

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

Rational versus emotional product recall: Effect of product recall communication on consumer's emotions, attitude and intentional behavior.

Master Thesis Communication Science Master Marketing & Communication Faculty Behavioural Science University of Twente Graduation committee: 1st supervisor: Dr. Ardion Beldad 2nd supervisor: Dr. Mirjam Galetzka

Abstract

The purpose of this study regarding product recall crisis communication was to give answer to the research questions of this research. By means of a 2x2x2 scenario-based experiment it was aimed to investigate the impact between product recall message framing (rational vs. emotional), product type (food vs. cosmetic), and prior recall history (first product recall vs. second product recall) of the affected company and their influence on consumer's emotions, attitude and behavioral intentions. Data was gathered by using an online questionnaire. In total, 294 participants were randomly assigned. Remarkably, most results were in contrast with pre-assumptions and prior research. However, this research validates the importance of choosing appropriate framing regarding prior recall history. Emotional framing tends to soften negative emotions when used at a second product recall. Furthermore, the present research states that emotions and attitude towards the affected company play an important role in crisis communication. They do influence behavioral intentions such as word-of-mouth and future purchase intention. Therefore, it is very crucial for a company to attempt influencing the emotions of consumers by means of framing in order to ease the negative effect of the crisis. This needs to be taken into account when considering framing, especially regarding prior crisis history.

Key words: product recall, crisis communication, framing, product type, prior recall history, emotions, attitude, behavioral intentions

1. Introduction

A product recall is both a common crisis and crisis response which occur pervasively in today's markets. It is an activity that withdraws products from the market in order to protect consumers from further product use hazards. Product-harm crisis arises mostly from inaccurate quality controls within the production process. Product recalls are troublesome operations not only for the affected organization but also for consumers, particularly when products might cause serious damage. Recalling products provokes significant decline in firm value (Ahmed et al., 2002; Pruitt & Peterson, 1986) and brand equity (Chen et al., 2009; Thinimalai & Sinha, 2011).

The amount of product recalls has increased over the years. Presently, consumers are frequently confronted with product recalls from different industries, such as automobile, food, electronics and cosmetics. For instance, in 2013 the frozen pizza producer 'Wagner' recalled its products from the market due to discovery of small metal pieces in their frozen pizzas. In 2010, the carmaker 'Toyota' withdrew its cars from the market due to faulty gas pedals. When a product poses a potential harm to the user, consumers are likely to feel angry towards the organization which in turn might lead to negative word-of-mouth (Folkes, 1984 & 1988).

Since the time of globalization, organizations have tried to adapt themselves to fast growing markets. They want to be faster and more innovative than their global competitors. Therefore, organizations have to make quick decisions and their production process as fast and as cheap as possible in order not to lose too much time. They want to reach competitive advantage. However, an organization does not always make the right decision. Consequently, once in a while organizations are confronted with an internal crisis which sometimes cannot be avoided. A product recall is one example of an internal crisis. The main reason for a product recall to be announced is lack of safety which in turn results in risk of harm (Beamish & Bapuji, 2008; Daughety & Reinganum, 1995; Lyles et al., 2008). Lack of safety indicates that the product might potentially harm the end-user. Therefore, the product recall announcement advises the consumer not to use the recalled product anymore (Horaa et al., 2011). However, the entire procedure of a product recall creates a crisis situation for the affected organization.

An organizational crisis can be defined as "a low-probability, high-impact event that threatens the viability of the organization and is characterized by ambiguity of cause, effect, and means of resolution' (Pearson & Clair, 1998, p.60). An internal crisis occurs due to mistakes or unexpected events within the organization. As a consequence, it usually affects only that particular organization and prevents the organization from reaching its goals. An external crisis in contrast arises mainly due to environmentally based disturbance that not only affects one organization but rather entire communities (Seeger, Sellnow & Ulmer, 2003). However, an internal crisis can cause serious damage to the image of an organization. In this case, organizations have to decide how to deal with the crisis in

order to avoid negative reputation. News, whether good or bad, can be spread out very easily nowadays and affect the reputation of an organization. In particular, the Internet and the fastgrowing social media networking sites have made communication and spreading news faster.

However, appropriate crisis communication such as product recall announcements can be used to lessen the reputational damage and change consumer's negative attitude towards the affected organization (Coombs, 2007). Therefore, organizations have to decide how to approach consumers with product recall announcements in order to positively shape their perception. Message framing plays an important role in shaping consumer's conception. Yet, message framing has been only introduced recently to the field of crisis communication (Claeys & Cauberghe, 2014; Claeys, Cauberghe and Leysen, 2013). As a result, the effect of product recall message framing on consumer's emotions, attitude and behavioral intention has not been sufficiently examined yet. Therefore, the focal aim of this study is to investigate the use of message framing in the context of product recall communication.

Not only message framing shapes consumer's perceptions but also prior crisis history plays an essential role in how consumers evaluate an organization. People will become skeptical about the goodwill of the affected organization if it has already manifested several 'scandals' in form of product recalls in the past. Yet, the impact of prior crisis history on post-crisis consumers' emotion, attitude and behavioral intention has also received only little attention. Consequently, this study aims to contribute to crisis communication research by adding the impact of prior crisis history on product recall message framing. Due to demanding consumers, it is likely that the amount of product recalls will increase in the future (Dahlen & Lange, 2006; Dean, 2004). As a consequence, it is important for organizations to understand the impact of different types of product recall communication strategies.

Therefore, this present study will contribute to for the research area of crisis management in four ways. First, this research will contribute to the need in realizing more research on crisis communication (Coombs, 2007); in particular regarding product recall crisis situations. Second, the findings of this study will establish the impact of rational versus emotional product recall message framing on consumers' emotions and attitude. Third, this research will explore the impact of crisis history (first product recall vs. second product recall) on consumer post-crisis perception and behavioral intention towards the affected organization. Finally, the novelty of this study is to investigate the moderated impact of product type (food vs. cosmetic) in product recall communication on consumer perception. While many research have already examined the impact of high-involvement products such as cars and electronic products in product withdrawals, this study will approach the gap in the literature regarding low-involvement products such as food (i.e. cheese)

and daily skin care products (i.e. body wash). All three above mentioned independent variables are chosen to examine to what extent product recall communication will benefit an organization positively regarding prior crisis history and product type.

In summary, the purpose of this study is to examine how the effects of message framing of product recall communication (rational vs. emotional), prior crisis history (first product recall vs. second product recall) of the affected organization and product type (food vs. cosmetics) has an influence on: anger, sympathy, word-of-mouth, future purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness (divided into ability, benevolence and integrity) in the affected company. Thus, the two main research questions for this study are as follows:

- **RQ1**: To what extent does the effect of product recall message framing (rational vs. emotional), prior crisis history (first product recall vs. second product recall) and product type (cheese vs. body wash) influence customer's emotions (anger and sympathy), behavioral intention (word-of-mouth and future purchase intention) and attitude (ability, benevolence and integrity)?
- **RQ2**: To what extent does product type moderate the effect of either product recall framing or prior recall history on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and attitude?

In the following, the effects of the dependent variables as well as the independent variables will be discussed in more detail, emphasizing their research contribution by means of prior research and the hypotheses statements of this study. Then, the method of the 2x2x2 experiment will be elaborated, followed by the results and discussion section.

2. Impact of product recall on consumer's emotions, attitude and behavioral intention

Effective crisis management plays an important role in order to reduce negative publicity and to maintain and rebuild good reputation of an organization (Stafford et al. 2002). Spence et al. (2006) and Ulmer, Seeger and Sellnow (2007) indicated that frequent, authentic and explicit communication is the best solution to diminish uncertainty and to restore an organization's image (Coombs & Holladay, 1996). Reynolds (2002) stated in his study of crisis and emergency risk communication that an organization should be first and righteous with its communication in order to survive a crisis situation.

Previous research (e.g. Coombs and Holladay, 1996; Reynolds, 2002; Ulmer, Seeger and Sellnow, 2007) have mainly focused on how organizations should handle negative incidents in order to maintain or repair an organization's reputation. According to a number of current studies organizations have broadly two options to respond to an organizational crisis. An organization can choose whether to reveal the crisis itself or take the risk that a third party might disclose the negative information in the future (Fennis & Stroebe, 2013). However, product recalls are mainly performed voluntarily (Copeland et al., 2004; Chen et al., 2009).

Depending on the severity of the crisis, product recalls have a great impact on business operations of the affected organization. In most cases, a significant decrease in firm value can be noticed (Ahmed et al., 2002; Pruitt & Peterson, 1986). Throughout the years, the number of product recalls has increased significantly (Beamish & Bapuji,2008). Product recalls - voluntary or mandatory - have a great impact on sales and marketing activities of a company (Coleman, 2011; Mowen et al., 1981). Van Heerde et al. (2007) claim that product recalls can even affect the sales of other products of the same brand. This in turn causes financial losses on the market performance of the affected companies (Cheah et al. 2007; Chen et al. 2009). Moreover, product recalls also may have a negative effect on consumer's perception and attitude toward the company and its products (Dawar & Pillutla, 2000; Siomkos & Shrivastava, 1993). Product recalls might also lead to decreased future purchases, which in turn cause high sale losses (Cleeren et al., 2008).

Many scholars investigated the general attitude towards product recalls, while their studies revealed that product recalls do contribute to a negative impact on consumer perception (Mowen et al. 1981). Consumers experience different emotions during an organizational crisis. Some emotions have a negative effect on the reputation of the organization (Choi & Lin, 2009), while others may feel sympathy towards the organization. As a matter of fact, the degree of emotions varies depending on the relation that consumers have with the product and brand. If consumers have a deeper relation-ship with the brand, then the degree of emotions, such as anger, sadness and disappointment, evoked during a crisis, might be stronger than for consumers who occasionally use the brand.

Nabi (1999) summarized five negative emotions which individuals mainly generate in difficult situations: fear, sadness, guilt, fear and disgust. But the emotions anger and sadness play the most essential role among consumers when confronted with a crisis situation (Kim & Cameron, 2011). On the one hand, consumers who are confronted with a crisis of a product they use, will feel angry and disappointed towards the organization because the product did not meet their expectations. On the other hand, if the organization expresses sadness and apology towards the incident, consumer's anger might be reduced (Coombs, 2007).

The main concern of crisis communication is the subsequent emotional, behavioral and attitudinal reaction of consumers. Coombs and Holladay (2005) argued that a product crisis can provoke the feeling of anger and simultaneously minimize consumer's sympathy towards an organization which in turn will lead to negative word-of-mouth. Moreover, anger might damage the relation between organization and stakeholder so far that the consumer might end the relationship eventually. In order to maintain the relationship, consumers have to be likely to forgive the organization for its wrongdoing. Forgiveness can be defined as "the public effort to reduce negative thinking, overcome unpleasant emotion and restore their damaged relationship with an organization due to a crisis" (Moon & Rhee, 2013, p. 679). Research has demonstrated that people tend to forgive more willingly, if their negative feelings are minimized by appropriate crisis communication.

Another important factor which should be taken into account during crisis management is the behavioral intention of consumers. Every organization aims to sell its products and services, but the purchase intention might be decreased when the organization has to deal with a product-harm crisis. Then, consumers might avoid buying the affected product or even avoid buying products from the same brand in general due to consumer's perception of lack of product expertise (Laufer et al, 2005; Folkes, 1988).

Nevertheless, appropriate crisis communication can reduce and change the emotional response of consumers. Therefore, this study will focus on five attributes which might be influenced during product crisis communication: anger, sympathy, word-of-mouth, future purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness in the organization. Trustworthiness will be subdivided into the variables ability, benevolence and integrity.

