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Abstract

Decades of emotion research have demonstrated the unique influences of many specific emotions on consumer behaviors. These countless numbers of emotion effects can make it difficult to understand the role of emotions in consumer behavior. The current research introduces a parsimonious framework that can predict the effects of emotions on the consumer behavior of gift giving with just two appraisal dimensions: valence and agency. A series of studies examining gift giving reveals that positive emotions exert positive effects on gift giving, independent of their agency. In contrast, agency does predict the effects of negative emotions on gift giving. Negative self-caused emotions increase gift giving, whereas negative other-caused emotions decrease gift giving. These findings seem to hold for inactive and active emotions, and for uncertain and certain emotions. Together, these findings make a unique theoretical and empirical contribution to the understanding of emotions in gift giving. Moreover, it provides a pragmatic framework for both academics and practitioners.
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1.1 Introduction

Over the last couple of decades, numerous studies have shown how specific emotions can influence consumer behaviors. For example, we currently know that feelings of anger may motivate consumers to complain about a company (Nyer, 1997), that feelings of pride can encourage people to buy public display products (Griskevicius, Shiota, & Nowlis, 2010), and that dissatisfied customers experiencing regret may switch to a different service provider (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). With at least twenty emotions that play a role in marketing settings (Richins, 1997), it can be difficult for marketing academics and practitioners to identify and understand the influences of all these emotions on consumer behaviors. It is uncertain whether it is necessary to distinguish between similar emotions such as regret and disappointment, or shame and guilt when examining the influences of emotions on consumer behaviors. Some emotion scholars suggest that we should make this distinction (e.g., De Hooge, Zeelenberg, & Breugelmans, 2007; Griskevicius et al., 2010; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). The present research proposes that it is possible to predict the influences of emotions for at least some consumer behaviors on the basis of a limited number of emotion appraisal dimensions.

According to most scholars, emotions can be defined with a restricted number of cognitive or emotion appraisal dimensions. These include, for example, whether the emotion is positive or negative (valence), whether the outcomes are certain or uncertain (certainty), and whether the person feels powerful or powerless (power) (Bagozzi, Gopinath, & Nyer, 1999; Frijda, 1986; Frijda, Kuipers, & Ter Schure, 1989; Roseman, Wiest, & Swartz, 1994; Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Emotion valence (the extent to which an emotion is positive or negative) and
emotion agency (the extent to which an emotion is caused by oneself or caused by another person) are the two central appraisal themes that form the basis of the current research. Numerous emotion researchers have proposed valence and agency as appraisal dimensions (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Frijda, 1986; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988; Ruth, Brunel, & Otnes, 2002; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). Because these appraisal dimensions separately have been found to influence prosocial behaviors and altruism (e.g., Butt & Choi, 2006; Chaudhuri, 1997; Fredrickson, 2001; Kelley & Hoffman, 1997; Moll et al., 2007), the present research suggests that the interaction between valence and agency can predict, to a certain extent, the influence of specific emotions on a consumer behavior that generates millions of dollars every year: gift giving. Many scholars have examined the emotions that influence gift giving (e.g., Belk, 1976; Komter & Vollebergh, 1997; Ruth, 1996; Schwartz, 1967), but there is hardly any empirical work that studies the effects of multiple different emotions on gift giving. The current research also includes the appraisals of emotion activity (the extent to which an emotion makes the person feel active or inactive) and emotion certainty (the extent to which the outcomes of the emotion-generating situation are certain or uncertain), to test whether the effects of valence and agency generalize to active and inactive as well as certain and uncertain emotions.

The present research consists of studies which examine the effects of four different emotions on gift giving. These effects concern integral emotion influences, such that givers experience emotions towards receivers. The findings reveal that, at least for most of the tested emotions, the effects on gift giving decisions can be predicted on the basis of just two appraisal dimensions: valence and agency. More specifically, it appears that positive valence exerts positive influences on gift giving, independent of the agency. In contrast, the effects of emotions with a negative valence depend on the agency of the emotion. Negative emotions caused by the
giver generate positive effects on gift giving, but negative emotions caused by the receiver generate negative effects on gift giving. This framework also holds when including emotion activity (Study 5) or emotion certainty (Study 6) as a third appraisal dimension. Thus, emotion valence and agency seem to be able to predict most emotion influences on gift giving in a parsimonious way, making it easier for marketing practitioners and academics to understand and to apply emotion influences in consumer settings.

1.2 Gift giving and emotions

Gift giving has been studied by scholars from anthropology, psychology, marketing, economics, sociology, and philosophy (for overview see Banks, 1979; Belk, 1982). According to most disciplines, gifts can be understood as goods or services that are voluntarily provided from one person to another person or to a group (Belk, 1979). Usually, this provision takes place in ritual-like situations, such as birthdays, weddings, or Christmas settings, and the gifts may involve physical gifts, immaterial gifts (such as time or services), or cash gifts (Belk, 1976). The gift giving process takes place in three general stages: a gestation stage in which the giver searches for and buys gifts, a prestation stage in which gifts are exchanged, and a reformulation stage in which gifts are consumed or rejected, and in which the relationship between the giver and the recipient may change (Sherry, 1983).

Numerous factors can influence gift giving (Belk, 1976; Sherry, 1983), and emotions are considered to be one of those factors. Most theories and empirical research on emotions in gift giving focus on emotion effects during the gift giving process (Algoe, Haidt, & Gable, 2008; Belk, 1996; Ruffle, 1999; Ruth, Brunel, & Otnes, 2004; Ruth, Otnes, & Brunel, 1999; Sherry, McGrath, & Levy, 1993; Wooten, 2000). Instead, the current research focuses on how emotions generated before the gift giving process can influence the purchase of gifts during the gestation
stage. These emotions concern the giver’s emotions in relation to the receiver and thus reflect integral emotion effects. Gift giving theories mention that love, joy, penitence, sadness, and gratitude might stimulate gift giving to express emotional states (Cheal, 1988; Fischer & Arnold, 1990; Ruth, 1996; Sherry, 1983), or that gifts communicate feelings of love, affection, care, esteem, and friendship (Belk & Coon, 1993; Goodwin, Smith, & Spiggle, 1990; Komter & Vollebergh, 1997; Otnes, Ruth, & Milbourne, 1994; Wolfinbarger & Yale, 1993). A giver may express feelings of joy and pride with gift giving after a recipient has achieved something (Ruth, 1996; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), and may try to lessen feelings of guilt by purchasing gifts (Wolfinbarger, 1990). A number of empirical studies support the notion that emotions might influence gift giving in the gestation stage. The positive emotions of pride and confidence have been found to stimulate self-gift giving (Mick & Faure, 1998), and feelings of (agapic) love have been shown to exert an effect on the money, time, and effort that is spent on finding a gift (Belk & Coon, 1993; Goodwin et al., 1990). Thus, many different emotions seem to influence gift giving during the gestation stage, although little empirical research has examined the effects of multiple different emotions on gift giving. If different emotions indeed exert different effects on gift giving, how can these emotion influences be summarized in a parsimonious framework?

In general, emotions arise in response to evaluative judgments and interpretations of events that are relevant for consumers’ well-being (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Nyer, 1997). Put differently, emotions reflect a goal that is potentially threatened (in the case of negative emotions) or served (in the case of positive emotions) (Zeelenberg, Nelissen, Breugelmans, & Pieters, 2008). Different combinations of these evaluative judgments, often called cognitive appraisals or emotion appraisals, yield different emotional responses (Frijda, 1986; Ortony et al., 1988; Roseman, Antoniou, & Jose, 1996; Smith & Lazarus, 1993). Most scholars mention the
existence of five emotion appraisal dimensions: valence or pleasantness (the extent to which an emotion is positive or negative), activity or arousal (the degree to which one feels active or inactive), certainty (the degree to which the outcome of the event is certain or uncertain), power or control (the degree to which one feels powerful or powerless), and agency (the degree to which the emotion is caused by oneself or by other people) (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Frijda, 1986; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). Of these appraisal dimensions, I argue that the two appraisal dimensions of valence and agency can be used to predict emotion effects on gift giving.

The appraisal dimension of valence makes a distinction between positive emotions and negative emotions (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Frijda, 1986). Research has demonstrated that a distinction between emotions on the basis of their positivity or negativity is essential in understanding emotion influences on many different kinds of behavior that are related to altruism and prosociality (e.g., Chaudhuri, 1997; Fredrickson, 2001; Gino & Schweitzer, 2008; Reisenzein & Hofmann, 1990, 1993; Ruth et al., 2002). For example, compared to negative emotions, positive emotions have been found to encourage cooperation in groups and in social dilemma games (Haselhuhm & Mellers, 2005; Hertel, Neuhof, Theuer, & Kerr, 2000). They have also been shown to increase prosocial actions, increase helping, increase altruistic behaviors towards colleagues, and to reduce harmful actions towards others (Batson, 1998; Isen & Levin, 1972; Kelley & Hoffman, 1997). Because gift giving is considered to be a form of prosocial or altruistic behavior (Fischer, Gainer, & Arnold, 1996; Homans, 1961; Otnes & Beltramini, 1996), these findings indicate that the appraisal dimension of valence should be taken into account when predicting emotion effects on gift giving.

