, John D., Joseph N. Fry, and Benard Portis (1974), "A Taxonomy of Prepurchase Information Gathering Patterns," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1 (December), 35–42.
- ▶ Dhar, Ravi and Itamar Simonson (1992), "The Effect of the Focus of Comparison on Consumer Preferences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (November), 430–40.
- ▶ ——— and ——— (1999), "Making Complementary Choices in Consumption Episodes: Highlighting Versus Balancing," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (February), 29–44.
- ▶ Draganska, Michaela and Dipak C. Jain (2005), "Product-Line Length as a Competitive Tool," *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 14 (March), 1–28.
- ▶ Fiske, Susan T. (1980), "Attention and Weight in Person Perception: The Impact of Negative and Extreme Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38 (6), 889–906.
- ▶ Gardner, Burleigh B. and Sidney J. Levy (1955), "The Product and the Brand," *Harvard Business Review*, 33 (March–April), 33–39.
- ▶ Hamilton, Ryan, Jiewen Hong, and Alexander Chernev (2007), "Perceptual Focus Effects in Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34 (August), 187–89.
- ▶ Horsky, Dan and Paul Nelson (1992), "New Brand Positioning and Pricing in an Oligopolistic Market," *Marketing Science*, 11 (Spring), 133–53.
- ▶ Janiszewski, Chris and Donald R. Lichtenstein (1999), "A Range Theory Account of Price Perception," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (March), 353–69.
- ▶ Johnson, Eric J. and J. Edward Russo (1984), "Product Familiarity and Learning New Information," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (June), 542–50.
- ▶ Keller, Kevin Lane (1998), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring and Managing Brand Equity*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- ▶ Krishna, Aradhna, Mary Wagner, Carolyn Yoon, and Rashmi Adaval (2006), "Effects of Extreme-Priced Products on Consumer Reservation Prices," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16 (2), 176–90.
- ▶ Lee, Leonard and Dan Ariely (2006), "Shopping Goals, Goal Concreteness, and Conditional Promotions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June), 60–70.
- ▶ Levin, Irwin P. (1974), "Averaging Processes in Ratings and Choices Based on Numerical Information," *Memory & Cognition*, 2 (4), 786–90.
- ▶ Mackenzie, Scott B. (1986), "The Role of Attention in Mediating the Effect of Advertising on Attribute Importance," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (September), 174–95.
- ▶ Markman, Arthur B. and C. Miguel Brendl (2000), "The Influence of Goals on Value and Choice," in *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, Vol. 39, D.L. Medin, ed. San Diego: Academic Press, 97–129.
- ▶ Martin, Leonard L., John J. Seta, and Rick A. Crelia (1990), "Assimilation and Contrast as a Function of People's Willingness and Ability to Expend Effort in Forming an Impression," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (1), 27–37.
- ▶ Martineau, Pierre (1958), "The Personality of the Retail Store," *Harvard Business Review*, 36 (January–February), 47–55.
- ▶ Mazumdar, Tridib and Kent B. Monroe (1990), "The Effects of Buyers' Intentions to Learn Price Information on Price Encoding," *Journal of Retailing*, 66 (Spring), 15–32.
- ▶ Moe, Wendy W. (2003), "Buying, Searching, or Browsing: Differentiating Between Online Shoppers Using in-Store Navigational Clickstream," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13 (1–2), 29–39.
- ▶ Monroe, Kent B. (1973), "Buyers' Subjective Perceptions of Price," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10 (February), 70–80.
- ▶ Myers, Robert H. (1960), "Shaping Your Store Image," *Journal of Retailing*, 36 (Fall), 129–37.
- ▶ Pieters, Rik and Michel Wedel (2004), "Attention Capture and Transfer in Advertising: Brand, Pictorial, and Text-Size Effects," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (April), 36–50.
- ▶ Putsis, William P., Jr., and Narasimhan Srinivasan (1994), "Buying or Just Browsing? The Duration of Purchase Deliberation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31 (August), 393–402.
- ▶ Rosbergen, Edward, Rik Pieters, and Michel Wedel (1997), "Visual Attention to Advertising: A Segment-Level Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (December), 305–314.
- ▶ Schmalensee, Richard (1978), "Entry Deterrence in the Ready-to-Eat Breakfast Cereal Industry," *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9 (Autumn), 305–327.
- ▶ Simester, Duncan (1995), "Signaling Price Image Using Advertised Prices," *Marketing Science*, 14 (2), 166–88.
- ▶ Simonson, Itamar and Amos Tversky (1992), "Choice in Context: Trade-Off Contrast and Extremeness Aversion," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (August), 281–95.
- ▶ Singh, Vishal, Karsten Hansen, and Robert Blattberg (2006), "Market Entry and Consumer Behavior: An Investigation of a Wal-Mart Supercenter," *Marketing Science*, 25 (September–October), 457–76.
- ▶ Srivastava, Joydeep and Nicholas Lurie (2001), "A Consumer Perspective on Price-Matching Refund Policies: Effect on Price Perceptions and Search Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (September), 296–307.
- ▶ ——— and ——— (2004), "Price-Matching Guarantees as Signals of Low Store Prices: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *Journal of Retailing*, 80 (Summer), 117–28.
- ▶ *The Sun* (2008), "Cheeseburger to Cost Beefy £85," (April 23), (accessed October 23, 2009), [available at <http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/article1077128.ece>].
- ▶ Thaler, Richard (1985), "Mental Accounting and Consumer Choice," *Marketing Science*, 4 (3), 199–214.
- ▶ Troutman, C. Michael and James Shanteau (1976), "Do Consumers Evaluate Products by Adding or Averaging Attribute Information?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3 (September), 101–106.
- ▶ Urbany, Joel E., Peter R. Dickson, and Alan G. Sawyer (2000), "Insights into Cross- and Within-Store Price Search: Retailer Estimates vs. Consumer Self-Reports," *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (2), 243–58.
- ▶ ———, ———, and William L. Wilkie (1989), "Buyer Uncertainty and Information Search," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (September), 208–215.
- ▶ Van Heerde, Harald J., Els Gijbrecchts, and Koen Pauwels (2008), "Winners and Losers in a Major Price War," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45 (October), 499–518.
- ▶ Wyer, Robert S., Jr., and Stanley F. Watson (1969), "Context Effects in Impression Formation," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12 (1), 22–33.