2.1. Rational versus emotional message framing

McKay-Nesbitt et al. (2011) revealed that message framing in advertisement has a great influence on how people perceive and evaluate the content of the message. Marketing and advertising research focused mainly on the effect of emotional framing by companies (Coombs & Holladay, 2005; Geuens et al., 2011), while crisis message framing concentrated mostly on the emotions experienced by consumers (Choi & Lin, 2009; Jin, 2009). Yet, only little research has been conducted concerning the impact of message framing in crisis communication (Claeys & Cauberghe, 2014; Claeys et al., 2013). Confronting customers with emotional crisis communication might appeal to the customer's emotions and therefore enhance their perception by using subjective and emotional features because it will give the organization a human face to which people can better relate to (Stafford & Day, 1995; Yoo & MacInnis, 2005).

A different option is the use of rational crisis communication features. Rational messages present merely objective and simple information about the crisis. Yoo and MacInnis (2005) investigated that rational versus emotional advertising messages have a different impact on consumer's brand attitude. Rational messages stimulate consumers to assess the trustworthiness in the message while emotional messages trigger primarily emotions to which the receiver can relate to. Thus, emotional crisis messages focus more on genuine apologies and empathy creation for the affected victims, while rational messages tend to concentrate on facts of the product defect and its consequences. However, apology is also part of rational framing.

Yet, only very little research has been conducted on product recall communication framing (rational vs. emotional) and on how it can influence the reactions and perceptions of customers. Therefore, it is important to investigate which framing is more appropriate in product recall announcements in order to positively shape consumer's perceptions. If a company decides on apologizing, it accepts responsibility and asks for forgiveness (Benoit & Drew, 1997; Fuchs-Burnett, 2002). Since organizational crisis generates high level of anger and disappointment among the customers, the affected companies attempt to repair the reputational damage. Emotional crisis message might have an impact on the value and sincerity of the crisis communication (Choi & Lin, 2007; Kim & Cameron, 2011). This is also supported by Read (2007) who argues that considerate implementation of emotional messages may serve to protect the reputation of the organization because it tends to reveal the feeling that the company cares about its consumers.

As previously mentioned, a company might choose a frame when disclosing a product recall message to the public. Therefore, crisis managers are able to present the same content of crisis communication differently to its consumers by using contrasting frames (i.e. emotional vs. rational) which will highlight certain aspects more than others. By doing so, consumers will be intentionally manipulated to pay more attention to these emphasized clues. This might eventually have an impact on how consumers evaluate the crisis information (Druckman, 2001).

In order to guide the product recall message to a certain framing, the content can be changed by either presenting factual information in combination with numbers (i.e. number of recalled products) or by including emotional features in the form of strong verbs and adjectives (i.e. we **really** regret; we are shocked). Claeys and Cauberghe (2014) defined rational framing as objective and straightforward, giving precise information about the crisis situation. On the contrary, emotional framing is described as subjective and evaluative due to use of drama. Emotional framing emphasizes

more on the sincere and genuine regret and concern about the crisis situation than facts (Moon & Rhee, 2012). This study will be in line with these definitions of rational and emotional framing. Therefore, in this study the same content of a product recall message will be manipulated regarding both framing types. The rational product recall framing will be designed in a direct and straightforward manner from the view of a third person, without including drama and emotional features. In contrast, emotional framing will include strong adjectives that demonstrate the feelings of the affected company towards the crisis situation. However, the content of the product recall message will more or less remain the same for both framing types.

By doing so, it is expected that emotional crisis communication will have an effect on the interpretation of the crisis situation, similar to the research by Choi and Lin (2007). They investigated the influence of rational versus emotional crisis communication. Their research results indicated that emotional features led to more positive reaction from the public compared to merely rational crisis communication. According to this research, it can be assumed that using emotional messages gives the organization a more human and genuine face to which customers can better relate to. Also in real life situations, people would rather forgive others when receiving an emotional-underlined explanation of the wrongdoing compared to merely receiving rational facts. Therefore, the crisis message response may vary according to the type of communication used during the crisis.

In addition, Kim and Cameron (2011) tested the effect of emotional framing within a technicalerror incident. Results indicated that the message which was provided with a strong emotional appeal showed a positive impact on people's response towards the accident compared to rational framing. These findings can be explained due to the fact that emotional framing triggers emotions off the addressee (McKay-Nesbitt et al., 2011). It enables the company to express its feelings regarding the crisis situation and its concern for the wellbeing of the consumers. If framed correctly, receivers of the message can relate to the sorrow of the company. However, rational framing requires the receiver to evaluate the credibility of the crisis message rather than relate to the purpose of the company, because barely facts are mentioned (Yoo & MacInnis, 2005). Therefore, it is very essential for a company to carefully match the framing with a particular crisis type.

Thus, more research needs to be conducted concerning the effect of different appeals of crisis communication in combination with other moderators and variables, such as prior recall history which will be described in the following chapter. Hence, this study will first investigate the effect of emotional versus rational product recall communication.

The first set of research hypotheses is as follows:

H1a: Emotional product recall framing leads to less anger compared to rational product recall framing.

- H1b: Emotional product recall framing leads to less negative word-of-mouth compared to rational product recall framing.
- H1c: Emotional product recall framing enhances sympathy compared to rational product recall framing.
- **H1d**: Emotional product recall framing enhances future purchase intention compared to rational product recall framing.
- H1e: Emotional product recall framing enhances a more positive trustworthiness (divided into (1) ability,(2) benevolence and (3) integrity) in the company compared to rational product recall framing.

2.2. Prior crisis history

Prior crisis history plays an essential role in crisis management. Turk, Jin and Stewart (2012) stated that how people consider an organization's reputation prior, during and after a crisis depends mostly on how appropriately an organization deals with crisis communication. Combs (2006) determined prior crisis history as consistency: whether the affected organization has already been confronted with similar crises in the past. If the consistency (crisis history) is high, then it means that the organization is constantly confronted with crisis incidents. Positive prior crisis history (no prior crisis) can be regarded as product expertise. However, a negative prior crisis history might underline the instability of producing good products. Several research conform with this assumption: an organization with good prior crisis history will undergo less damage from negative attention compared to an organization that has been affected by several product recalls already. Even the Situational Crisis Communication Theory by Coombs (2007) includes crisis history as important factor to analyze the crisis response consequences such as attitude, emotion and behavioral intention.

Although, it is rather difficult to shift negative publicity (Sims, 2009), it has shown that a crisis is not considered as that bad if the affected organization owns 'a reservoir of goodwill' which includes product expertise (Tucker & Melewar, 2005). Prior research has indicated that good crisis history (no crisis at all) serves organizations as a safeguard during primary crisis situations and helps to lessen damages of negative associations concerning brand equity and crisis responsibility for unsafe products (Dawar & Pillutla, 2000; Grunwald & Hempelmann, 2010). Suls and Martin (2005) claimed that negative consumer associations due to previous product recalls can be transferred to future actions of the organization. Research regarding car brands showed that brands which experienced fewer product recalls were less affected by the consumer's negative associations to prior product recalls compared to car brands which were hit by several product recalls (Wynne et al. 1976).

According to the dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) people are likely to reduce experienced inconsistency (dissonance) while taking into consideration earlier information which tends to have a

stronger effect on people's perception. Consumers tend to anticipate consistency in their beliefs about an organization and will be skeptical of series of crisis situations. However, if an organization is affected by a crisis for the first time, people might tend to ignore the intensity of the initial crisis. Thus, it is assumed that favorable prior recall history mitigates the impact of a product recall. According to prior research, the following hypotheses have been established:

- **H2a**: A favorable prior crisis history (first product recall) leads to less anger compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product recall).
- **H2b**: A favorable prior crisis history (first product recall) leads to less negative word-of-mouth compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product recall).
- **H2c:** A favorable crisis history (first product recall) enhances sympathy compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product recall).
- **H2d:** A favorable crisis history (first product recall) enhances future purchase intention compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product crisis).
- H2e: A favorable crisis history (first product recall) enhances more positive consumer trustworthiness in the organization (divided into (1) ability, (2) benevolence and (3) integrity) compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product crisis).

Prior recall history plays an important role in product recall communication (Turk, Jin & Stewart, 2012). Since the combined effect of message framing and prior recall history has not been researched yet, no significant evidence is available yet. However, this study will fill in the gap in the literature. Therefore, it is assumed that the impact of emotional and rational framing depends on the prior product recall history of a company. As previously mentioned, emotional framing implies subjective features, mostly accompanied with a deep apology, while rational framing merely involves objective features with a simple apology. However, in combination with prior recall history, framing might have an impact on consumer's perception regarding the crisis situation and brand equity. For instance, it is assumed that a company who already experienced a product recall will use an emotional framing for its product recall. Hearing about a second product recall by the same company, it might evoke negative emotions to the consumers. In order to ease the damage, it is expected that the company uses an emotional framing, expressing regret and deep feelings towards the crisis situation. Consequently, the company would be perceived as more genuine and humane and consumers might tend to forgive the company.

However, if the company has experienced a product recall crisis for the first time, it might not be necessary to confront them with emotional framing. Rather, it is expected that in a first time product recall a rational crisis communication approach would be more appropriate. Since no prior negative thoughts concerning product recalls are associated with the company, it would be sufficient to present the product crisis in a rational manner with important facts and a simple apology. To sum up, the hypotheses for the interaction between message framing and prior recall history are presented in the following:

- H3: If the company uses rational framing at the first product recall, it leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to using emotional framing for the first product recall.
- H4: If the company uses emotional framing at the second product recall, it leads to less (a) anger and(b) negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to using rational framing for the second product recall.

2.3. Product Type

Crisis management in the food and cosmetic industry is a very critical procedure. A product crisis in the food and cosmetic industry can range from the discovery of foreign bodies in products to bacterial or chemical contamination (Wilcock et al. 2004). Being confronted with such a crisis exposes the organization to have failed to provide its consumers with quality assurance. This can be fatal for both food and cosmetic producers.

Simple cosmetic products (i.e. body wash) and food (i.e. cheese) can be considered as lowinvolvement products. Low-involvement products are products that are bought frequently without involving long purchase decision making, while high involvement products do require a long purchase decision process. Kihlblom and Persson (2014) confirmed that it is not clear in literature whether cheese is defined as low- or high involvement product. However, due to the consumer's low effort in choosing the product, cheese has already been categorized as low-involvement product in several previous studies (Kihlblom & Persson, 2014; Veale, Quester &Karunaratna,2006). Accordingly, cheese will be considered as low-involvement product as well in this present study.

When considering the food market, it has to be taken into account that food consumption might have immediate impact on human health if the product is very harmful to the consumer (Ferencic & Wölfling, 2015). Ferencic and Wölfing (2015) state that brand loyalty for food products are difficult to maintain if the product quality does not meet the expectations of food quality standards. Their study showed that the central principles to be loyal to a particular food brand are high quality of the products and positive brand experience. Therefore, it is very important for food manufacturers to maintain high quality standards and prevent any product crisis.

However, in case a food manufacturer has been affected by a product crisis, the most probable action would be to withdraw the product immediately from the market. Food (i.e. cheese) is

something that consumers directly ingest which in turn can cause serious infections if it is contaminated with bacteria or other infectious germs (Kumar & Budin, 2006). Consequently, when consumers are faced with food quality issues, they might be anxious and concerned how it will influence their health. At the worst, consumers might stop buying products from the affected brand.

Results from the study by Ferencic and Wölfling (2015) indicated that product recalls in the food industry have negative effect on the purchase intention during the crisis as well as a considerable period afterwards. Hence, inconsistency in food quality has an unfavorable impact on brand loyalty on a long-term basis. Nevertheless, survey results showed that 62% of consumers would return to the affected food brand if they were sure that the irregularity has been removed (Ferencic & Wölfling, 2015). However, additional research is needed in the research field of food product recalls for getting a deeper understanding of the impact on consumer attitude and behavioral intention.