Since gift giving is an inherently social process that involves at least one other person (the receiver), I claim that the social aspects of emotions should also be taken into account when
explaining the role of emotions in gift giving. The appraisal dimension of agency (also named causality or responsibility) is the social aspect of emotions, and it distinguishes emotions that are caused by the self (self-caused emotions) from those caused by other people (other-caused emotions) (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Frijda, 1986; Ortony et al., 1988; Roseman et al., 1994). Translated to the giver’s perspective in a gift giving context, agency distinguishes self-caused emotions that result from actions of givers and other-caused emotions that result from actions of receivers. Previous research has found that agency is an important appraisal dimension for emotions in a social context (Lazarus, 1991; Reisenzein & Hofmann, 1993; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985; Weiner, 1986). For example, agency has been found to predict collaborative and competitive motives and subsequent compromise behaviors in negotiations (Butt & Choi, 2006; Butt, Choi, & Jaeger, 2005). It has also been demonstrated to influence social behaviors such as helping (or avoiding) others, attaching to others, correcting other people’s mistakes (Moll et al., 2007), complaining and protest behaviors towards companies (Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013; Soscia, 2007), and concerns with the welfare of comparable others (Choshen-Hillel & Yaniv, 2011). These findings suggest that the appraisal dimension of agency should also be taken into account when predicting emotion effects on the social act of gift giving.

There is some empirical support for the notion that the influence of emotions on gift giving can be predicted on the basis of the appraisal dimensions of valence and agency. Ruth et al. (2002) used a gift giving setting to examine whether consumption emotions could be summarized into a limited number of appraisal dimensions. In two studies, participants were asked to think of a situation in which they felt a certain emotion during or after having received a gift. Both studies found that most variance of ten different consumption emotions could be explained with two appraisal dimensions: valence and agency. Although the findings concern
emotions experienced after gift receipt and not the influence of emotions on the purchase of gifts, they do reveal that valence and agency might play a role in gift giving.

1.3 Hypotheses

In sum, I argue that the emotion effects of most emotions on gift giving can be predicted on the basis of just two appraisal dimensions: valence and agency. I propose that self-caused and other-caused emotions exert distinct influences on gift giving, which are contingent on the valence of the emotion. More specifically, I put forth the following two propositions.

Firstly, I hypothesize that positive valence (e.g., pride, joy, satisfaction, gratitude, love) increases gift giving, independent of the agency of the emotion. Positive emotions can broaden consumers’ momentary thoughts to focus on a wider (than typical) range of thoughts and actions (Derryberry & Tucker, 1994; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005). This range of thoughts and actions mostly focuses upon activities that are evolutionary adaptive and that build enduring personal resources (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). One such evolutionary adaptive activity that builds enduring personal resources is developing and maintaining social relationships. Therefore, all positive emotions are presumed to motivate social approach behaviors and actions that maintain one’s social relationships (Carver & Scheier, 1990; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Frijda, 1986). Indeed, “the function common to all positive emotions has been conceptualized as facilitating approach behavior” (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008, p. 778). For example, positive affect has been found to motivate helping, independent of the cause of these positive feelings (Isen & Levin, 1972). In a gift giving context, this suggests that positive emotions would increase gift giving to maintain relationships with receivers, independent of whether the positive feelings are caused by the giver (e.g., pride, satisfaction) or caused by the receiver (e.g., gratitude, love). Indeed, some positive other-caused emotions such as gratitude
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have been found to motivate cooperation and prosocial behavior (DeSteno, Bartlett, Baumann, Williams, & Dickens, 2010; McCullough, Kimeldorf, & Cohen, 2008). For positive self-caused emotions there is also some research suggesting that such emotions (e.g., pride) might stimulate prosocial behavior (Harth, Kessler, & Leach, 2008; Wubben, De Cremer, & Van Dijk, 2012).

Secondly, I hypothesize that negative valence (e.g., shame, guilt, anger, fear, disgust) can increase or decrease gift giving, depending on the agency of the emotion. My argument is based on the idea that negative emotions narrow consumers’ momentary thoughts to specific, immediate actions that address consumers’ needs (Derryberry & Tucker, 1994; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005). Negative emotions are believed to be developed for specific, survival-critical situations (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008; Frijda, 1986). When there are threatening situations that demand action, negative emotions are thought to shrink perceptions and thoughts to actions that are necessary to deal with the threat (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005; Zeelenberg et al., 2008). For instance, every specific negative emotion has been connected with specific action tendencies, whereas these tendencies are mostly underspecified for specific positive emotions (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). Moreover, recent research has demonstrated that negative emotions, despite their similar valence, can have different effects on prosocial behavior and decision making (De Hooge et al., 2007; Raghunathan & Pham, 1999; Lerner & Keltner, 2000). This suggests that negative emotions in a gift giving context will probably not stimulate gift giving automatically. Instead, negative emotions will motivate givers to analyze the gift giving situation in relation to their own needs. The agency of the emotion thereby provides information.

In the case of negative self-caused emotions such as shame or guilt, givers have done something wrong themselves. As a consequence, the emotion signals that gift giving might be
undertaken to improve the relationship with the receiver. This prediction might seem surprising at first given that previous literature on emotions showed that self-conscious emotions such as regret and guilt motivate a self-focus (Tracy, Robins, & Tangney, 2007), which may suggest that such emotions would decrease gift giving. Yet, some recent studies have challenged this view by reporting that guilt and shame can motivate prosocial behavior (De Hooge, Breugelmans, & Zeelenberg, 2008; De Hooge et al., 2007; Ketelaar & Au, 2003), and that negative self-caused emotions can motivate compromise behaviors in negotiations (Butt et al., 2005). These scholars argue that negative self-caused emotions make people feel less self-confident and subsequently stimulate behaviors that are positively regarded by others and by society in order to avoid more wrongdoing. This suggests that such negative self-caused emotions might stimulate gift giving.

On the contrary, negative other-caused emotions such as anger, fear, or contempt indicate that receivers have done something wrong. As a consequence, the emotion signals that the receiver should undertake action to mend the relationship with the giver, or, alternatively, that the giver should decrease gift giving in order to weaken the relationship with the receiver. This prediction is in line with the findings that negative other-caused emotions can motivate dominating behaviors in negotiations (Butt et al., 2005) and conflict-creating behaviors in relationships (Sanford & Rowatt, 2004). In summary, I hypothesize that negative self-caused emotions increase gift giving, whereas negative other-caused emotions decrease gift giving.

1.4 Examining emotion dimensions in gift giving

To study the proposition that the influence of emotions on gift giving depends on the appraisal dimensions of valence and agency, I conducted six studies in which different emotions were induced and different measures for gift giving were used. In all studies, I explored the effects of valence and agency on gift giving by first introducing an emotion induction task and
then measuring the effects on gift giving. There are different ways to measure increases and decreases in gift giving. Following conventional gift giving research, I used the amount of money that the giver spends on a gift, the effort that the giver puts into finding a gift (e.g., Flynn & Adams, 2009; Goodwin et al., 1990; Katz, 1976), how personal the gift is, and how big it is (Goodwin et al., 1990; Ward & Broniarczyk, 2011) as gift giving measures. To generalize the findings further, Study 2 explored emotion influences on the decision to buy a gift, and Studies 4 to 6 also measured the time that the giver intends to spend on searching for a gift.

In all studies, standard emotion induction measures from emotion research were used (De Hooge et al., 2008; Frijda et al., 1989; Roseman et al., 1994). In Studies 1 to 3, participants described a personal situation in which they experienced a certain emotion (the autobiographical recall procedure). To examine the effects beyond specific emotions, Study 4 directly manipulated the valence and agency dimensions. In addition, this study investigated whether emotion effects on gift giving occurred because givers wanted to maintain (in the case of positive emotions), improve (in the case of negative self-caused emotions), or weaken (in the case of negative other-caused emotions) the relationships with receivers. To avoid confusion, these motivations will collectively be labeled relationship management from now on. Together, these studies provide support for the idea that emotion effects on gift giving can be predicted on the basis of the dimensions of valence and agency.

Studies 5 and 6 continued by examining whether other appraisal dimensions might also play a role. Study 5 included the appraisal dimension of activity whereas Study 6 included the appraisal dimension of certainty. In both studies all gift giving measures and reasons for gift giving were assessed. In addition, because one might argue that the strength of the relationship between givers and receivers might play a role in the findings, Studies 5 and 6 included
relationship strength as a covariate in the analyses. The results reveal that the valence-agency framework can also predict effects of inactive and uncertain emotions on gift giving. Together, the six studies complement each other in multiple ways, and convergence in the results obtained in these different settings contribute to the generalizability of the findings.

2. Study 1: Inducing pride, gratitude, guilt, and anger

2.1 Method

2.1.1. Participants and design. Two hundred seventy-one international students from a Western European university (147 males, $M_{age} = 20.41$, $SD_{age} = 2.15$) participated in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. They were randomly assigned to the control condition or to one of the conditions of a 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) between subjects design with gift giving and money spent on the gift as dependent variables.

2.1.2. Procedure and variables. To induce emotions, participants first completed an autobiographical recall procedure. In this manipulation procedure, participants are usually asked to recall a personal incident in which they experienced a certain emotion (De Hooge et al., 2007; Ketelaar & Au, 2003; Roseman et al., 1994). In this study, participants reported a personal experience in which they felt very proud (positive self-caused condition), gratified (positive other-caused condition), guilty (negative self-caused condition), or angry (negative other-caused condition). In the control condition, participants described a regular weekday. Participants spent approximately ten minutes on the emotion induction task. Next, participants were asked to think of someone towards whom they experienced the emotion (in the other-caused conditions) or someone who was present in the described event (in the self-caused conditions). If there was nobody present, participants were asked to think of someone that they had told about the event
afterwards. In all cases, participants typed the name of this person.

To measure gift giving, participants then imagined that a week after the described event it was the named person’s birthday. As the dependent measures, participants indicated how much they would spend on the birthday gift (amount in euros), how much effort they would put into finding a gift (0 = no effort, 10 = a lot of effort), how personal the gift would be (involvement, 0 = not personal at all, 10 = very personal), and how big the gift would be (size, 0 = smaller than normal, 10 = bigger than normal). A factor analysis on these gift items showed a clear one factor solution (see Appendix A for the items and factor loadings). The factor gift giving (Eigenvalue = 3.04) explained 76% of the variance, but only formed a reliable scale (α = .92) when the money spent on the gift was left out (α = .36 when included). Therefore, in this and further studies the money spent on the gift was analysed separately. Finally, as an emotion manipulation check, participants reread their situation description and indicated how much pride, gratitude, guilt, and anger they felt (0 = not at all, 10 = very strongly).

2.2 Results and Discussion

2.2.1. Emotion manipulation check. Results for the emotion manipulation checks of Studies 1 to 4 can be found in Table 1. The emotion manipulation for all those studies was successful. Participants in the positive self-caused condition reported more pride than participants in all other conditions, and more pride than other emotions. Similar effects were found for gratitude in the positive other-caused condition, for guilt in the negative self-caused condition, and for anger in the negative other-caused condition.

2.2.2. Gift giving. According to the predictions, the effects of negative emotions, but not of positive emotions, are dependent on the agency of the emotion. Positive emotions (pride and gratitude) and negative self-caused emotions (guilt) would increase gift giving, whereas negative
other-caused emotions (anger) would decrease gift giving. Results for Studies 1, 3, and 4 can be found in Table 3. Please note that for Studies 1 to 4 the degrees of freedom for the ANOVAs and the contrast analyses differ. Because the control condition did not have a value on valence or agency (it is neutral on both valence and agency), this condition was only included in the contrast analyses. A 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) ANOVA with gift giving as dependent variable showed two main effects \((F_s > 32.30, ps < .01, \eta^2_s > .13)\) and a two-way interaction \((F(1, 214) = 38.27, p < .01, \eta^2 = .15)\). Participants in the positive self-caused condition \((t(266) = 2.44, p = .01)\), in the positive other-caused condition \((t(266) = 2.76, p < .01)\), and in the negative self-caused condition (albeit marginally, \(t(266) = 1.87, p = .06\)) all bought bigger gifts in terms of effort, involvement, and size compared to participants in the control condition. There were no differences across these three conditions \((ts < 1)\). In contrast, participants in the negative other-caused condition bought a smaller gift compared to all other conditions \((ts > 7.11, ps < .01)\).

2.2.3. Money spent on the gift. A 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) ANOVA with money as dependent variable showed two main effects \((F_s > 6.79, ps < .01, \eta^2_s > .03)\) and a two-way interaction \((F(1, 214) = 7.37, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03)\). Participants in the positive self-caused condition \((t(266) = 3.25, p < .01)\), the positive other-caused condition \((t(266) = 3.26, p < .01)\), and the negative self-caused condition \((t(266) = 1.94, p = .05)\) all spent more on the gift compared to control participants. There were no differences across these three conditions \((ts < 1.24, ps > .22)\). In contrast, participants in the negative other-caused condition spent less on the gift compared to all other conditions \((ts > 2.04, ps < .04)\).

2.2.4. Discussion. Study 1 provides first support for the idea that the valence-agency framework can predict emotion effects on gift giving. Whereas positive emotions (pride and
gratitude) appeared to increase gift giving, the effects of negative emotions depended on the agency of the emotion. The negative self-caused emotion guilt increased gift giving, but the negative other-caused emotion anger decreased gift giving. However, one might question whether measures such as the type of gift consumers would buy and the amount they would be willing to spend reflect all possible gift giving behaviors. For example, emotions might exert different effects on the decision to buy a gift. Therefore, Study 2 replicates the results of Study 1 with other gift giving measures.

3. Study 2: Other gift giving measures

3.1 Method

3.1.1. Participants and design. One hundred seventy-nine international students from a Western European university (70 males, $M_{age} = 21.49$, $SD_{age} = 1.98$) participated in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. They were randomly assigned to the control condition or to one of the conditions of a 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) between subjects design with gift giving decision and type of gift as dependent variables.

3.1.2. Procedure and variables. To induce emotions, participants first completed the autobiographical recall procedure of Study 1. Participants then typed the name of the person who was present in the described event or who was told about the event afterwards. To measure gift giving, participants imagined that a week after the described event it was the named person’s birthday. As the dependent measures, participants indicated whether they would buy a gift for this person (yes vs. no) and what type of gift they would buy (a present, a gift card, money, or nothing). It was thereby assumed that buying a present would entail greater effort than buying a gift card or giving money (Ruth et al., 1999). Finally, participants reread their
situation and answered the emotion manipulation check of Study 1.

3.2 Results and Discussion

3.2.1. Gift giving decision. According to the hypotheses, the effects of negative emotions, but not of positive emotions, are dependent on the agency of the emotion. Positive emotions (pride and gratitude) and negative self-caused emotions (guilt) are expected to increase gift giving, whereas negative other-caused emotions (anger) are expected to decrease gift giving. Indeed, a chi-square test showed that agency had no influence on gift giving in the positive conditions. Both self-caused (95 %) and other-caused emotions (94 %) motivated participants to give a gift ($\chi^2 < 1$). In contrast, agency did have an effect on gift giving in the negative conditions. Most participants in the negative self-caused condition intended to give a gift (85 %), whereas only 57 % of participants in the negative other-caused condition intended to do so ($\chi^2 (1, N = 69) = 6.64, p = .01, \phi = .31$). Of the control participants, 92 % intended to give a gift.

3.2.2. Type of gift. A chi-square test showed that emotions also influenced the type of gift that participants intended to buy. Agency had no effect on the type of gift in the positive conditions. Both self-caused (95 %) and other-caused emotions (89 %) motivated participants to give a present ($\chi^2 (2, N = 73) = 2.12, p = .35$). In contrast, agency did influence the type of gift in the negative conditions. Negative self-caused emotions mostly motivated participants to give a present (77 %), whereas only 40 % of participants in the negative other-caused condition intended to do so ($\chi^2 (3, N = 69) = 9.87, p = .02, \phi = .38$). 14 % of participants in the negative other-caused condition intended to give a gift card, and 43 % intended to give nothing. Of the participants in the control condition, 81 % intended to give a present.

3.2.3. Discussion. Study 2 replicates the results of Study 1 with different dependent measures. It seems that the valence-agency framework can predict emotion influences on gift
giving aspects such as whether a gift is bought and what type of gift is bought. Positive emotions (pride and gratitude) appeared to stimulate gift giving, whereas the effects of negative emotions depended on the agency. The negative self-caused emotion guilt stimulated gift giving, but the negative other-caused emotion anger did not. Even though Studies 1 and 2 find similar results on different dependent measures, there may be some doubts about the generalizability of the findings. Both studies examined the effects of the emotions of pride, gratitude, guilt, and anger. Study 3 excludes the possibility that the emotion effects on gift giving might be based on the specific emotions used in Studies 1 and 2. In this next study, four other emotions, namely satisfaction, love, shame, and fear were induced.

4. Study 3: Inducing four other emotions

4.1 Method

4.1.1. Participants and design. Two hundred twenty international students from a Western European university (107 males, $M_{age} = 21.67$, $SD_{age} = 2.45$) participated in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. There were four participants who did not answer the autobiographical recall induction, resulting in two hundred sixteen participants (104 males, $M_{age} = 21.67$, $SD_{age} = 2.46$). They were randomly assigned to the control condition or to one of the conditions of a 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) $\times$ 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) between subjects design with gift giving and money spent on the gift as dependent variables.

4.1.2. Procedure and variables. Participants completed the same procedure as in Study 1. This time, however, they were asked to report a personal experience in which they felt very satisfied (positive self-caused condition), loved (positive other-caused condition), ashamed (negative self-caused condition), or afraid (negative other-caused condition). Participants indicated what gift they would buy for the named person (a person towards whom the emotion...
was experienced, who was present in the described event, or who was told about the event afterwards) by answering the gift giving items of Study 1. Participants ended with the emotion manipulation check, on which they indicated how much satisfaction, love, shame, and fear they felt (0 = not at all, 10 = very strongly).

4.2 Results and Discussion

4.2.1. Gift giving. Studies 1 and 2 suggested that the positive emotions satisfaction and love and the negative self-caused emotion shame increased gift giving, whereas the negative other-caused emotion fear decreased gift giving. The ANOVA on gift giving showed two main effects ($F$s > 19.79, $p < .01, \eta^2 s > .10$) and a two-way interaction ($F(1, 173) = 24.56, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$). Both positive emotions and the negative self-caused emotion (albeit marginally for the negative self-caused emotion, $t s > 1.85, p < .06$) increased gift giving compared to the control condition. These three conditions did not differ ($t s < 1$). In contrast, negative other-caused emotions decreased gift giving compared to all other conditions ($t s > 4.79, ps < .01$).

4.2.2. Money spent on the gift. The ANOVA on money spent on the gift showed only a main effect of valence ($F(1, 173) = 25.41, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$; agency $F < 1$) and a two-way interaction ($F(1, 173) = 23.49, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$). Participants in the positive self-caused condition (albeit marginally, $t(211) = 1.93, p = .06$), in the positive other-caused condition ($t(211) = 5.57, p < .01$), and in the negative self-caused condition (albeit marginally, $t(211) = 1.74, p = .08$) all spent more on the gift than the control condition. Unexpectedly, participants in the positive other-caused condition also spent more compared to the positive self-caused and the negative self-caused conditions ($t s > 3.73, ps < .01$). Participants in the negative other-caused condition instead spent less compared to all other emotion conditions ($t s > 3.36, ps < .01$), and marginally less compared to the control condition ($t(211) = 1.60, p = .11$).
4.2.3. Discussion. Although there are some variations in the findings of Study 3 compared to Studies 1 and 2, the findings indicate that the valence-agency framework can mostly predict the effects of specific emotions such as satisfaction, love, shame, and fear on gift giving. These four emotions showed that both positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions can increase gift giving, and that negative other-caused emotions can decrease gift giving. The framework could not predict the finding that the positive other-caused emotion love stimulated givers to spend more money on gifts compared to the other tested emotions.