There is still a gap in the literature regarding cosmetic product recalls. Cosmetics are usually applied on the skin and do not directly enter the body, but might cause also serious skin irritations if non-appropriate ingredients are used. Therefore, consumer reaction and emotions might be stronger compared to products which do not have direct contact with the consumer. Food and cosmetics are both products that involve body contact. Food is directly ingested while cosmetic products are directly applied on the skin. Both can cause serious damage to the consumer if the products are contaminated with unsuitable ingredients. Since food goes inside the body, it is assumed that food product recalls will have a more negative effect on consumer's emotions, attitude and behavioral intention compared to cosmetic products. Due to this assumption, the following hypotheses will be investigated in this study:

H5a: A food product recall increases anger more compared to a cosmetic product recall.

H5b: A food product recall increases negative word-of-mouth more compared to a cosmetic product recall

H5c: A food product recall reduces sympathy compared to a cosmetic product recall.

H5d: A food product recall reduces future purchase intention compared to a cosmetic product recall.H5e: A food product recall reduces consumer's trustworthiness in the organization, sub-divided into

(1) ability, (2) benevolence and (3) integrity, compared to a cosmetic product recall.

So far, no research has been conducted regarding the interaction between product recall framing and product type. But it can be expected that the impact of emotional and rational framing on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and attitude can differ with different product types. On the one hand, food is a product that goes directly into the body while consuming it. Therefore, being affected by a food crisis, consumer might suffer serious damage. On the other hand, cosmetic products are mainly applied on the skin, which also might directly affect consumer's health. Therefore, both a food and cosmetic product recall can be considered as crises that might result in serious health conditions for consumers.

Thus, a food and cosmetic crisis manager has to thoroughly think about the product recall framing that it wants to use in order to ease the crisis situation and reduce consumers' anger and disappointment towards the affected company. Regarding the fact that food is directly ingested, it will have a deeper involvement and impact with the consumer's body. Therefore, it is expected that the company should use an emotional message framing for the food product recall due to the immediate involvement the consumer will have with the product. While using the emotional framing, companies can attempt to demonstrate its feeling about the crisis and try to convince consumers to remain using the brand by transmitting them their sincere concern about the consumers.

Although, cosmetics also involve a direct application on the consumer's body, it does not immediately enter into the inner body parts. It is rather applied on the skin and mostly affects the consumer when used on a long term. In most cases, the consumer does not even notice the damage immediately after using it compared to a food product crisis. Therefore, it is hypothesized that a rational message framing is more appropriate for a cosmetic product recall. Since the potential severity of the crisis might not be directly noticed by consumers, companies can rather mention important information and facts concerning the product crisis rather than overstate the crisis situation with an emotional framing. Using emotional framing for a product recall might have the opposite effect of worrying the consumers even more.

In the following, the two hypotheses for the product type and message framing are presented: **H6**: If the company recalls a food product, an emotional framing leads to less (a) anger and (b)

negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthines in the company compared to an emotional framing when recalling a cosmetic product.

H7: If the company recalls a cosmetic product, a rational framing leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to rational framing while recalling a food product.

Research by several authors (Dawar & Pillutla, 2000; Grunwald & Hempelmann, 2010), has shown that a favorable prior recall history, that is no prior crisis history, reduces anger and negative associations towards the affected company. Moreover, a company that already has experienced a similar crisis will receive negative associations from consumers, which in turn will affect future actions of the company (Suls & Martin, 2005). Therefore, it is expected that any company that experience a product recall for the first time, will be less harmed than a company that already has

experienced a product recall. Therefore, it might be considered that a company, recalling any type of product for the first time will be regarded more favorable by consumers than when recalling these products for the second time. However, as mentioned above, food is a product that is ingested directly into the body. Hence, a consumer might get angrier at and more disappointed with a food company than with a cosmetic company that recalls its products for the second time. In most cases, consuming an unsound food product will immediately cause serious harm to the consumer while a cosmetic product in most cases causes harm when used on a longer period. Therefore, consumers might be skeptical and avoid food products from a company that have been recalled for the second time compared to cosmetic products.

Thus, the hypotheses for the interaction between product type and prior recall history are as follows:

- H8 : If the company recalls body wash for the first time, it leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to recalling cheese for the first time.
- H9: If the company recalls body wash for the second time, it leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to recalling cheese for the second time.

In addition, there has been no research conducted that tested a three-way interaction effect between message framing, prior product recall history and product type. Consequently, a research question concerning the three-way interaction is created.

RQ3: To what extent does emotional framing as compared to rational framing impact customer's emotions (anger and sympathy), behavioral intentions (word-of-mouth and future purchase intention) and attitude (ability, benevolence and integrity) for a first or second food and cosmetic product recall?

In Figure 1 the research model for the 2x2x2 experiment is shown:



Figure 1: Theoretical framework

2.4. Influence of emotions and attitude on behavioral intention

Taking the eight dependent variables into account, it can be assumed that consumer's emotions and attitude might also have an influence on behavioral intention. In this present study, anger and sympathy can be categorized as emotions, while purchase intention and word-of-mouth as behavioral intentions. The three variables ability, benevolence and integrity for trustworthiness can be merged in specific terms. Competence-based (ability) and character-based trustworthiness (benevolence and integrity) can be therefore classified as consumer's attitude towards the affected company.

Several research have already indicated that behavioral intentions can be predicted by emotions and attitude. Zhao et al. (2014) argued in their study that attitudes strongly influence future purchase intentions. People who have a positive attitude towards an issue, are willing to show purchasing behavior. Moreover, attitude is positively related to word-of-mouth (Martin and Lueg, 2013). If consumers trust a company and in its actions, they will as a matter of course recommend it to others and praise its actions. The opposite might occur when consumers perceive a company as untrustworthy.

On the one hand, if a company is hit by a crisis which consumers regard as preventable, negative emotions such as anger and disappointment might arise that in turn will lead to a higher negative word-of-mouth intention (Chang et al., 2015). On the other hand, consumers who have a positive attitude towards a company are likely to talk positively about that particular organization with others (Walsh et al., 2009). According to Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), people engage in negative word-of-mouth mainly with the aim to help others and prevent them from wrong decisions. Another reason is to just share their anger with fellow men (Sundaram, Mitra & Webster, 1998). Thus, negative attitude as well as unfavorable opinions about a company decrease future purchase intentions (Duan, Gu & Whinston, 2008).

It is not only attitude that influences behavioral intentions, but also emotions felt by consumers can have a tremendous impact on future purchase intentions and word-of-mouth. In fact, consumer's positive (i.e. sympathy) or negative (i.e. anger) emotional reaction towards a topic or company will either intensify or diminish satisfaction that eventually influences future intentions (Han & Jeong, 2013). As a matter of course, negative emotions such as regret, anger and disappointment will lower purchase intention and promote unfavorable word-of-mouth (Coombs & Holladay, 2007; Folkes et al., 1987; Soscia, 2007; Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004). For the positive emotion sympathy it is expected to increase future purchase intention and positive word-of-mouth.

3. Method of Data Gathering

As Figure 1 indicates, a 2 (rational vs. emotional crisis communication) x 2 (product type: food vs. cosmetics) x 2 (prior recall history: first product crisis vs. second product crisis) between-subjects factorial design was conducted to answer the research questions and whether to support or reject the hypotheses. It is assumed that the effect of product recall framing and prior product recall history of the organization on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the affected company is moderated by the variable product type (cheese vs. body wash).

The dependent variables consist of anger, sympathy, word-of-mouth, future purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness in the organization. Furthermore, relevant covariates such as credibility of the message, product involvement, health concern and knowledge of the consequences of the crisis were taken into account in this research. In this method section, the design and procedure of the 2x2x2 experiment, the participants who took part in this experiment, the measures including scales and reliabilities, the results of the pre-test of this experiment and the manipulation checks of the main study will be presented in the following.

3.1. Procedure

In this section the procedure of the experiment is described in more detail. In total, eight fictitious scenarios concerning a product recall were created to manipulate message framing (rational vs. emotional product recall communication), product type crisis (cheese vs. body wash) and prior product recall history (first product recall vs. second product recall). All scenarios dealt with two fictitious brands in order to avoid pre-reputational image by existing brands. Four scenarios covered the fictitious cheese brand 'Hollandkaas', while four scenarios were represented by the body wash brand 'FreshUp'. The scenarios discussed a voluntary product recall, published on a famous Dutch online news channel (Nu.nl).

As described above, two product types were approached in this study: food and cosmetics. The product type food was limited to cheese, because it is an important food component in the Netherlands, where this study was conducted. As cosmetic product a body wash brand has been chosen, because this product is used by the majority of people on a daily basis. The cheese product was manipulated to be contaminated with morbific bacteria which have caused foodborne disease. The body wash was manipulated to contain harmful chemicals which have caused skin irritations.

Furthermore, the crisis communication was manipulated to be either rational or emotional. The prior reputation was manipulated either as first experienced product recall or already second product recall.

For each product type two scenarios were manipulated to contain rational product recall communication in combination with information of either a first product recall or second product recall. The rational framing included facts about the product crisis, the immediate withdrawal of products from the market, accompanied with a short apology. The other two scenarios for each product type remained the same, except that rational crisis communication was replaced by emotional crisis communication. The emotional framing contained facts about the product crisis in combination with a deep and genuine apology and display of emotional features by the affected organization. Each scenario was accompanied with a questionnaire which had the goal to collect answers for the manipulation checks, measures of the dependent variables, covariates and sociodemographical variables.

All scenarios were distributed by means of an online questionnaire which was created by the tool 'Qualtrics'. An overview of the questionnaire and all eight scenarios are presented in the Appendix. Potential respondents for the online experiment were approached via e-mail and Social Media. Additionally, participants were also approached personally while handing them out printed versions of the questionnaire. Each participant was presented randomly to one of the eight scenarios. The experiment was conducted in Dutch. The aim was to only approach Dutch people in order to keep the cultural background of the participants homogenous.

3.2. Pre-Test

In this section the results of the pre-test will be described. Before starting distributing the main questionnaire, it was essential to find out if the eight scenarios could be found credible enough and if the manipulations could be correctly perceived. Thus, the main focus of the pre-test results lied on the comprehension of the articles, especially regarding product type, product recall framing and prior crisis history. In order to do a manipulation check, a t-test was conducted.

In total, 14 participants were targeted within the pre-test, who were asked to fill in two questionnaires which in turn resulted in 28 completed questionnaires. Each respondent filled in two questionnaires with the same framing (either rational or emotional), but different content of the independent variables of product type and prior crisis history. By doing so, it was avoided that participants could compare rational and emotional message framing and therefore could indicate more easily which framing was used. The main goal was to identify if each framing type could be perceived correctly during the pre-test, since the construct framing plays an important role in this study. The participants voluntarily participated in this pre-test.

The majority of participants was able to match the manipulations correctly to the scenarios. The respondents correctly indicated which product type (either cheese or body wash) has been recalled. When the company recalled cheese, the participants significantly stated that cheese was recalled (M=4.75, SD=0.45) compared to that body wash was recalled (M=1.07, SD= 0.26) with t= 26.652 and p<.001. When the company recalled body wash, participants also significantly indicated that body

wash was recalled (M=4.93, SD= 0.26) compared to that cheese was recalled (M= 1.15, SD= 0.38) with t= -31.386 and p<.001.

In the case when the article referred to a first product recall, participants significantly detected that it was a first time product recall (M= 4.13, SD= 1.15) compared to a second time product recall (M= 2.25, SD= 1.14) with t= 4.294 and p<.001. When it was a second time product recall, the majority of participants indicated that it was a second time product recall (M=2.67, SD= 0.79) compared to a first time product recall (M= 1.69, SD= 1.23) with t= -2.559 and p<.017. Since the prior recall history was not significantly clear to everyone, the indication of the recall history has been made clearer in the main study.