According to the hypotheses, emotions tell the giver something about the relationship with the receiver. Both positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions increase gift giving, because they signal that the relationship with the receiver should be maintained (positive emotions) or improved (negative self-caused emotions). In contrast, negative other-caused emotions decrease gift giving because they signal that the relationship with the receiver should be weakened. Alternatively, emotions could influence gift giving for different reasons. For example, the giver may want to express feelings and use gift giving as a way to do so. Emotions could also influence perceptions of how easy or difficult it is to buy a gift, such that positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions would decrease the perceived costs of gift giving, and negative other-caused emotions would increase the perceived costs of gift giving. To examine why emotions affect gift giving, Study 4 measured the reasons underlying gift giving. The next study directly manipulated valence and agency instead of specific emotions to test whether the effects can indeed be explained by the valence and agency of emotions and not by the specific emotions.

5. Study 4: Inducing valence and agency

5.1 Method
5.1.1. Participants and design. After excluding four participants who did not answer the autobiographical recall procedure, one hundred thirty-eight participants (62 males, \(M_{age} = 20.96, SD_{age} = 2.37\)) participated in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. They were randomly assigned to the control condition or one of the conditions of the 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) \(\times\) 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) between subjects design with gift giving, money spent on the gift, and time spent on the gift as the dependent variables.

5.1.2. Procedure and variables. Participants first recalled a situation in which they felt very positive due to their own behavior (positive self-caused condition), positive due to the behavior of other people (positive other-caused condition), negative due to their own behavior (negative self-caused condition), or negative due to the behavior of other people (negative other-caused condition). In the control condition, participants recalled a normal weekday. Next participants indicated how much pride, satisfaction (both positive self-caused), gratitude, love (both positive other-caused), guilt, shame (both negative self-caused), fear, and anger (both negative other-caused) they felt in the described situation (0 = not at all, 10 = very strongly).

Participants followed the same procedure as in the other studies and typed in the name of a person towards whom they experienced the feeling (in the other-caused conditions) or someone who was present in the described event (in the self-caused conditions). If there was nobody present, participants thought of someone that they had told about the event afterwards. In all cases, participants typed the name of this person. They then answered the gift giving measures of Study 1, but also indicated how much time they would spend on searching for a gift (in minutes) (item five of Appendix A). Next, participants responded to twelve items about the reasons why they decided to give a gift. These items were specifically developed to measure relationship management, expression of feelings, and perceived costs of gift giving. A factor
analysis with Oblimin rotation was conducted to allow the factors to be correlated. This analysis showed a clear three-factor solution (see Appendix B for the items and factor loadings of the Pattern matrix). The first factor, relationship management (Eigenvalue = 4.79), consisted of seven items, explained 40% of the variance, and formed a reliable scale ($\alpha = .91$). The second factor, express feelings (Eigenvalue = 2.30), explained 19% of the variance ($\alpha = .93$). Finally, the third factor, perceived cost (Eigenvalue = 1.65), explained 14% of the variance ($\alpha = .75$). Two negatively formulated items did not load on any factor, and were therefore left out of the analyses. For each item, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which this motivated their choice for the gift (0 = not at all, 10 = very strongly).

5.2 Results and Discussion

5.2.1. Gift giving. Both positive valence conditions would increase gift giving, independent of whether the positive feelings were self-caused or other-caused. For the negative valence conditions, self-caused feelings would increase gift giving and other-caused feelings would decrease gift giving. Two main effects ($F$s < 26.25, $p$s < .01, $\eta^2$s > .20) and a two-way interaction ($F(1, 107) = 36.77, p < .01, \eta^2 = .26$) were found. Again, both positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions increased gift giving compared to the control condition ($t$s > 1.95, $p$s < .05) and did not differ from each other ($t$s < 1.18, $p$s > .24). Participants in the positive other-caused condition bought marginally bigger gifts than participants in the negative self-caused condition ($t(133) = 1.85, p = .07$). Negative other-caused emotions decreased gift giving compared to all other conditions ($t$s > 5.93, $p$s < .01).

5.2.2. Money spent on the gift. For money spent on the gift two main effects ($F$s > 10.20, $p$s < .01, $\eta^2$s > .09) and a two-way interaction ($F(1, 107) = 4.50, p = .04, \eta^2 = .04$) were found. Both positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions increased gift giving compared
to the control condition (albeit marginally for negative self-caused emotions, \( t > 1.68, p < .09 \)) and did not differ from each other (\( t < 1.40, p > .16 \)). Negative other-caused emotions decreased gift giving compared to all other conditions (\( t > 2.17, p < .03 \)).

5.2.3. Time spent searching for a gift. For time spent two main effects (\( F > 8.36, p < .01, \eta^2 > .07 \)) and a two-way interaction (\( F(1, 107) = 22.48, p < .01, \eta^2 = .17 \)) were found. Both positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions increased time spent on the gift compared to the control condition (\( t < 2.47, p < .01 \)) and did not differ from each other (\( t < 1.35, p > .18 \)). Participants in the negative other-caused condition spent less time searching compared to all other conditions (\( t > 2.85, p < .01 \)).

5.2.4. Reasons for gift giving. According to the hypotheses, emotions would influence gift giving because they signal that the relationship with the receiver should be maintained (in the case of positive emotions), improved (in the case of negative self-caused emotions), or weakened (in the case of negative other-caused emotions). It was not expected that emotions would influence gift giving because givers wanted to express their feelings, or because emotions influenced perceptions of the costs of gift giving. Indeed, the ANOVA on relationship management showed two main effects (\( F > 34.47, p < .01, \eta^2 > .24 \)) and a two-way interaction (\( F(1, 107) = 25.00, p < .01, \eta^2 = .19 \)). Participants in the positive self-caused condition (\( t(133) = 2.34, p = .02 \)) and in the negative self-caused condition (albeit marginally, \( t(133) = 1.73, p = .09 \)) were more interested in maintaining their relationship compared to participants in the control condition. There was no difference between the positive other-caused condition and the control condition (\( t(133) = 1.13, p = 26 \)). In contrast, participants in the negative other-caused condition were less interested in maintaining their relationship compared to all other conditions (\( t > 6.61, p < .01 \)).
The effects of emotions on gift giving could not be explained by a motivation to express feelings or by changes in perceived costs of gift giving. The ANOVA on express feelings showed only a main effect of valence \(F(1, 107) = 15.34, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13\). A similar ANOVA with perceived cost as dependent variable showed a two-way interaction \(F(1, 107) = 4.85, p = .03, \eta^2 = .04\), but the pattern of results did not reflect the pattern found for emotion effects on gift giving. Participants in the positive self-caused condition found it easier to buy gifts compared to participants in all other conditions \(ts > 1.98, p < .06\). There were no other differences across the between conditions \(ts < 1.59, p > .12\).

Because the hypotheses predict mediation of only one gift giving reason (relationship management) and not of the other two reasons (express feelings and perceived cost), I analyzed the data by means of the PROCESS macro, model 4 (the parallel multiple mediator model). PROCESS uses an OLS regression-based path analytical framework for estimating direct and indirect effects, combined with bootstrap methods to make inferences about the significance of the indirect effects (see Hayes, 2013 for an extensive description). Condition was first recoded into four dummy variables. Mediation analyses for every dummy variable separately demonstrated that relationship management \(bs > 0.59, ts > 7.60, ps < .01\) and express feelings \(bs > 0.12, ts > 2.48, ps < .02\) were predictors of gift giving for all conditions, while perceived cost \(bs < 0.09, ps > .19\) was not. Supporting the hypotheses, bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects via relationship management \(bs > 0.69\) based on 10,000 bootstrap samples were entirely above zero \(0.18 < 95\% \text{ CIs} < 1.99\), while all bootstrap confidence intervals via express feelings included zero \(-0.003 < 95\% \text{ CIs} < 0.46\). There was no evidence that emotions influenced gift giving independent of its effect on relationship management \(bs < 0.22, ts < 1\) (with the exception of the positive other-caused condition, \(b = 1.29, p < .01\), and the negative
For money spent on the gift, relationship management ($b > 1.97, t > 1.69, p < .09$) and express feelings ($b > 1.83, t > 2.29, p < .03$) were predictors, while perceived cost ($b < 0.58, p > .55$) was not. Bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects via relationship management ($b > 3.28$) were entirely above zero ($2.05 < 95\% \text{ CIs} < 16.77$), while all bootstrap confidence intervals via express feelings included zero (-5.43 < 95\% \text{ CIs} < 8.44). There was no evidence that emotions influenced money independent of its effect on relationship management ($b < 7.93, t < 1.31, p > .19$) (with the exception of the negative other-caused condition, $b = 16.48, p = .02$). Finally, for time spent on the gift, only relationship management was a predictor ($b > 4.49, t > 3.54, p < .01$) (express feelings $b < 1.22, p > .15$; perceived cost $b < 1.53, p > .14$). Bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects ($b > 5.61$) were entirely above zero ($1.71 < \text{bootstrapped 95\% CIs} < 28.55$), and emotions did not influence time independent of its effect on relationship management ($b < 5.56, t < 1$).

5.2.5. Discussion. Study 4 replicates the findings of the previous studies with a different emotion manipulation and also sheds some light on why emotions influence gift giving. A direct manipulation of the emotion dimensions of valence and agency again shows that the valence-agency framework can predict emotion effects on gift giving. Moreover, one of the reasons why these effects take place is that emotions signal whether the relationship with the receiver should be maintained, improved, or weakened. Positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions increase gift giving because they signal that the relationship should be maintained (positive emotions) or improved (negative self-caused emotions). In contrast, negative other-caused emotions decrease gift giving because they signal that the relationship should be weakened. Motivation to express feelings, or changed perceptions in the cost of gift giving could not
explain the emotion effects.

Although Studies 1 to 4 provide converging evidence for the valence-agency framework, they do not test the role of other appraisal dimensions such as activity (also called arousal) or certainty. According to emotion literature, emotions can make people feel active (e.g., pride or anger) or inactive (e.g., happiness or sadness) (Frijda et al., 1989; Roseman et al., 1994). All previously tested emotions are considered to be active emotions. Study 5 included activity as an appraisal dimension to test whether the hypothesized effects also apply to inactive emotions. Emotions can also be based on situations that entail certain outcomes (e.g., sadness, anger, or pride), or on situations in which there is no certainty concerning outcomes yet (e.g., anxiety or hope). All previously tested emotions are certain emotions. Study 6 included certainty as an appraisal dimension to test whether the hypothesized effects also apply to uncertain outcomes.

Moreover, Study 4 demonstrated that relationship management is one reason why emotions influence gift giving. Another possible reason could be mood repair. Givers could change their gift giving in order to make themselves feel better. To test this possible reason, Studies 5 and 6 included mood repair as a reason for gift giving. Finally, it is possible that the emotion effects on gift giving could be explained by differences in the strength of relationships between givers and receivers. To exclude this possibility, relationship strength was included as a covariate in the analyses of Studies 5 and 6.

6. Study 5: Inducing inactive emotions

6.1 Method

6.1.1. Participants and design. After excluding seven participants who did not answer the autobiographical recall procedure, two hundred forty-three US citizens (130 males, \(M_{\text{age}} = 32.64, SD_{\text{age}} = 11.85\)) participated in a study on Amazon Mechanical Turk in exchange for a
monetary reward. They were randomly assigned to one of the conditions of the 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) × 2 (activity: inactive vs. active) between subjects design with gift giving decision, gift giving, money spent on the gift, and time spent on the gift as the dependent variables.

6.1.2. Procedure and variables. According to most emotion theories, inactive emotions do not have a clear agency. In other words, they can be self-caused or other-caused depending on the situation (Frijda, 1986; Frijda et al., 1989; Nyer, 1997; Ortony et al., 1988; Reisenzein & Hofmann, 1990, 1993; Richins, 1997; Roseman et al., 1994). Therefore, in this study four different emotions were induced (happiness as a positive inactive emotion, pride as a positive active emotion, sadness as a negative inactive emotion, and anger as a negative active emotion). Participants in the self-caused condition recalled a situation in which each of these four emotions was felt due to something they had done to/for another person, and participants in the other-caused condition recalled a situation in which the emotion was felt due to the behavior of other people. Next, participants indicated how much pride, happiness, anger, and sadness they felt in the described situation (1 = not at all, 7 = very strongly). They also indicated to what degree they felt negative and positive (valence), whether they themselves or another person was the cause of the situation (agency), whether they felt inactive or active (activity), whether they felt uncertain or certain (certainty), and whether they felt powerless or powerful (power) (1 = not at all, 7 = very strongly).

Participants typed the name of the person in the described situation. They answered the gift giving dependent measures of Studies 1 and 2, and indicated their reasons for gift giving on the items from Study 4. This time, the reasons also included three items related to mood repair (Appendix B, items 13 to 15, \( \alpha = .94 \)). Finally, to control for the strength of the relationship with
the receiver, participants indicated how strong their relationship was with the person in question, how close they were, how satisfied they were with their relationship, and how much they liked the person in question (1 = not at all, 7 = very strong/close/satisfied/much liked) ($\alpha = .93$).

6.2 Results and Discussion

6.2.1. Emotion manipulation check. The emotion manipulation in both Studies 5 and 6 worked (see Table 2 for specific emotions). The appraisal dimension items also demonstrated that the agency manipulation was successful. Participants in the self-caused conditions felt that they were the cause of the situation ($M = 5.26$, $SD = 1.74$) more and other people less ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 2.06$) than those in the other-caused conditions ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.89$ and $M = 5.50$, $SD = 1.90$, $t$s > 8.84, $ps < .01$). Participants in the positive conditions felt more positive ($M = 6.18$, $SD = 1.11$) and less negative ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 1.19$) than those in the negative conditions ($M = 1.56$, $SD = 1.04$ and $M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.55$, $t$s(241) > 23.12, $ps < .01$).

Unfortunately, participants in the inactive conditions did not report feeling more inactive ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.82$) or less active ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 2.18$) compared to those in the active conditions ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.72$ and $M = 4.01$, $SD = 2.06$, $t$s < 1). Because participants in the inactive conditions did not report feeling more inactive than active either, and because most emotion theories agree that happiness and sadness are inactive emotions and pride and anger are active emotions (Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000), participants might not have understood the items “I felt inactive” and “I felt active” as intended. A posttest with 101 US citizens (38 males, $M_{age} = 37.06$, $SD_{age} = 14.21$) on Amazon Mechanical Turk confirmed this idea. In the posttest, participants were asked to report to what extent they felt inactive, active, low on energy, energized, aroused, stimulated, not motivated to do anything, motivated to do something, and motivated to take action (1 = not at all, 7 = very strongly) when they felt happiness, pride,
sadness, and anger (in random order). Results showed that experiences of the inactive emotions of happiness and sadness were reported as being lower on energy ($M = 3.76, SD = 0.86$), less energized ($M = 3.97, SD = 0.89$), less arousing ($M = 3.70, SD = 1.09$), less stimulating ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.92$), less motivating to do something ($M = 3.94, SD = 0.95$), more motivating not to do anything ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.03$), and less motivating to take action ($M = 3.87, SD = 1.07$) compared to experiences of the active emotions of pride and anger ($Ms < 2.09, SDs < 1.03$ for low on energy and motivating not to do anything, $Ms > 4.63, SDs < 1.66$ for the other items, $ts > 5.72, ps < .01$).

**6.2.2. Gift giving decision.** Studies 1 to 4 demonstrated that the effects of active negative emotions, but not of active positive emotions, depend on the agency. Thus, pride and self-caused anger were expected to increase gift giving, and other-caused anger was expected to decrease gift giving. More importantly, Study 5 tested whether this pattern of results would also be found for the inactive emotions happiness and sadness (see Table 4). Even though the results partially differed across gift giving dependent measures, overall the findings revealed that the same pattern applies to inactive emotions. Chi-square tests with gift giving decision as dependent variable showed that agency had no influence on gift giving for the positive inactive emotion happiness. Both self-caused (97 %) and other-caused happiness (93 %) motivated participants to give a gift ($\chi^2 < 1$). In contrast, agency did affect gift giving marginally for the negative inactive emotion sadness. Most participants in the self-caused sadness condition intended to give a gift (84 %), whereas only 64 % of participants in the other-caused sadness condition intended to do so ($\chi^2 (1, N = 67) = 3.39, p = .07, \varphi = .23$). This finding replicated the pattern found for active emotions in Study 2. Unexpectedly, the results for positive active emotions did not replicate the findings of Study 2. Although the majority of participants in the
self-caused pride condition reported they would buy a gift (79 %), even more participants would do so in the other-caused pride condition (100 %, $\chi^2 (1, N = 53) = 6.67, p = .01, \phi = .36$). The results for anger did replicate the findings of Study 2. Most participants in the self-caused anger condition intended to give a gift (85 %), whereas only half of the participants in the other-caused anger condition intended to do so ($\chi^2 (1, N = 65) = 9.02, p < .01, \phi = .37$).

**6.2.3. Gift giving.** The valence-agency framework can predict the effects of inactive emotions on gift giving. A 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) × 2 (activity: inactive vs. active) ANOVA with gift giving as dependent variable and relationship strength added as a covariate variable showed only a main effect of valence ($F(1, 234) = 4.43, p = .04, \eta^2 = .02$; $F$s < 2.40, $ps > .12$ for agency and activity), a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1, 234) = 11.47, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$), and no three-way interaction ($F < 1$). Agency had no influence on gift giving ($ts < 1.61, ps > .11$) for both inactive and active positive emotions. However, it did have an effect on gift giving ($ts > 3.62, ps < .01$) for both inactive and active negative emotions. Self-caused sadness and self-caused anger increased gift giving compared to other-caused sadness and other-caused anger.

**6.2.4. Money spent on the gift.** The valence-agency framework can predict the effects of inactive emotions on money spent on the gift. The ANOVA with money spent on the gift as dependent variable and relationship strength as a covariate showed only a marginal main effect of activity ($F(1, 234) = 2.77, p = .09, \eta^2 = .01$; for valence and agency $F$s < 2.57, $ps > .12$), a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1, 234) = 6.49, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$), and a three-way interaction ($F(1, 234) = 6.49, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$). Separate 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) ANOVAs with relationship strength as covariate for inactive and active emotions demonstrated a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1,
$t(235) = 8.31, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$) for inactive emotions only. While there was no difference between self-caused and other-caused happiness on money spent on the gift ($t(235) = 1.39, p = .17$), there was a difference between self-caused and other-caused sadness ($t(235) = 4.24, p < .01$). Participants in the self-caused sadness condition intended to spend more on the gift. For active emotions, there was no difference between the self-caused and other-caused pride conditions on money spent on the gift ($t < 1$), and there was a marginal significant difference between the self-caused and other-caused anger conditions ($t(235) = 1.77, p = .08$). Participants in the self-caused anger condition intended to spend marginally more on the gift.

**6.2.5. Time spent on the gift.** The valence-agency framework can predict the effects of inactive emotions on time spent on the gift. The ANOVA with time spent on the gift as dependent variable and relationship strength as a covariate showed only a marginal main effect of agency ($F(1, 234) = 2.90, p = .09, \eta^2 = .01$; for valence and activity $Fs < 1$), a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1, 234) = 5.16, p = .02, \eta^2 = .02$), and no three-way interaction ($F < 1$). Agency had no influence on gift giving ($ts < 1$) for both inactive and active positive emotions. However, it did affect gift giving ($ts > 2.65, ps < .01$) for both inactive and active negative emotions. Self-caused sadness and self-caused anger increased time spent searching on a gift compared to other-caused sadness and other-caused anger.