Concerning the product recall framing (either rational or emotional) it showed that out of 14 responses for the rational framing, 12 indicated that they perceived the product recall message as rational. 9 out of 14 participants for the emotional framing stated correctly that the company used an emotional framing for its product recall. This indicates that the majority of participants did perceive the framing correctly. To make it even clearer both product recall framings have been slightly amended for the main study. Since good results could be obtained during the pre-test, only little changes have been made for the main study. In addition, all constructs were found to be reliable, because the values of Cronbach's alpha were relatively high (above 0.7).

3.3. Participants

Participants for this research were mainly approached through the personal network via email and Social Media and a university platform called SONA Systems. Simultaneously, participants were approached personally at university with printed versions of the questionnaire. In total, 416 surveys have been collected within the main study, from which 334 remained after cleaning the data set. However, for this study it was aimed to merely approach Dutch people, therefore all 'foreigners' were also deleted from the research data. Eventually 294 participants were included into the main research analysis, from which 182 are female and 112 male. Participants were approached within a 5 week period. A variety of age groups, ranging from 18 to 65, has been reached during the data collection. However, the majority of the participants (84.7%) belongs to the age group 18-26. Furthermore, most of the participants (89.6%) are highly educated and originate from the Dutch province Overijssel (70.1%). Detailed information can be retrieved from the table (Figure2) below.

		n	
Gender	Male	112	
	Female	182	
Education	Наvo	5	
	Vmbo	19	
	Intermediate vocational education	6	
	Professional vocational education	62	
	Tertiary education (university)	201	
Province	Groningen	3	
	Friesland	14	
	Drenthe	3	
	Overijssel	206	
	Flevoland	2	
	Gelderland	36	
	Utrecht	12	
	Noord-Holland	10	
	Zuid-Holland	3	
	Noord-Brabant	1	
	Limburg	4	
	I am not from the Netherlands	40	

Figure 2: Participants divided by gender, education and province

As already mentioned previously, the research design contained eight experimental conditions, which were randomly assigned to participants. The distribution of conditions can be seen in table 3.

		1st product recall	2nd product recall	Total
Cheese	Rational framing	40	36	150
	Emotional framing	35	39	
Body wash	Rational framing	39	32	
				145
	Emotional framing	35	39	
Total		149	146	295

Figure 3: Distribution of experimental conditions

3.4. Measures

After having gathered the data, a principle component analysis (PCA) was performed to identify components for the dependent variables and covariates. An orthogonal rotation (Varimax) for 47 items was conducted. The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer Olkin) measure was .83 which suggested that the sample was factorable. Loadings less than .50 were excluded in the PCA. The analysis categorized the 47 items into 13 components. However, not all items were classified according to the nine pre-formed constructs for the covariates and dependent variables (credibility, health concern, product involvement, knowledge of consequences, anger, sympathy, future purchase intention, word-of-mouth and trustworthiness). The results of the principle component analysis are shown in Table 4. In the following, each component will be described in more detail, mainly focusing on the items used for the scales included in the analysis and their Cronbach's alpha scores.

The first four components are composed by the measures for the covariates, including credibility of the message ("reliable – not reliable", "serious – not serious" and "credible – not credible"), health concern ("I find my health important.", "I highly value my health" and "I am aware of my health"), product involvement ("I use this kind of product often.", "I use this kind of product daily." and "This kind of product is an important part of my lifestyle") and knowledge of consequences of the impact of crisis ("I am aware of the consequences if I use products with harmful substances", "I know that harmful ingredients are not good for my health" and "A product with harmful substances can endanger my health"). These covariates were chosen to see if the participants would tend to be more affected by the crisis when taking these items into account. For instance, if participants do not find the crisis message credible, are not interested in maintaining a good health or do not use products such as cheese or body wash on a regular basis, then it is more likely that they will not perceive the crisis as serious or will not be concerned about the crisis situation and in turn might not show intensive emotions towards the crisis situation.

The credibility component was retrieved from Qiu, Pang & Lim (2012) and measured by a two item bipolar scale. The value of Cronbach's alpha for this construct is .82, which shows a high reliability. The other covariates were measured by a five-point Likert scale. Cronbach's alpha of the components health concern ($\alpha = 0.80$) and product involvement ($\alpha = 0.89$) can also be regarded as highly reliable. However, the component knowledge of consequences shows a quite poor reliability ($\alpha = 0.60$). In order to achieve a higher reliability of .84 the item "I am aware of the consequences if I use product with harmful ingredients" was deleted. This item was also not correctly categorized within the PCA analysis. It was classified as 'stand-alone' component.

In addition to the covariates, the independent variables were also measured by a five-point Likert scale. Two of the dependent variables were anger and sympathy. In order to measure the emotions

participants experience towards the crisis situation, each of the two components contained four items which were adopted from McDonald, Sparks & Glenden (2010). With a Conbrach's alpha of .85 for anger and .77 for sympathy, these components were found to be reliable. Furthermore, future purchase intention was measured by six items, retrieved from Chaudhuri & Holbrook (2001). This construct shows a quite poor reliability of .60. Therefore, the item "Due to the product recall, I will choose for another brand" was deleted in order to obtain a higher score for Cronbach's alpha (α =0.88). Another component measured if participants would talk favorably or unfavorably about the brand after hearing about the crisis situation. Thus, the word-of-mouth construct was measured by six items. With a Conbrach's alpha of .70 it showed a marginal reliability. However, the deletion of items did not ensure a higher reliability. Within the PCA analysis, the word-of-mouth construct was divided into two separate components: namely into negative and positive word-of-mouth.

The last construct forms the measure of consumer's trustworthiness in the company, which is divided into three sub-constructs: ability, benevolence and integrity. These items are adopted from Mayer & Davis (1999). All three sub-constructs show a quite high reliability with .91 for the construct ability, .83 for the construct benevolence and a marginal reliability of .70 for the construct integrity. However, the PCA analysis did not clearly identify three separate components for the construct trustworthiness. While the items for ability are well-classified, the items for benevolence and integrity are not clearly separated. The positive-phrased items build one component, whereas the reversed (negative-phrased) items of both constructs compose another component. Taken these outcomes into account, the items for trustworthiness can be also merged in two categories for further research: competence-based (ability) and character-based trustworthiness (benevolence & integrity). However, since all three sub-constructs belong to the main construct of trustworthiness, the uneven division of components for this construct does not play a major role.

3.5. Manipulation Check Main Study

In this section the results for the manipulation checks of the main study will be discussed. The construct of the manipulation check was measured by 7 items; two items for product type ("The company recalls cheese.", "The company recalls body wash."), three items for product recall framing ("rational vs. emotional", "formal vs. informal", "objective vs. subjective") adopted from Choi & Lin (2007) and two items for prior product recall history ("It is the first time that the company has to recall products", "It is the second time that the company has to recall products").

In order to perform a manipulation check, a t-test was conducted. For the items concerning the product recall framing no t-test was necessary, because the measures were obtained by a bipolar scale, where the participant could either choose between "emotional" and "rational".

		Component										
Construct	Item	1 2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10	11	. 12	13
Credibility	Reliable / Not reliable							,831				
	Serious / Not serious							,809				
	Credible / Not credible							,842				
Health Concern	I find my health important.								,800			
	I highly value my health.								,875			
	I am aware of my health.								,766			
Product Involvement	I use this kind of product often.					,893						
	I use this kind of product daily.					,904						
	This kind of product is an important part in my lifestyle.					,872						
Knowledge of Consequences	I am aware of the consequences if I use products with harmful substances.											,845
<u>.</u>	I know that harmful ingredients are not good for my health.										,86	5
	I know that harmful substances can endanger my health.										,87	2
Anger	I am angry at the company.			,534								
-	l am outraged.			,785								
	I am very disappointed.			,831								
	I am annoyed.			,768								
Sympathy	I feel sympathy.						,710					
	l am sad.						,586					
	I have compassion.						,832					
	I feel empathy.						,808,					
Future Purchase Intention	I would continue buying products from this brand.		,670									
	Due to the product recall, I would choose for another brand.											
	I will not buy any product from this brand.		,815									
	I would still buy different products from the company.		,784									
	I will not buy any product from this company.		,778									
Negative Word of Mouth	I would talk negatively about the brand.									,6	75	
	I would warn my family and friends about the product.									,6	73	
	I would complain about the product.									,7,	29	
Positive Word of Mouth	I would talk positively about the brand.*				,849							
	I would advise the brand to my family and friends.*				,878,							
	I would recommend the product to others.*				,789							
Ability	The company is well-qualified to perform its job.	,752										
	I trust the abilities of the company.	,766										
	The company is very capable of performing its job.	,818										
	The company is not well-qualified.*	,794										
	The company is unprofessional in what it is doing.*	,737										
Benevolence	The company is very concerned of my welfare.	,670										
	My needs are very important to the company.	,750										
	The company does everything in order not to harm me.	,741										
	The company dies everything to help me.	,751										
	The company does not do its best to help me.*								,55			
	The company does not look out what is important to me.*								,60	2		
ntegrity	The company has a strong sense of justice.	,591										
	I can be sure about that the company will always stick to its word.											
	Sound principles seem to guide the company.									_		
	The behavior and the actions of the company are inconsistent.*								,54			
	The company does not its best to treat others fairly.*								,71	5		

When participants have not indicated the correct framing, their questionnaires were directly deleted from the data collection. The reason for this procedure was to ensure that the participant perfectly understood the framing in order to obtain reliable results regarding the framing manipulation. In total, 416 surveys have been collected, from which 294 remained after cleaning the data and excluding the non-Dutch population. However, about 82 participants indicated the wrong framing. The reason for the high amount of wrong framing indication will be discussed in the later state within the limitation section.

For the other two manipulations a t-test has been conducted. The results show a significant difference in both manipulation constructs. When cheese was recalled, the participants significantly noticed that cheese was the recall product (M=4.46m SD=0.73) compared to that body wash was recalled (M=1.38, SD=0.77) with t=39.683 and p<.001. When the recall product was body wash, participants significantly stated that body wash was recalled (M=4.59, SD=0.68) compared to that cheese was recalled (M=1.31, SD=0.69) with t=-41.132 and p<.001.

When the article indicated a first product recall, participants significantly indicated that it was the first time that the company recalled products (M=4.17, SD=0.93) compared to that the company recalled products for the second time (M=1.69, SD=0.94) with t=22.715 and p<.001. When the article indicated that it was the second time for the company to recall products, participants significantly stated that is was the second product recall (M=4.36, SD=0.90) compared to that is was the first time (M=1.78, SD=0.84) with t= -24.956 and p<.001.

In summary, it can be observed that the manipulation checks in the main study were successful.

4. Results

In this section, the main results of this study will be described. First, the main effects will be mentioned. Afterwards the focus will be brought to the interaction effects. As already mentioned above the three independent variables are product type, framing and recall history. The dependent variables for this research are anger, sympathy, word-of-mouth, purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness in the company (divided into the constructs ability, benevolence and integrity). Moreover, three covariates were included: health concern, product involvement and knowledge of consequences.

A MANOVA and MANCOVA analysis by means of SPSS was conducted in order to test the above mentioned hypotheses. These analyses allow us to compare the outcomes of two groups on various dependent variables. The MANCOVA analysis contains the measures including the covariates. However, no mayor significant difference could be found when including the covariates. Therefore, only the results of the MANOVA analysis are included in the following section. Finally, a regression analysis was performed to test the influence of emotions and consumers' attitude on behavioral intention.