**6.2.6. Reasons for gift giving.** It was expected that emotions would influence gift giving because they signal that the relationship with the receiver should be maintained, improved, or weakened. A second possible reason was that givers would use gift giving to repair their mood. Again, the PROCESS macro model 4 was used to test these hypotheses. Mediation analyses for every of the seven dummy variables separately for every gift giving dependent measure demonstrated that relationship management ($bs > 0.88, ts > 14.98, ps < .01$ for gift giving, $bs >
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8.93, ts > 4.62, ps < .01 for money, and bs > 10.14, ts > 5.34, ps < .01 for time) was the only predictor of gift giving for all emotion conditions (mood repair bs < 2.18, ps > .19). Supporting the hypotheses, bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects via relationship management (bs > 0.34) based on 10,000 bootstrap samples were entirely above zero (0.05 < 95% CIs < 4.01 for gift giving, 0.17 < 95% CIs < 47.98 for money, and 0.53 < 95% CIs < 76.56 for time), while all bootstrap confidence intervals via mood repair included zero (-9.78 < 95% CIs < 11.93). There was no evidence that emotions influenced gift giving independent of its effect on relationship management (bs < 1.03, ps > .11 for gift giving, bs < 21.33, ps > .12 for money, bs < 19.53, ps > .30 for time) (with the exception of other-caused pride for gift giving, b = 0.80, p = .05, and self-caused sadness for money, b = 38.56, p < .01, and for time, b = 36.16, p = .04).

6.2.7. Discussion. One of the remaining questions was whether the valence-agency framework would also hold for inactive emotions. Overall the findings of Study 5 seem to suggest that the valence-agency framework can also account for the effects of inactive emotions such as happiness and sadness on gift giving. Moreover, the effects of both active and inactive emotions on gift giving seem to be mediated by a motivation to maintain, improve, or weaken the relationship with the receiver, and not by a motivation to feel good (mood repair). Finally, the emotion effects on gift giving were found even when relationship strength was included as a covariate, suggesting that the findings could not be explained by differences in the relationship between the giver and the receiver. Study 6 examines whether the hypothesized framework also applies to uncertain emotions such as hope and anxiety.

7. Study 6: Inducing uncertain emotions

7.1 Method
7.1.1. Participants and design. After excluding eight participants that did not answer the autobiographical recall procedure, two hundred forty-two US citizens (147 males, \( M_{\text{age}} = 31.33, SD_{\text{age}} = 11.05 \)) participated in a study on Amazon Mechanical Turk in exchange for a monetary reward. They were randomly assigned to one of the conditions of the 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) \( \times \) 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) \( \times \) 2 (certainty: uncertain vs. certain) between subjects design with gift giving decision, gift giving, money spent on the gift, and time spent on the gift as the dependent variables.

7.1.2. Procedure and materials. This study had the same design as Study 5. This time, however, two uncertain emotions (hope and anxiety) and two certain emotions (pride and anger) were induced. To manipulate agency, for every emotion participants in the self-caused condition remembered a situation in which the emotion was felt due to something they had done to/for another person, and participants in the other-caused condition remembered a situation in which the emotion was felt due to the behavior of other people. Participants continued with the manipulation check, gift giving dependent measures, and reasons for gift giving from Study 5.

7.2 Results and Discussion

7.2.1. Emotion manipulation check. Participants in the self-caused conditions felt themselves to be the cause of the situation (\( M = 4.13, SD = 2.29 \)) more and other people less (\( M = 3.74, SD = 2.18 \)) than the other-caused conditions (\( M = 2.15, SD = 1.60 \) and \( M = 5.39, SD = 1.97, ts > 6.18, ps < .01 \)). Participants in the positive conditions felt more positive (\( M = 5.72, SD = 1.36 \)) and less negative (\( M = 1.73, SD = 1.15 \)) than the negative conditions (\( M = 1.96, SD = 1.52 \) and \( M = 5.39, SD = 1.72, ts > 19.49, ps < .01 \)). Finally, participants in the uncertain conditions felt more uncertain (\( M = 4.13, SD = 1.99 \)) and less certain (\( M = 3.14, SD = 1.92 \)) than the certain conditions (\( M = 2.80, SD = 1.99 \) and \( M = 3.90, SD = 2.06, ts > 2.97, ps < .01 \)).
7.2.2. Gift giving decision. The certain emotions pride and self-caused anger were expected to increase gift giving, whereas other-caused anger was expected to decrease gift giving. Study 6 examined whether this pattern of results would also be found for the uncertain emotions hope and anxiety (for results see Table 5). The valence-agency framework did not explain the effects of uncertain emotions for gift giving decision. Agency had no influence on gift giving for the positive uncertain emotion hope. Both self-caused (100%) and other-caused hope (97%) motivated participants to give a gift ($\chi^2 < 1$). Agency also did not have an influence on gift giving for the negative uncertain emotion anxiety. The majority of participants in both the self-caused anxiety condition (75%) and the other-caused anxiety condition (71%) intended to give a gift ($\chi^2 < 1$). The valence-agency framework did explain the effects of certain emotions for gift giving decision. Both self-caused (94%) and other-caused pride (100%) motivated participants to buy a gift ($\chi^2 (1, N = 65) = 2.00, p = .16$). In addition, most participants in the self-caused anger condition intended to give a gift (89%), whereas only 60% of the participants in the other-caused anger condition intended to do so ($\chi^2 (1, N = 56) = 5.75, p = .02, \phi = .32$).

7.2.3. Gift giving. The valence-agency framework can predict the effects of uncertain emotions on gift giving. A 2 (valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (agency: self-caused vs. other-caused) × 2 (certainty: uncertain vs. certain) ANOVA with gift giving as dependent variable showed main effects of valence and agency ($F$s $> 6.79, ps < .01, \eta^2$s $> .03$; certainty $F < 1$), a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1, 234) = 16.76, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$), and no three-way interaction ($F(1, 234) = 2.31, p = .13$). Agency had no influence on gift giving ($t$s $< 1$) for both uncertain and certain positive emotions, whereas it did affect gift giving ($t$s $> 2.02, ps < .05$) for both uncertain and certain negative emotions. Self-caused anxiety and self-caused anger increased gift giving compared to other-caused anxiety and other-caused anger.
7.2.4. Money spent on the gift. The valence-agency framework can predict the effects of uncertain emotions on money spent on the gift. The ANOVA on money spent on the gift showed a main effect of agency ($F(1, 234) = 5.07, p = .03, \eta^2 = .02$; for valence and certainty $Fs < 2.16, ps > .13$), a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1, 234) = 11.09, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$), and no three-way interaction ($F(1, 234) = 1.34, p = .25$). Agency had no influence on money spent on the gift ($ts < 1.41, ps > .16$) for both uncertain and certain positive emotions, but did affect money spent on the gift ($ts > 2.43, ps < .02$) for both uncertain and certain negative emotions. Self-caused anxiety and self-caused anger increased the money spent on the gift compared to other-caused anxiety and other-caused anger.

7.2.5. Time spent on the gift. Finally, it seems that the valence-agency framework can also predict the effects of uncertain emotions on time spent on the gift. The ANOVA on time spent on the gift showed a main effect of valence ($F(1, 234) = 9.90, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$; agency and certainty $Fs < 2.29, ps > .13$), a two-way interaction of valence and agency ($F(1, 234) = 8.20, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$), and no three-way interaction ($F < 1$). Agency had no influence on time ($ts < 1.62, ps > .11$) for both uncertain and certain positive emotions, but did affect gift giving (albeit marginally for anxiety, $t(235) = 1.74, p = .07$; for anger $t(235) = 2.16, p = .03$) for both uncertain and certain negative emotions. Self-caused anxiety and self-caused anger increased time spent on the gift compared to other-caused anxiety and other-caused anger.

7.2.6. Reasons for gift giving. Relationship management was thought to be the mediating factor for uncertain emotions. Mediation analyses for every of the seven dummy variables separately for every gift giving dependent measure demonstrated that relationship management ($bs > 0.87, ps < .01$) was the only predictor of gift giving for almost all conditions. With the exception of other-caused hope, bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects
via relationship management ($bs > 0.31$) based on 10,000 bootstrap samples were entirely above zero ($0.30 < 95\% \text{ CIs} < 27.96$). Other-caused hope was the only emotion that influenced gift giving independent of its effect on relationship management ($bs > .75$, $p s < .06$ for other-caused hope, $bs < 33.73$, $ps > .14$ for the other emotions).

7.2.7. Discussion. In general, the findings seem to suggest that the valence-agency framework can also predict the effects of uncertain emotions on gift giving. It appears that uncertain positive emotions increase gift giving, independent of their agency. With the exception of the decision to buy a gift, the influence of uncertain negative emotions on gift giving depend on their agency. When excluding other-caused hope, the motivation to maintain, improve, or weaken the relationship with the receiver also seems to be the mediator for uncertain emotions.

8. General discussion

A large number of studies have taught us that consumers can experience a plethora of emotions, each with their own influences on consumer behaviors. Yet, the huge amount of detailed knowledge on consumer emotions makes it difficult to understand the role of emotions in consumer behaviors, let alone to manage such emotion influences. The current research shows that many emotion influences on for example gift giving can be predicted with just a limited number of emotion appraisal dimensions. Together, the negativity or positivity of an emotion (valence) and the cause of the emotion (agency) can explain how various specific emotions influence gift giving. Six studies with different emotions and different gift giving measures indeed revealed that positive emotions and negative self-caused emotions increase gift giving, and that negative other-caused emotions decrease gift giving. Furthermore, a meta-analysis of the effects observed across all six studies, using Winer (1971)'s method of pooling $t$'s, validated the results. For positive emotions, the effect of agency was not significant ($z = 1.84$, $p = .08$, -
.005 < 95% CI < 0.16) and the effect size was small \( (r = .08) \). On the contrary, for negative emotions the effect of agency was significant \( (z = 9.53, p < .01, .32 < 95\% \text{ CI} < 0.48) \) and the effect size was large \( (r = .41) \). These findings attest to the robustness of the valence-agency framework. Such a parsimonious framework can help both academics and practitioners in managing consumer emotions.