4.1. Main effects for framing

The MANOVA analysis without including the covariates demonstrates a significant effect for framing on word-of-mouth (F(8,279) =4.46, p=.04)). From this result it can be concluded that participants are willing to talk more negatively when they are confronted with an emotional framing (M=3.52, SD=.43) than when they are confronted with a rational framing (M=3.39, SD=.43). There are no significant main effects for framing on other dependent variables. Consequently, hypothesis 1b is not supported. Hypothesis 1b stated that emotional framing leads to less bad word-of-mouth compared to rational framing. However, the results are in contrast to hypothesis 1b. Since no other significant main effects were found for message framing, also hypothesis 1a, 1c, 1d and 1e are not supported.

4.2. Main effects for recall history

For the independent variable recall history several main effects were found. The MANOVA analysis shows a significant main effect on anger (F(8,279) = 4.75, p=.03)), purchase intention (F(8,279) = 15.96, p=.00)), word-of-mouth (F(8, 279) = 10.31, p=.01)), and ability (F(8,279) = 18.53, p=.00)). For recall history a marginally significant main effect is found on benevolence (F(8,279) = 2.99, p=.09). These results indicate that participants were more angry when the company recalled a product for the second time (M=2.49, SD=.66) than when the company recalled products for the first

time (M=2.29, SD=.64). Furthermore, the future purchase intention was higher when the company had experienced a product recall for the first time (M=3.36, SD=.51) than when it experienced a product recall for the second time (M=3.07, SD=.52), while they are willing to talk more negatively in the second product recall condition (M=3.56, SD=.43) compared to the first product recall condition (M=3.36, SD=.42). In addition, competence-based trustworthiness in the company in form of the construct ability was perceived higher in the first product recall condition (M=3.16, SD=.56) compared to the second product recall condition (M=2.81, SD=.58), same applies for character-based trustworthiness in the company. Benevolence was perceived higher in the first product recall (M=3.29, SD=.50) compared to the second product recall product recall condition (M=3.17, SD=.52). Thus, these results support hypotheses 2a, 2b, 2d, 2e (1) and 2e (2). Hypotheses 2c and 2e (3) were not supported because no significant main effects were found.

4.3. Main effects for product type

The MANOVA analysis for product type shows several significant main effects. There is a significant main effect for product type on anger (F(1,279 = 3.93, p=.05)), purchase intention (F(1,279=4.81, p=.03)), word-of-mouth (F(1,279=4.21, p=.04)) and on the construct ability (F(1,279=19.02, p=.00)). The results indicate that participants felt more anger when they were confronted with a cosmetic product recall (M=2.48, SD=.66) than when they were confronted with a food product recall (M=2.30, SD=.65). Furthermore, participant's behavioral intentions were significantly affected by the product type. This means that the future purchase intention was higher when cheese was recalled (M=3.30, SD=.51) than when body wash was recalled (M=3.14, SD=.52). Regarding word-of-mouth, participants would tend to talk more negatively when body wash was recalled (M=3.52, SD=.43) than when cheese was recalled (M=3.40, SD=.42). In addition, the ability of the company was perceived higher when cheese was recalled (M=3.16, SD=.56) than when body wash was recalled (M=2.81, SD=.57).

Taken these results into account, it means that hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d and 5e are not supported. It was argued that a food product recall will increase anger, word-of-mouth and reduce future purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness in the organization compared to a cosmetic product recall. However, the results of this research demonstrate the opposite.

4.4. Interaction effects between framing and recall history

The MANOVA analysis shows only a marginally significant interaction effect between framing and recall history on sympathy (F(8,279) = 6.77, p=.08)). This means that participants felt more sympathy towards the company when a rational framing was used for a first product recall (M=2.69, SD= .82) than used for a second product recall (M=2.57, SD=.87). Also, participants felt more sympathy in the second product recall condition when emotional framing was used (M=2.82, SD=.84) than in the first

product recall condition (M=2.63, SD=.87). No interaction effects were for found for anger (F(8,279)=.02, p=.96)), purchase intention(F(8,279)=.99,p=.32)),word-of-mouth (F(8,279)=.46,p=.50)), ability (F(8,279)=.29,p=.60)), benevolence (F(8,279)=1.52, p=.22)) and integrity (F(8,279)=.16, p=.69)).

As a follow-up analysis, a simple main effect analysis was performed. The results show that framing in general was significant for the second product recall condition (F(8,279) =2.89, p=.04)), but not for the first product recall condition (F(8,279) =0.84, p=.56)). Sympathy towards the company was higher among the participants when emotional framing (M=2.82, SD=.84) was used in the second recall condition than when rational framing (M=2.57, SD=.89) was used in the second product recall condition. Consequently, only hypothesis 4c is supported which stated that emotional framing at a second product recall enhances sympathy compared to using emotional framing for the first product recall. Since no other significant interaction effects between framing and recall history were found on the other dependent variables, hypotheses 3 and 4a, b, d and e are not supported.





4.5. Interaction effects between framing and product type

The MANOVA analysis indicates that there is no statistically significant interaction effect between product type and framing (F(8,279)=1.51, **p=.15**)). Consequently, no interaction effects between product type and framing could be found. Thus, hypotheses 6 and 7 are not supported.

4.6. Interaction effects between prior recall history and product type

The MANOVA analysis indicates a significant interaction effect between product type and recall history on ability (F(8,279)=6.77, p=.01)). This result shows that participants perceive the ability of the company higher when a food product is recalled for the first time (M=3.23, SD=.78) than when it

was recalled for the second time (M=3.10, SD=.81). Furthermore, participants perceive the ability of the company also higher when a cosmetic product is recalled for the first time (M=3.09, SD=.81) than when it was recalled for the second time (M=2.53, SD=.82). There was no significant interaction effect on anger (F(8,279)=2.56, p=.11)), sympathy (F(8,279)=.96, p=.33)), purchase intention (F(8,279) = .08, p=.77)), benevolence (F(8,279) = .11, p=.75)) and integrity (F(8,279) = 1.80, p=.17)).

Having found a significant interaction effect between product type and recall history on ability, a follow-up analysis has been performed in order to explain the interaction. The results from the simple effect analysis show that product type was significant for the second product recall condition (F(8,279)=5.44, p=.00)), but not for the first product recall condition (F(8,279)=0.79, p=.61)). It means that the ability of the company was perceived higher when cheese (M=3.10, SD=.81) was recalled for the second time compared to when body wash (M=2.53, SD= .82) was recalled for the second time. These results are in contrast with hypothesis 8e(1) which stated that recalling body wash for the second will lead to a more positive trustworthiness in the company compared to recalling cheese for the second time. Therefore, taking this result into account and having not found other significant interaction effect between product type and recall history, hypotheses 8 and 9 are not supported.



Figure 5: Graph for interaction effect between product type and recall history on ability.

4.7. Three-way interaction effects

The MANOVA analysis indicates a three-way interaction effect between framing, recall history and product type for the dependent variable word-of-mouth (F(8,279)=4.90, p=.03)). This result represents that participants who were confronted with a rational product recall framing, are willing to talk more negatively about the company when the food product was recalled for the second time (M=3.51, SD=.87) than when it was recalled for the first time (M=3.26, SD=.80). It also means that when being confronted with an emotional product recall framing, participants are willing to talk more negatively about the company when a food product was recalled for the second time (M= 3.44, SD=.85) than when it was recalled for the first time (M=3.37, SD=.86). In addition to that the results indicate that participants are willing to talk more negatively about the company when they are confronted with a rational product recall framing in a second time cosmetic product recall (M=3.43, SD=.91) than in a first time cosmetic product recall (M=3.37, SD=.84). Furthermore, the three-way interaction effect for word-of-mouth shows that participants are willing to talk more negatively about the company when they are confronted with an emotional product recall framing in a second time cosmetic product recall (M=3.84, SD=.83) than in a first time cosmetic product recall (M= 3.44, SD=.87). There was no three-way interaction effect found for the other dependent variables. When including the three covariates, there was also only a three-way interaction effect found for word-of-mouth (F(8,275)=4.78, p=.03)).

The follow-up analysis by means of the simple main effect analysis indicated that the first product recall condition was only significant for the product type body wash (F(8,279) =5.71, p=.00)). Product type body wash was significant for rational (F(8,279)=2.31,p=.02)) and emotional framing (F(8,279) =4.99, p=.00)). Moreover, second product recall condition was significant for rational (F(8,279)= 2.07, p=.04)) and emotional framing (F(8,279)= 7.16, p= .00)). Thus, when body wash was recalled for the second time, negative word-of-mouth was higher when emotional framing was used (M=3.84, SD=.93) than when rational framing was used (M=3.43, SD=.83). In addition, when emotional framing was used at the body wash product recall, negative word-of-mouth was higher when it was recalled for the first time (M= 3.44, SD= .87). Finally, when emotional framing was used for the second product recall, negative word-of-mouth was higher when body wash was recalled (M=3.84, SD=.83) than when cheese was recalled (M=3.44, SD=.85). The plots for the three-way interaction effects for word-of-mouth can be retrieved from the tables 7 and 8.





Figure 7&8: Graphs for three-way interaction effect between product type and message framing in the first product recall condition and the second product recall condition on word-of-mouth.

4.9. Regression analysis

Besides the MANOVA analysis, an additional stepwise regression analysis was performed in order to explore the influence of emotions and consumers' attitude on behavioral intention. The independent variables anger and sympathy are categorized as emotions, while competence-based (ability) and character-based trustworthiness (benevolence and integrity) are categorized as attitude. Purchase intention and word-of-mouth are categorized as behavioral intentions. Moreover, word-of mouth is divided into negative and positive word-of-mouth. The results can be found in tables below.

Regression and		standardized Coefficents	Beta	t	p
Anger	–>WOMneg		.39	6,93	.00*
Ability	–>WoMneg		21	-3.63	.00*
Sympathy	–>WoMneg		.07	1,30	.20
Benevolence	–>WoMneg		.02	.27	.80
Integrity	–>WoMneg		.01	.12	.91
Ability	–>WoMpos		.35	6,54	.00*
Sympathy	->WoMpos		.16	2,87	.04*
Anger	–>WoMpos		12	-1,89	.06
Benevolence	–>WoMpos		.06	.92	.36
Integrity	–>WoMpos		.01	.19	.85
Ability	->Purchase Int.		.29	5,33	.00*
Benevolence	->Purchase Int.		.25	4,16	.00*
Anger	->Purchase Int.		20	-3,92	.00*
Integrity	->Purchase Int.		.13	2,32	.02*
Sympathy	->Purchase Int.		.05	1,05	.30

Figure 9: Results of regression analysis (Note: * significant at the .05 level

The stepwise regression analysis removes the weakest correlated variables and therefore directly demonstrates which variables explain the distribution best. Thus, negative word-of-mouth can be predicted for 27% (R^2 =.270) by anger and ability (F(2,291) = 55.23, p=.00). The stepwise regression analysis shows that anger (β =.36, p=.00) and ability (β =.20, p=.00) have a significant influence on negative word-of-mouth, while sympathy (β =.07, p=.19), benevolence (β =.02, p=.79) and integrity (β =.01, p=.91) have not.

Furthermore, positive word-of-mouth can be predicted for 15.5% (R^2 =.155) by ability and sympathy (F (2,291)=26.76, p=.00). The stepwise regression analysis thus revealed that ability (β =.32, p=.00) and sympathy (β =.14, p=.00) have a significant influence on positive word-of-mouth. However, the variables anger (β = -.12, p=.06), benevolence (β =.06, p=.36) and integrity (β =.01, p=.85) do not have a significant influence on positive word-of-mouth.