8.1 Theoretical and practical contributions

The present findings constitute an important contribution to gift giving research. Gift giving scholars agree that emotions play a central role in all stages of the gift giving process. Many theories mention different specific emotions that might evoke gift giving, and some studies have provided empirical support for the idea that emotions might influence gift giving. However, there has been very little empirical research that has studied how at least two different emotions might influence gift giving, or that has provided a theoretical framework for how different emotions can influence gift giving. The current research addressed this issue by presenting a series of empirical studies on the role of givers’ emotions in gift giving, and by providing a parsimonious framework that captures most emotion effects on gift giving.

The current findings also provide some new insights into the reasons underlying emotion effects on gift giving. According to most gift giving research, emotions can affect gift giving because givers want to express their feelings. These include the expression of emotional states such as love, joy, penitence, sadness, and gratitude (Cheal, 1988; Fischer & Arnold, 1990; Ruth, 1996; Sherry, 1983), or the communication of feelings of love, affection, care, pride, esteem, and friendship to receivers (Belk & Coon, 1993; Goodwin et al., 1990; Komter & Vollebergh, 1997; Otnes et al., 1994; Ruth, 1996; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985; Wolfinbarger & Yale, 1993). Indeed, the results of Studies 4 to 6 demonstrate that givers may feel a need to express their
feelings when they experience positive emotions. Yet, givers experiencing negative emotions
did not indicate a need to express their feelings, and the reported need to express feelings did not
predict the found emotion effects on gift giving. Instead, a motivation to maintain, improve, or
weaken relationships with receivers seemed to be able to predict the emotion pattern in gift
giving. We now know that when givers experience a positive emotion or a negative self-caused
emotion, they feel a need to maintain or improve their relationships with receivers, and
consequently increase gift giving, and when givers feel a negative other-caused emotion, they
will want to weaken their relationships with receivers, and consequently decrease gift giving.
These findings seem to suggest that emotions influence consumer behaviors because consumers
want to maintain or change their relationships with others.

On a more general level, I believe that the study of emotion appraisal dimensions in gift
giving can also broaden the view on how emotions influence consumer behaviors. Until
recently, most research concerning emotion effects on consumer behaviors focused on the
effects of one or more specific emotions (Aaker, Drolet, & Griffin, 2008; Griskevicius et al.,
2010). This research may have provided a detailed picture of how specific emotions influence
consumer behaviors, but it does not give a clear picture of how emotions play a role. For
example, a florist trying to sell flowers as a gift by using emotion appeals will not realize that he
could increase sales by gratitude-inducing sales messages. A more parsimonious model, which
distinguishes emotions on the basis of a limited number of appraisal dimensions, such as the one
applied in the current research, may provide a solution. In that case, the florist would realize that
not only gratitude but multiple different positive emotions or negative self-caused emotions
could increase sales. Thus, the understanding of consumer behavior would benefit from research
that identifies which appraisal dimensions are best in distinguishing different emotions,
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capturing the interplay among those emotions, and predicting behavioral outcomes.

The present findings have multiple managerial implications. In interpersonal selling, the current framework might be used by retailers to induce emotions that fit with their sales targets. Similar to the emotion induction methods used in the current studies, retailers might ask consumers if they ever encountered events caused by themselves or by other people that made them feel positive or negative. Recalling such events might influence consumers’ decisions whether to buy a gift, what gift to select from a gift registry, or how much money to spend. Such tactics could also be applied in direct marketing using social media. On a more general level, the current framework could help to identify what types of emotions can be used for emotion appeals in advertisements that focus on gift giving. The findings suggest that especially advertisements aiming for positive emotions or negative self-caused emotions, independent of what the specific emotion might be, should be effective in stimulating gift giving. Moreover, the findings seem to indicate that promotional activities for gift giving should mostly be held at locations that generate positive emotions or negative self-caused emotions. For instance, amusement parks, zoos, sex shops, catholic churches, and conferences aimed at specific topics such as emotions or interpersonal relationships seem to be good locations for generating gift giving. Finally, sales promotions aimed at gifts could be more effective when using the current valence-agency framework. Slogans such as “did someone make you feel positive?” printed on coupons might help.

8.2 Limitations and future research

Four observations can be made concerning the current studies. First, the effects of negative self-caused emotions on gift giving do not seem to be as strong as the effects of other emotions on gift giving. In all studies, positive emotions and the negative other-caused emotions
exerted significantly different effects on gift giving compared to situations in which givers did not experience any emotion. Yet, in most studies the effects of negative self-caused emotions on gift giving were marginally different from situations in which givers did not experience any emotion. This might suggest that negative self-caused emotions do not always have a positive effect on gift giving. It is important to note that, although the comparisons with neutral conditions mostly revealed marginally significant results, the positive effects of the negative self-caused emotions on gift giving did not differ from the positive effects of the positive emotions. Thus, negative self-caused emotions and positive emotions have similar effects on gift giving. Similarly, the effects of negative self-caused emotions on gift giving did differ from negative other-caused emotions, suggesting that agency is relevant when predicting the effects of negative emotions on consumer behaviors such as gift giving. Future research is needed to further demonstrate the effects of negative self-caused emotions on consumer behaviors.

Second, there are some variations in the findings across studies. Most notably are the findings that the positive other-caused emotion love increased gift giving more than all other emotions in Study 3, and that other-caused anxiety did not influence the decision to buy a gift in Study 6. Interestingly, both love and anxiety have been mentioned by multiple scholars to play a significant role in gift giving (Belk & Coon, 1993; Goodwin et al., 1990; Komter & Vollebergh, 1997; Wolfinbarger & Yale, 1993; Wooten, 2000). Together with the current findings, this might indicate that love and anxiety are two emotions that exert additional influences on gift giving above and beyond their valence and agency. Moreover, these variations were not predicted on the basis of the valence-agency framework. This implies that even though the valence-agency framework is largely sufficient to predict emotion effects on gift giving and is useful because it is parsimonious, it may at times fail to capture some specific emotion effects.
These findings can serve as the seeds of future research that examines the applications and boundaries of the valence-agency framework.

Third, readers may question the importance of the motivation to improve one’s social relationships that is generated by negative self-caused emotions. Negative self-caused emotions such as shame, guilt, and regret may arise in situations where there are no other people present. When this was the case, participants of Studies 1 to 4 instead thought of people who were told about the event afterwards. One may wonder whether givers would experience a need to improve anything about relationships with such “told-about-event-afterwards” receivers. After all, these receivers had not been hurt in any way. Yet, one may argue that the perceived need to improve our social relationships, particularly for impression management reasons, may also occur when we give negative information about us to others. For example, the relationship management scale included aspects such as “I care about what the receiver thinks of me” and “I want to make a good impression on the receiver”. Indeed, a comparison between participants that reported on a receiver being present or not present during the negative self-caused emotion-inducing event on relationship management in Study 4 did not show a significant difference ($t(25) = 0.37, p = .72$). Future research is needed to further study the role of relationship improvement motivations in negative self-caused emotions when receivers are not related to the emotion-inducing events.

The fourth and final observation concerns the generalizability of the findings. Gift giving is an often-occurring consumer behavior in which millions of dollars are spent each year (Belk, 1976; Cheal, 1988; Mauss, 1925; Otnes & Beltramini, 1996; Ruth et al., 1999). Some researchers consider gift giving to be a form of prosocial behavior or to describe a range of different behaviors that could also be labeled charitable giving (Belk, 1979; Fischer et al., 1996;
Sherry, 1983). For example, gift giving can be related to blood and organ donations, governmental foreign aid, church relief work, contributions to charitable causes, and community service. Following this line of reasoning, the current findings could apply to all of these behaviors. However, gift giving also has its specific elements. For example, it can be perceived as a form of social or interpersonal consumer behavior in which the consumer interacts with one other person. The findings of Studies 4 to 6 indeed indicate that the emotion effects on gift giving occur because the giver wants to maintain, improve, or weaken the relationship with the receiver. This might limit the generalizability of the current findings to other social consumer behaviors. Future research could examine whether the emotion effects demonstrated in the current research hold for other consumer behaviors such as donations to charity, environmentally friendly behaviors, and social media use.