In addition, purchase intention can be predicted for 43.3% (R^2 =.433) by ability, benevolence, anger and integrity (F(4,289)= 55.10, p=.00). Hence, ability (β =.25, p=.00), benevolence (β =.25, p=.00), anger (β =-.16, p=.00) and integrity (β =.16, p=.02) do have a significant influence on purchase intention, while only sympathy (β =.05, p=.30) has not.



Figure 10: Results of the regression analysis (Note:*significant at .05 level)

H1a: Emotional product recall framing leads to less anger compared to rational product recall framing.	Not supported
H1b: Emotional product recall framing leads to less negative word-of-mouth compared to rational product recall framing.	Not supported
H1c: Emotional product recall framing enhances sympathy compared to rational product recall framing.	Not supported
H1d: Emotional product recall framing enhances future purchase intention compared to rational product recall framing.	Not supported
H1e: Emotional product recall framing enhances a more positive trustworthiness (divided into (1) ability, (2) benevolence and (3) integrity) in the	Not supported
company compared to rational product recall framing.	
H2a: A favorable prior crisis history (first product recall) leads to less anger compared to unfavorable prior crisis history (second product recall).	Supported
H2b: A favorable prior crisis history (first product recall) leads to less negative word-of-mouth compared to unfavorable prior crisis history (second	Supported
product recall).	
H2c: A favorable crisis history (first product recall) enhances sympathy compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second experienced product crisis).	Not supported
H2d: A favorable crisis history (first product recall) enhances future purchase intention compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product	Supported
crisis).	
H2e: A favorable crisis history (first product recall) enhances more positive consumer trustworthiness in the organization (divided into (1) ability, (2)	H2e (1) & (2): Supported
benevolence and (3) integrity) compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product crisis).	H2e (3) : Not supported
H3: If the company uses rational framing at the first product recall, it leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative WOM and enhances (c) sympathy, (d)	Not supported
future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to using emotional framing for the first product recall.	
H4: If the company uses emotional framing at the second product recall, it leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative WOM and enhances (c) sympathy, (d)	H4c :Supported
future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to using rational framing for the second product recall.	H4a,b,d,e : Not supported
H5a: A food product recall increases anger more compared to a cosmetic product recall.	Not supported
H5b: A food product recall increases negative word-of-mouth more compared to a cosmetic product recall	Not supported
H5c: A food product recall reduces sympathy compared to a cosmetic product recall.	Not supported
H5d: A food product recall reduces future purchase intention compared to a cosmetic product recall.	Not supported
H5e: A food product recall reduces consumer's trustworthiness in the organization, sub-divided into (1) ability, (2) benevolence and (3) integrity, compared to a cosmetic product recall.	Not supported
H6 : If the company recalls a food product, an emotional framing leads to less (a) anger and (b) negative word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to an emotional framing when recalling a cosmetic product.	Not supported
H7: If the company recalls a cosmetic product, a rational framing leads to less (a) anger and(b) negative Word-of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy,(d)	Not supported
future purchase intention and a positive(e) trustworthiness in the company compared to rational framing while recalling a food product.	
H8: If the company recalls body wash for the first time, it leads to less (a) anger and (b) bad word- of-mouth and enhances (c) sympathy, (d) future	Not supported
purchase intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to recalling cheese for the first time.	
H9: If the company recalls body wash for the second time, it leads to less (a) anger and (c) bad WOM and enhances (b) sympathy, (d) future purchase	Not supported
intention and a positive (e) trustworthiness in the company compared to recalling cheese for the second time.	

Figure 11: Summary of supported and not supported hypotheses of this present research

5. Discussion

The purpose of this study regarding product recall crisis communication was to give answer to the research questions of this research. By means of a 2x2x2 scenario-based experiment it was aimed to investigate the correlation between product recall message framing, product type and prior recall history of the affected company and their influence on consumer's emotions, attitude and behavioral intentions. Since this combination of independent variables have not yet been researched within previous studied, product type (food vs. cosmetic), product recall message framing (rational vs. emotional) and prior recall history (first product recall vs. second product recall) was manipulated within this experiment in order to investigate its effects on anger, sympathy, word-of-mouth, future purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness in the affected company. The construct consumer's trustworthiness was sub-divided into ability, benevolence and integrity. Furthermore, covariates such as health concern, product involvement and knowledge of consequences were included to this study as well. Regarding the covariates it can be said that they are not important predictors of the main and interaction effects, since there were no mayor significant differences observed, despite the inclusion of the covariates. Several analyses revealed a number of significant results. However, not all hypotheses were supported.

In this section, first the main findings will be discussed in more detail concerning the main effects and interactions effects. Second, future research directions will be considered as well as the practical implications of this present research. Finally, the general conclusion will be presented.

5.1. Main effects

5.1.1 Framing

This current study explores if framing in a company's product recall communication has impact on consumer's emotions, behavioral intentions and attitude. Therefore, it was hypothesized that emotional product recall framing leads to less anger, word-of-mouth and enhances sympathy, future purchase intention and a more positive trustworthiness in the company compared to rational framing. However, the main findings of this study reveal different outcomes which are in contrast with the hypotheses concerning product recall framing.

Framing only demonstrated a significant main effect on word-of-mouth. Yet the result is different from the proposed assumptions. The results indicate that emotional framing rather leads to higher negative word-of-mouth compared to rational framing. These findings do not only contradict with the hypotheses, but also with previous research. Research by Choi and Lin (2007) revealed that

participants who were confronted with emotional framing in crisis communication were more favorable towards the affected organization compared to when they were confronted with rational framing. This is due to the human face that organizations adopt when they use emotional framing. Consequently, consumers can better relate to it and perceive the company as more genuine and therefore are more willing to forgive the wrongdoing of the company compared to when they merely receive rational facts and a short apology about the crisis situation.

Moreover, research has shown that companies that use emotional features in their crisis communication can protect their reputation, because by using emotions the company comes across as more human which in turn diminishes the anger experienced by the consumers (Van der Meer & Verhoeven, 2014). Kim and Cameron (2011) affirmed that emotional framing also influences consumer's attitudes and behavioral intentions towards the affected company. Furthermore, using emotional features can enhance trustworthiness in the organization which has experienced a crisis (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

In comparison with previous research, the results of this research have remarkably not proven that emotional framing decreases anger, word-of-mouth and enhances sympathy, future purchase intention and trustworthiness in the affected company. The reason for the discrepancy in results with previous research might be explained that this study focused on product recalls as crisis situation. As mentioned previously, product recalls are common crisis situations in today's society. Companies want to adapt as fast as possible to the demanding consumers which sometimes might lead to an oversight in control during the production process of products. Product recalls are increasing and might increase in the future. Therefore, consumers are used to product recall actions within different industries. Thus, consumers might have perceived the emotional framing as too excessive for just a product recall. People do not want to hear any drama for a minor product recall. Furthermore, the manipulated product recalls scenarios used in this study represented rather less dangerous consequences of using the unsound products. Skin irritations or a foodborne disease are 'complaints' that are bearable and not very dramatic. Results might have differed when the use of the food and cosmetic product might have led to long-term diseases like cancer or even death. Therefore, the emotional framing might have upset the participants more, because they did not perceive the product recall message as credible, but rather as over-the-top. Another reason for the contracting results could be that other factors had a stronger influence which prevented the occurrence of a main effect for framing.

Therefore, this present study argues that framing as an independent use in product recall communication does not have an effective influence on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the company. An explanation for this result could be that people have different perceptions of frames or rather different preferences according the message formation
within a product recall communication. In this research, the emotional framing for product recall was probably perceived as inappropriate for a product recall message which in result resulted in opposite outcomes for the hypotheses.

5.1.2 Prior recall history

This study also investigated if prior recall history has an influence on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the affected company. Therefore, it was hypothesized that a favorable prior crisis history (first product recall) leads to less anger, word-of-mouth and enhances sympathy, future purchase intention and a more positive trustworthiness in the company compared to an unfavorable prior crisis history (second product recall).

Several significant main effects were found which support most of the hypotheses concerning prior recall history. The main findings show that there is a significant main effect on anger, purchase intention, word-of-mouth and ability. These results are in favor with prior research.

It was argued by several researchers that a good crisis history, that is no prior crisis, benefits as safeguard during primary crisis situations (Dawar & Pillutla, 2000; Grunwald & Hempelmann, 2010). They also stated that a favorable crisis history helps to diminish negative associations regarding brand equity and crisis responsibility for unsound products. Coombs and Holladay (2006) also affirmed that an organization with a favorable pre-crisis history experience less loss in reputation compared to organizations which already accounts for several crisis situations. Furthermore, the dissonance theory by Festinger (1957) plays also an important role in crisis situations. People tend to take earlier information into consideration when they experience an inconsistency. Consumers tend to expect consistency in their beliefs about an organization. However, if an organization is affected by a crisis for the first time, people might tend to ignore the intensity of the initial crisis compared to a company that has already experienced a series of crisis situations.

The results obtained in this study, mostly confirm with these prior research. Only the dependent variables sympathy and character-based trustworthiness could not clearly manifest significant main effects. It could be explained that people will be somewhat disappointed about a crisis, regardless if the affected company has experienced a crisis for the first or second time. Therefore, sympathy might not be experienced when being confronted with a crisis at the first moment reading the product recall message. However, sympathy might develop on the long-term, when consumers deal with the product recall in more detail. The same could be applied for character-based trustworthiness. People might be dissatisfied and therefore do not perceive the company as fair or guided by sound principles.

Yet, this present study argues that prior recall history as an independent use in product recall communication does have an effective influence on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the affected company.

5.1.3 Product type

Furthermore, it was examined if the product type has an influence on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the affected company within a product recall. Therefore, it was hypothesized that a food product recall (i.e. cheese) increases anger, word-of-mouth and decreases sympathy, future purchase intention and a more positive trustworthiness in the company compared to a cosmetic product recall (i.e. body wash). Since the effects of food and cosmetic products on emotions, behavioral intentions and attitude have not been compared in previous research, the hypotheses were formed through logical reasoning.

However, none of the hypotheses concerning product type were supported. In fact, the results contradict with the pre-assumptions made in this study. The results show a discrepancy in the hypotheses, revealing that anger, word-of-mouth and purchase intention were increased while ability was perceived lower when a cosmetic product was recalled compared to a food product.

Product recall within the food and cosmetic industry is in general a very critical procedure. Regarding the food market, it has to be taken into account that food consumption might have immediate impact on human health if the product is very harmful to the consumer (Ferencic & Wölfling, 2015). Food is directly ingested into the body of a consumer and therefore can cause serious infections if it is contaminated with harmful substances or other infectious germs (Kumar & Budin, 2006). Ferencic and Wölfking (2015) confirmed that food product recalls do have a negative effect on (future) purchase intention. Furthermore, recalling food might also have an unfavorable impact on brand loyalty on the long-term. For cosmetic products no prior-research results could be found. However, it was assumed that due to the direct application on the skin, it can also cause serious damage to the consumer and therefore have a great impact on consumer's emotions and behavioral intentions. But since food goes directly inside the body, its effect was assumed to be stronger compared to a cosmetic product.

Why the opposite was disclosed by the main findings of this present study is not very clear yet. There might be several reasons. Participants might have not taken the reason for the cheese product recall (contamination with morbific bacteria which has caused foodborne disease) as too serious compared to the caused skin irritation within the body wash product recall. Another reason could be that the participants have not heard or rather experienced a cheese product recall before, so that they might not regard the cheese product recall as plausible enough compared to the body wash condition. The study by Ferencic and Wölfling (2015) revealed also that 62% of consumers would return to the affected food brand if they were sure that the irregularity has been removed (Ferencic & Wölfling, 2015). Thus, the reason for the contradicting findings can also be related to the outcome of the study by Ferencic and Wölfling. Participants might not considered the cheese product recall as too serious and might not felt too much affected by it compared to the body wash product recall. So,

participants in this study might be also willing to keep buying 'Hollandkaas' as soon as the affected products are removed from the shelves.

Finally, the discrepancy could have arisen as well from the fact that the brands for cheese and body wash were fictitious. People were not able to relate to these products, especially to cheese. Cheese brands are more known to people than body wash brands. The quality in food products might be more important to people, so people might purchase a rather well-known brand of cheese then a non-known cheese brand. The quality for body wash might not be that relevant, since the goal is to clean the body. But cheese is rather an indulgence product which directly enters the body. So, people would probably have reacted differently when they were confronted with a real cheese brand name which needs to recall its products. In addition, the reason can also relate to the product involvement. Body wash is used rather on a regular basis compared to cheese. Therefore, people have perceived the body wash product recall as more dramatic, taking into account that it used by the majority of people on a daily basis compared to cheese.

5.2 Interaction effects

Furthermore, the present study also investigated the possibility of interaction effects.

5.2.1 Framing and prior recall history

For the interaction between framing and prior recall history and product type it was assumed that the combination of rational framing at first product recall will lead to a better outcome for the dependent variables compared to the combination of rational framing at a second product recall. In addition, it was hypothesized that emotional framing used for a second time product recall will influence the dependent variables higher than emotional framing used at a first time product recall.

However, there is once again only very little evidence that the interplay between framing and prior recall history influences significantly consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the affected company. Merely a marginally significant interaction effect between framing and recall history was found on sympathy. Sympathy towards the company was higher among the participants when emotional framing was used in the second recall condition than when rational framing was used in the second product recall condition. An explanation for this result could be that a second product recall might lead to negative consumer's feeling towards the company. However, using emotional features as crisis communication while expressing regret and deep feelings towards the crisis situation, the company would be perceived as more genuine and humane. Consequently, consumers might feel sympathy for the company. In contrast, using only rational features at a second product recall communication, people might have felt that the company does not really care or take responsibility for its wrongdoing for the second time, because within the manipulated scenario the company only gave a simple apology accompanied with rational facts about the crisis situation. Therefore, sympathy was lower in the rational framing condition compared to the emotional framing condition during a second product recall. Since the interaction between framing and prior product recall history has not been researched before, it can neither be related to previous research findings.

5.2.2 Framing and product type

The interaction between framing and product type in this study was also purely exploratory, because no previous research has been conducted concerning this type of interaction. It was assumed that the combination of a food product recall and emotional framing will lead to a better outcome for the dependent variables compared to the combination of cosmetic product and rational framing. In addition it was hypothesized that for a cosmetic product a rational framing will influence the dependent variables higher than the combination of food product recall and rational framing.

However, this research did not find any proof of an interaction effect between framing and product type on anger, word-of-mouth, sympathy, purchase intention and consumer's trustworthiness in the affected company. A potential explanation for these results could be that product type does not influence framing at all. So, the use of different products within a product recall communication does not add any impact on people's emotions, behavioral intentions and attitude, because the influence of framing might be too strong. As discussed earlier, an interaction between both independent variables might arise when real brand names will be used. Then, people could relate to the products and form a picture about these products which in turn might show a significant effect on the dependent variables. Using fictitious brands do not allow consumers to relate to the product which in turn makes it difficult to evaluate the crisis situation.

5.2.3 Prior recall history and product type

The interaction between prior recall history and product type in this study was also exploratory, because no prior studies have already investigated this type of interaction either. It was assumed that the combination of a cosmetic product as first product recall will lead to a better outcome for the dependent variables compared to the combination of food product as first product recall. In addition it was hypothesized that a cosmetic product recalled for the second time will influence the dependent variables higher than the combination of food product as second product recall.

The main findings of this study only provide very little evidence that the interplay between recall history and product type on consumer's emotions, behavioral intention and trustworthiness in the company. There was only a significant interaction effect found on ability. The ability of the company was perceived higher when cheese was recalled for the second time compared to when body wash was recalled for the second time. These main findings are in contrast with the hypothesis which

stated that recalling body wash for the second will lead to a more positive trustworthiness in the company compared to recalling cheese for the second time.

This might be once again explained by the use of fictitious brand names in this study, so people could not really relate to the cheese brand and therefore did not feel emotionally attached to the manipulated cheese product recall message. For a body wash the brand name might not be that important because it is used mostly on a daily basis to clean the body. Among the participants it might be assumed that any type of soap brand would do its job. However, the case might be different for a cheese product, because it is rather an indulgence product and not every cheese brand satisfies the taste and needs of consumers. Not knowing the brand, participants probably did not engage themselves with the cheese product recall condition within this study. Thus, the outcome might probably support the hypothesis if a real cheese and body wash brand name would have been used in this research.

5.2.4 Framing, Recall history and Product type

So far, there has not been any research conducted that investigates the three-way interaction between framing, recall history and product type. Therefore, it was an exploratory approach. The findings revealed that that word-of-mouth was more negatively when body wash was recalled for the second time within the emotional framing condition compared to within the rational framing condition. Moreover, when body wash was recalled within the emotional framing for the second time word-of-mouth was higher compared to when the product was recalled for the first time whereas negative word-of-mouth was higher when body wash was recalled within the emotional framing than when cheese was recalled for the second time. These results conclude that recall history has the most positive influence on consumer's emotion, behavioral intentions and trustworthiness in the company, regardless of framing and product type. The results for the main effects also confirm this outcome. However, further research is needed in order to get a better picture about the interaction effects of these three independent variables.

5.3 Regression analysis

Regarding consumer's emotions and attitude, it was revealed that they predict behavioral intention such as word-of-mouth and purchase intention. The main findings pointed out that anger positively influence negative word-of-mouth and negatively influences positive word-of-mouth and purchase intention. Moreover, sympathy positively influences positive word-of-mouth, while character-based and competence-based trustworthiness in the company positively influences purchase intention. In addition to that ability negatively influences word-of-mouth.

Several research have already proofed that behavioral intention can be predicted by emotions and attitude. Consumers, who have a favorable attitude towards a company or product, are more likely to repurchase a certain product (Zhao et al, 2014) and talk positively about that particular company (Martin & Lueg, 2013). The same applies for emotions. Negative emotions such as anger are likely to result in negative word-of-mouth, since consumers are not satisfied with an action of the company (Henning-Thurau et al, 2004). Emotions also effect other behavioral actions such as purchase intention.

This information is essential in crisis communication since emotions like anger and disappointment are easily evoked when consumers hear about product crisis. Crisis manager have to deal carefully with crisis communication in order to diminish the possibility of negative word-of-mouth and purchase intention.

6. Implications

6.1. Theoretical implications

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of a product recall communication strategy when composed of two different message framings in combination with product type and prior recall history. Product recall communication poses an important challenge for the company, because consumers tend to feel angry towards a company when products appear to be harmful. This not only results in significant decline in firm value (Ahmed et al., 2002; Pruitt & Peterson, 1986) and brand equity (Chen et al., 2009), but also in negative word-of-mouth (Folkes, 1984 & 1988). A product recall can consequently cause serious damage to the image of the affected company.

However, product recall announcements can be framed accordingly to lessen the reputational damage and change consumer's negative attitude towards the affected organization (Coombs, 2007). Therefore, it is essential for the company to announce product recalls in a way that they positively shape consumer's perception. Since research regarding message framing has been recently introduced to the field of crisis communication (Claeys & Cauberghe, 2014; Claeys, Cauberghe and Leysen, 2013),this present study provides new insights into effects of framing of product recall message on consumer's emotions, attitude and behavioral intention. Aside from framing, the combination with prior crisis history and also product type in this present study illustrates new observations to crisis communication research, although a little contradictory to prior research. Especially the impact of low-involvement products such as food and cosmetics regarding product recalls are understudied. Both product types can endanger consumer's health seriously if they are contaminated with harmful substances. Thus, due to the conflicting results with the hypotheses and prior research concerning framing, further elaboration on this subject is needed while also investigating the interaction effects between framing, prior recall history and product type.

6.2. Managerial implications

When a company experiences a product crisis and consequently has to recall its products from the market, crisis managers have to determine what kind of communication strategy they should use. It is obvious that any type of crisis communication, including product recall communication, will have an effect on public's perceptions. The goal of any crisis manager is to put the consumer's mind at ease regarding the crisis they are confronted with and ensure consumers that everything possible is done to settle the crisis. The way a crisis communication is framed can effect consumer's emotions, behavioral intentions and trustworthiness in the affected organization. When a company has to approach the public with a product recall message, the crisis manager does not only need to decide what type framing to use, but also consider the fact how many times the company has already experienced similar crisis situations. Thus, prior recall history is essential in creating the communication strategy. Within this study it was shown that prior recall history independently influenced consumer's emotions, behavior intentions and trustworthiness in the company. It is reasonable that consumers will be more skeptical about the ability and skills of a company that has experienced similar crises in the past already. Especially, in case of an already experienced crisis, a crisis manager is challenged to convince consumers to still stick to the brand, even though the company was confronted with several problems before. Therefore, it is very important for a crisis manager to match the correct framing according to the prior recall history. Even though that not all hypotheses were supported in this study, it is recommended to use emotional framing when the company has experienced a product recall for the second time already.

Previous research has shown that emotional features in crisis communication protect a company's reputation. It also gives the company a more human face. People can better relate to it and might reduce anger and rather enhance sympathy towards the affected company.

Furthermore, a crisis manager should not underestimate the emotions and attitude of consumers because this present study has also confirmed that they have a great influence on behavioral intentions. Therefore, it is advised to frame a product recall communication in a way that positively shapes emotions. Using an inappropriate framing can, beside the actual crisis, upset the consumer even more which in turn might lead to negative word-of-mouth and lower future purchase intentions.

7. Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study contains several limitations which might have influenced the outcome of this present study. In this section the limitations will be mentioned and suggestions will be made to improve future research. In this present study a convenience sample was engaged for the data gathering. The surveys were mainly distributed to students. Consequently, the results are not equally spread among all age groups or educational levels. The majority of participant is highly educated and belongs to the age group 18-26. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized for the entire Dutch population. Future research should approach a wider range of sample with reference to age and educational background. Moreover, the study was only conducted among the Dutch population, over-representing the province Overijssel. As a consequence, future research could also investigate the impact among different cultures in order to see if differences can be observed regarding the effects of framing. Not only results from other countries could be compared, but also the outcome from different Dutch population. This could be even more interesting for the cheese condition, since 'Gouda' cheese originates from the Dutch province 'Zuid-Holland'.

Regarding the framing manipulation, it has to be mentioned that not every participant was able to perceive either emotional or rational framing correctly. A quite high number of 82 participants perceived the framing manipulation incorrectly, who were deleted from the data set. This might be also an indication why contradictory results were found compared to pre-assumptions and prior research. There might be at least two reasons that could explain the high rate in indicating the wrong framing. First, since the majority of surveys were distributed via online channels, it cannot be traced back if participants were either merely focused on the scenario presented or were distracted by something else. On the one hand, it can be that some participants did not read the scenario carefully, so they were not able to give a correct answer regarding the framing manipulation. On the other hand, it might be possible that the framing was not clear to everyone. Since perceptions differ, it can be the case that participants could not distinguish between rational and emotional framing. Thus, it might be wise for future research to make the distinction between those two framings clearer by including more emotional or rational features in order to avoid a high number of invalid responses. Concerning the distraction of participants, potential research can be conducted within a laboratory where the interruption might be less compared to a social environment.