8.3 Conclusion

Decades ago, emotion scholars demonstrated that the effects of positive emotions on consumer behaviors could be different from the effects of negative emotions on the same behaviors. Since then, we have acquired significantly more knowledge on emotions and their effects. We currently know that there are at least twenty different consumer emotions, each with their own causes and consequences. Yet, this huge amount of data can prevent us from identifying the essential aspects of emotion influences on consumer behaviors. The current findings provide a solution, and demonstrate that most emotion influences on at least some consumer behaviors can be understood by taking into account only a limited number of appraisal dimensions. After decades of detailed studies, it thus appears that it may be time to take a step back and focus on the basics of emotions, namely emotion appraisal dimensions.
Appendix A

*Items and factor loadings of the gift giving measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
<th>Study 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much money would you spend on X’s birthday?</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much effort would you put into finding a gift for X?</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How personal would the gift be that you would buy for X?</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How big would the gift be that you would buy for X?</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How much time would you spend searching for a gift for X?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability (α) .36/.92 .89 .93

*Note.* With the exception of money (item 1) and time (item 5), items were answered using 10-point scales with end points labelled 0 (no effort/not personal at all/very small) and 10 (much effort/very personal/very big). Money was measured in euros in Studies 1 to 4 and in dollars in Studies 5 and 6, and time was measured in minutes.
Appendix B

*Items and factor loadings of the reasons for gift giving in Studies 4 to 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Relationship management</th>
<th>Express feelings</th>
<th>Perceived cost</th>
<th>Mood repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wanted to make [receiver] feel better</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Wanted to have a good interaction with [receiver]</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Wanted to receive a positive reaction from [receiver]</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Care about what [receiver] thinks of me</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Wanted to make a good impression on [receiver]</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Wanted to look good</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Don’t care about what [receiver] thinks of me (recoded)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Wanted to show [receiver] how I feel</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Wanted to express my feelings</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Buying a gift for [receiver] was very easy</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Buying a gift for others is easy</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Buying a gift for [receiver] required little effort</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Wanted to make me feel better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Wanted to feel good again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Wanted to improve my mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reliability (α) | .91 | .93 | .75 | .94 |

*Note.* Items were complements to the sentence “I chose to give this gift because I…” and were answered using 10-point scales with end points labelled 0 (not at all) and 10 (very strongly). In the participant’s text the [receiver] was the name of the mentioned person. Items 13 to 15 were only included in Studies 5 and 6, and the factor loadings of these items concern the factor analysis run in Study 5.
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Table 1

*Emotion manipulation check means (and standard deviations) and tests in Studies 1 to 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Target emotion</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
<th>Study 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-caused</td>
<td>Other-caused</td>
<td>Self-caused</td>
<td>Other-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>Target emotion</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>8.90 (1.20)</td>
<td>8.40 (1.94)</td>
<td>8.00 (1.76)</td>
<td>8.74 (1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other conditions</td>
<td>$t_{(266)} &gt; 6.04^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(266)} &gt; 4.01^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(266)} &gt; 12.62^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(266)} &gt; 10.60^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other emotions within the same condition</td>
<td>$t_{(57)} &gt; 6.33^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(52)} &gt; 5.50^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(53)} &gt; 10.32^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(53)} &gt; 8.63^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td>Target emotion</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>8.86 (1.58)</td>
<td>8.39 (1.52)</td>
<td>8.38 (1.67)</td>
<td>8.46 (1.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other conditions</td>
<td>$t_{(174)} &gt; 6.38^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(174)} &gt; 6.35^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(174)} &gt; 6.47^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(174)} &gt; 7.86^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other emotions within the same condition</td>
<td>$t_{(36)} &gt; 4.49^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(35)} &gt; 6.43^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(33)} &gt; 7.36^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(34)} &gt; 9.96^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3</td>
<td>Target emotion</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>8.53 (1.88)</td>
<td>8.51 (1.53)</td>
<td>8.00 (1.23)</td>
<td>8.09 (2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other conditions</td>
<td>$t_{(211)} &gt; 2.34^{*}$</td>
<td>$t_{(211)} &gt; 4.84^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(211)} &gt; 7.89^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(211)} &gt; 6.36^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other emotions within the same condition</td>
<td>$t_{(44)} &gt; 5.49^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(42)} &gt; 3.21^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(40)} &gt; 8.18^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(44)} &gt; 6.75^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4</td>
<td>Target emotion</td>
<td>Pride, satisfaction</td>
<td>Gratitude, love</td>
<td>Guilt, shame</td>
<td>Anger, fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>8.11 (1.60), 8.56</td>
<td>7.82 (2.42), 7.57</td>
<td>7.74 (1.81), 7.33</td>
<td>7.24 (2.61), 2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.57)</td>
<td>(2.56)</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other conditions</td>
<td>$t_{(133)} &gt; 2.83^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(133)} &gt; 3.00^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(133)} &gt; 4.77^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(133)} &gt; 2.06^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to other emotions</td>
<td>$t_{(26)} &gt; 3.63^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(27)} &gt; 3.47^{**}$</td>
<td>$t_{(26)} &gt; 2.09^{*}$</td>
<td>$t_{(28)} &gt; 2.09^{*}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within the same condition

Note. For every condition, the target emotion was compared to the same emotion in the other conditions (“compared to other conditions”) and compared to other emotions within the same condition (“compared to other emotions within the same condition”). * ps < .05 ** ps < .01.
Table 2

*Emotion manipulation check means (and standard deviations) and tests in Studies 5 and 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 5</td>
<td><strong>Target emotion</strong></td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M (SD)</strong></td>
<td>8.90 (1.20)</td>
<td>8.40 (1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Compared to other conditions</strong></td>
<td><em>ts</em>(266) &gt; 6.04**</td>
<td><em>ts</em>(266) &gt; 4.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Compared to other emotions</strong></td>
<td><em>ts</em>(57) &gt; 6.33**</td>
<td><em>ts</em>(52) &gt; 5.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 5</td>
<td><strong>within the same condition</strong></td>
<td><em>ts</em>(57) &gt; 6.33**</td>
<td><em>ts</em>(52) &gt; 5.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 6</td>
<td><strong>Target emotion</strong></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M (SD)</strong></td>
<td>5.81 (1.12)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Compared to other conditions</strong></td>
<td><em>ts</em>(238) &gt; 3.84**</td>
<td><em>ts</em>(238) &gt; 2.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Compared to other emotions</strong></td>
<td><em>ts</em>(57) &gt; 3.26**</td>
<td><em>ts</em>(64) &gt; 5.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. For every condition, the target emotion was compared to the same emotion in the other conditions (“compared to other conditions”) and compared to other emotions within the same condition (“compared to other emotions within the same condition”). *ps < .05 **ps < .01.*
Table 3

*Gift giving and gift giving reason means (and standard deviations) as a function of condition in Studies 1, 3, and 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>Total gift giving</td>
<td>6.08 (1.65) (^a)</td>
<td>7.06 (1.82) (^b)</td>
<td>7.22 (1.80) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>24.54 (20.09) (^a)</td>
<td>40.07 (27.89) (^b)</td>
<td>40.47 (29.92) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3</td>
<td>Total gift giving</td>
<td>6.09 (2.13) (^a)</td>
<td>7.10 (1.39) (^b)</td>
<td>7.27 (1.75) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>22.60 (21.30) (^a)</td>
<td>33.07 (27.89) (^b)</td>
<td>53.23 (33.33) (^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4</td>
<td>Total gift giving</td>
<td>5.74 (1.96) (^a)</td>
<td>7.38 (1.25) (^b)</td>
<td>7.73 (1.25) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>22.22 (21.63) (^a)</td>
<td>43.11 (31.16) (^b)</td>
<td>37.89 (29.36) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>44.41 (22.67) (^a)</td>
<td>62.67 (27.76) (^b)</td>
<td>72.54 (24.71) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>6.24 (1.78) (^a)</td>
<td>7.40 (1.44) (^b)</td>
<td>6.80 (1.40) (^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td>4.74 (2.77) (^a)</td>
<td>7.67 (1.37) (^b)</td>
<td>6.68 (2.67) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express feelings</td>
<td>4.28 (1.98) (^{ab})</td>
<td>4.95 (2.07) (^b)</td>
<td>3.55 (2.72) (^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Total gift giving was the mean of effort, involvement, and size scores (ranging from 0 to 10). Money was measured in euros, time in minutes. There are no significant differences between means with the same superscript, with all \(t < 1.24, p > .22\). Means with different superscripts differ significantly with all \(t > 1.94, p < .05\), and means with letters \(^{ab}\) and \(^{ad}\) differ marginally significantly from means with letter \(^a\) with all \(t > 1.60, p < .11\).
Table 4

Gift giving and gift giving reason means (and standard deviations) as a function of condition in Study 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Inactive conditions</th>
<th>Active conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-caused</td>
<td>Other-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total gift giving</td>
<td>6.76 (1.89)^a</td>
<td>6.50 (2.49)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>60.33 (45.37)^a</td>
<td>86.96 (123.19)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>96.63 (85.67)^a</td>
<td>86.96 (66.60)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>7.65 (1.42)^a</td>
<td>7.73 (2.08)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>9.10 (1.95)^a</td>
<td>8.11 (3.03)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived cost</td>
<td>6.23 (2.24)^a</td>
<td>6.38 (3.15)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood repair</td>
<td>4.62 (2.71)^a</td>
<td>5.15 (3.52)^a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total gift giving was the mean of effort, involvement, and size scores (ranging from 0 to 10). Money was measured in dollars, time in minutes. There are no significant differences between means with the same superscript, with all ts < 1.40, ps > .16. Means with different superscripts differ significantly with all ts > 2.04, ps < .05, and means with letters ab differ marginal significantly from means with letter a, all ts > 1.67, ps < .09.
### Table 5

**Gift giving and gift giving reason means (and standard deviations) as a function of condition in Study 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Uncertain conditions</th>
<th>Certain conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-caused</td>
<td>Other-caused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total gift giving</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.51 (2.45)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.96 (2.19)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>62.14 (40.70)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>85.23 (91.09)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>80.32 (102.87)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>113.17 (87.32)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>7.26 (1.93)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.39 (2.19)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>8.45 (2.29)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8.57 (3.19)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express feelings</td>
<td>7.50 (2.07)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.56 (2.83)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived cost</td>
<td>5.04 (2.76)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.66 (2.75)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood repair</td>
<td>5.04 (2.76)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.66 (2.75)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Total gift giving was the mean of effort, involvement, and size scores (ranging from 0 to 10). Money was measured in dollars, time in minutes. There are no significant differences between means with the same superscript, with all ts < 1.62, ps > .11. Means with different superscripts differ significantly with all ts > 2.02, ps < .05, and means with letters ab differ marginal significantly from means with letter a, all ts > 1.74, ps < .08.