Furthermore, as already mention in the discussion section, a major reason for the discrepancy in results can be explained by the use of fictitious brands. Non-real brands were used in this present study to avoid pre-reputational judgments made though previous experiences. However, using fictitious brands do have disadvantages as well. Participants might have a hard time relating to the brand or product. It is never easy to indicate someone's emotions or rate the trustworthiness in a

company which is unknown to the participants. Moreover, being confronted with a product recall communication from a brand which does not interest the participant, it might be difficult to judge the incident due to low involvement with the product. Participants are not able to relate to the brand as well as to the crisis situation either. Consequently, a lack of realism arises which prevents participants to engage intensively with the incident which in turn might influence the results of the study. Therefore, future research should be also conducted with real brand names.

Another limitation of this present study is the product choice. This study compared the effect of cheese and body wash. The previous mentioned issue can be also related to the product type, especially to cheese. Body wash is rather a simple product that does not need a lot of brand awareness in order to rate its use. Any type of soap would be able to clean the body. So, it would not matter that much if the brand for body wash is fictitious. It is common that people also use no brand body wash to shower. Contrary to body wash, cheese is a product that does need brand awareness to be able to establish associations with the product. Cheese is an indulgence product that might not be used on a daily basis. In addition to that, not everyone consumes cheese compared to body wash. Hence, it might be considered that for cheese a real brand name would have enhanced the results. Future research should choose a food and cosmetic product that resemble in product involvement such as bread and soap. Products should be clear low-involvement products. Cheese is not clearly categorized as low-involvement product which might have affected the results of this study.

Finally, this current study investigated the effect of product recall framing on a short-term basis. That is, participants had to evaluate the incident and express their feelings directly after reading the manipulated scenarios. In a real-life case, consumers will hear from different channels about a product recall which allows people to compare information and evaluate the incident afterwards. In this present study participants were somehow forced to express their feelings according to only one online news article. For future research a longitudinal study can be considered which allows participants to compare different type of channels and information provided about the product recall.

8. Conclusions

Crisis communication is important to any company that is hit by a crisis. This study investigated the effect of product recall communication framing in combination with product type and prior recall history on consumer's emotions, behavioral intentions and trustworthiness in the affected company. Most of the results within this present study did neither conform to the research hypotheses nor to prior research. Remarkably, emotional framing led to higher negative word-of-mouth compared to rational framing. However, this research validates the importance of choosing appropriate framing regarding prior recall history. Emotional framing tends to soften negative emotions when used at a second product recall. Surprisingly, participants reacted to the cosmetic product recall incident more negatively compared to the cheese product recall incident which contradicted with the research assumptions. Thus, this study confirmed that a cosmetic product recall leads to higher word-ofmouth when emotional framing is used for the second product recall. Furthermore, the present study states that emotions and attitude towards the affected company plays an important role in crisis communication. They do influence behavioral intentions such as word-of-mouth and future purchase intention. Thus, it is very crucial for a company to attempt influencing the emotions of consumers by means of framing in order to ease the negative effect of the crisis. This needs to be taken into account when considering framing regarding prior crisis history.

9. Acknowledgement

I would like to sincerely thank my first supervisor, Dr. Ardion Beldad, for his positive support and enthusiasm during the whole process of the master thesis. He provided me with crucial insight into different aspects of crisis communication. I also would like to express my gratitude towards my second supervisor, Dr. Mirjam Galetzka, for her sharp comments and advice on my research which helped me moving on.

References

Ahmed, P., Gardella, J., Nanda, S. (2002). Wealth Effect of Drug Withdrawals on Firms and their Competitors. *Financial Management* 31(3): 21–41.

Beamish, P.I W. & Bapuji, H. (2008): Toy Recalls and China: Emotion vs. Evidence. *Management* and Organization Review, 4 (2): 197-208.

Benoit, W. L., & Drew, S. (1997). Appropriateness and Effectiveness of Image Repair Strategies. *Communication Reports, 10, 153–163.*

- Chang H.H. et al. (2015). The Effects of Response Strategies and Severity of Failure on Consumer Attribution with Regard to Negative Word-of-Mouth. *Decision Support Systems 71 (2015) 48–61*
- Chaudhuri, A. & Holbrook, M.B. (2001) The Chain of Effects from Brand Trust and Brand Affect to Brand Performance: the Role of Brand Loyalty. *J. Mark., 65 (2), 81–93*

Cheah, E., Chan, W., Chieng, C. (2007): The Corporate Social Responsibility of Pharmaceutical Product Recalls: An Empirical Examination of U.S. and U.K. Markets, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76 (4): 427-449.

Chen,Y., Ganesan, S., Liu, Y. (2009): Does a Firm's Product-Recall Strategy Affect Its Financial Value? An Examination of Strategic Alternatives During Product-Harm Crises. *Journal of Marketing, 73* (6): 214-226.

Choi, Y., & Lin, Y. (2009). Consumer Responses to Mattel Product Recalls Posted on Online Bulletin Boards: Exploring two Types of Emotion. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 21*, 198-207.

Claeys, A. S., & Cauberghe, V. (2014). What Makes Crisis Response Strategies Work? The Impact of Crisis Involvement and Message Framing. *Journal of Business Research, 67, 182-189.*

- Claeys, A. S., Cauberghe, V., & Leysen, J. (2013). Implications of Stealing Thunder for the Impact of Expressing Emotions in Organizational Crisis Communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *41*(3), 293-308.
- Cleeren, K., Dekimpe, M. G., Helsen, K. (2008): Weathering Product-Harm Crises, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36 (2): 262-270.
- Cohen, J. R. (1999). Advising Clients to Apologize. Southern California Law Review, 72, 1009–1073
- Coleman, L. (2011): Losses from Failure of Stakeholder Sensitive Processes: Financial Consequences for Large US Companies from Breakdowns in Product, Environmental, and Accounting Standards, *Journal of Business Ethics, 98 (2): 247-258.*

Coombs,W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (1996). Communication and Attributions in a Crisis: An Experimental Study of Crisis Communication. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *8*, 279–295

Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2005). Exploratory Study of Stakeholder Emotions: Affect and Crisis.

Coombs, W. T. (2007). Protecting Organization Reputations During a Crisis: The Development and Application of Situational Crisis Communication Theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *10*(3), 163–177.

Coombs, W. T. (2006). The Protective Powers of Crisis Response Strategies: Managing Reputational Assets During a Crisis. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 12, 241 – 259.

- Copeland, T., Jackson, G., Morgan, F., (2004). An Update on Product Recalls. *Journal of* Marketing Channel 11 (2,3), 103–121.
- Dahlen, M. & Lange, F. (2006) A Disaster is Contagious: How a Brand in Crisis Affects Other Brands. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 46, 4, pp. 388–397.
- Daughety, A.F., Reinganum, J.F., (1995). Product Safety: Liability, R&D, and Signaling. *American* Economic Review 85, 1187–1206.

Dawar, N., & Pillutla, M. M. (2000). Impact of Product-Harm Crises on Brand Equity: The Moderating Role of Consumer Expectations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *27*, 215–226.

- Druckman, J. N. (2001). The Implications of Framing Effects for Citizen Competence. *Political Behavior*, 23(3), 225-256.
- Duan, W., Gu, B., & Whinston, A. B. (2008). The Dynamics of Online Word-of-Mouth and Product Sales: an Empirical Investigation of the Movie Industry. *Journal of Retailing*, 84(2), 233-242

Fennis, B.M. & Stroebe, W. (2013) Softening the Blow: Company Self-Disclosure of Negative Information Lessens Damaging Effects on Consumer Judgment and Decision Making. Springer Science and Business Media, Dordrecht

Festinger, L. (1957). A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ferencic, M. & Wölfling, A. (2015) Impact of Negative Quality Inconsistency on Brand Loyalty. Economic and Business Review 17 (1), 5-23

- Folkes, V. S. (1984). Consumer Reactions to Product Failure: An Attributional Approach. *Journal* of Consumer Research, 10 (4), 398-409.
- Folkes, V. S., Koletsky, S., & Graham, J. L. (1987). A Field Study of Causal Inferences and Consumer Reaction: The View from the Airport. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *13*(4), 534-539.
- Folkes, V. S. (1988) Recent Attribution Research in Consumer Behavior: A Review and New Directions. Journal of Consumer Research, 14(4), 548-60.

Fuchs-Burnett, T. (2002). Mass Public Corporate Apology. *Dispute Resolution Journal*, 57(3), 26–32.

- Geuens, M., De Pelsmacker, P., & Faseur, T. (2011). Emotional Advertising: Revisiting the Role of Product Category. *Journal of Business Research, 64(4), 418–426.*
- Grunwald, G. & Hempelmann, B.(2010). Impacts of Reputation for Quality on Perceptions of Company Responsibility and Product-Related Dangers in Times of Product-Recall and Public Complaints Crises: Results From an Empirical Investigation. *Corporate Reputation Review, 13,* 264 – 283.
- Han,H., & Jeong,C.(2013).Multi-Dimensions of Patrons' Emotional Experiences in Upscale Restaurants and their Role in Loyalty Formation: Emotion Scale Improvement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 32, 59–70.*
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic Word-of-Mouth via Consumer-Opinion Platforms: What Motivates Consumers to Articulate Themselves on the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *18*(*1*), *38-52*.
- Horaa, M., Bapujib, H., Rothc, A. (2011). Safety Hazard and Time to Recall: The Role of Recall Strategy, Product Defect Type, and Supply Chain Player in the U.S. Toy Industry. *Journal of Operations Management 29 (2011) 766–777*
- Jin, Y. (2009). The Effects of Public's Cognitive Appraisal of Emotions in Crises on Crisis Coping and Strategy Assessment. *Public Relations Review*, *35*, 310-313.
- Kihlblom, V., Persson, O. (2014). The Value of Locally Produced Household Cheese . *Jonkoping International Business School*
- Kim, H. J., & Cameron, G. T. (2011). Emotions Matter in Crisis: The Role of Anger and Sadness in the Public's Response to Crisis News Framing and Corporate Crisis Response. *Communication Research*, 38(6), 826_855.

Kumar, S. & Budin, E.M. (2006). Prevention and Management of Product Recalls in the Processed Food Industry: a Case Study Based on an Exporter's Perspective. *Technovation 26, 739–750*

Laufer, D. & Coombs W.T (2005). How Should a Company Respond to a Product Harm Crisis? The Role of Corporate Reputation and Consumer-Based Cues. *Business Horizons, 49, 379—385*

Lyles, M., Flynn, B., Frohlich, M. (2008). All Supply Chains don't Flow Through: Understanding Supply Chain Issues in Product Recalls. *Management and Organization Review 4 (2), 167–182*.

Martin, W.C., Lueg J.E. (2013) Modeling Word-of-Mouth. Journal of Business Research 66, 801–808

- McKay-Nesbitt, J., Manchanda, R. V., Smith, M. C., & Huhmann, B. A. (2011). Effects of Age, Need for Cognition, and Affective Intensity on Advertising Effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(1), 12–17
- Moon, B. B., & Rhee, Y. (2012). Message Strategies and Forgiveness During Crises: Effects of Causal Attributions and Apology Appeal Types on Forgiveness. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *89*(4), 677-694
- Mowen, J. C., Jolly D. and Nickell G. S. (1981): Factors Influencing Consumer Responses to Product Recalls: A Regression Analyses Approach, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 8 (1) 405-406.

Nabi, R. L. (1999). A Cognitive-Functional Model for the Effects of Discrete Negative Emotions on Information Processing, Attitude Change, and Recall. *Communication Theory*, 9(3), 292_320

- Patel, A., & Reinsch, L. (2003). Companies can Apologize: Corporate Apologies and Legal Liability. Business Communication Quarterly, 66, 17–26
- Pearson, C., & Clair, J. (1998). Reframing Crisis Management. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(1) 59-76.
- Pruitt, S. W. & Peterson, R. D. (1986). Security Prices Reactions Around Product Recall Announcements. *Journal of Financial Research*, 9(2), 113–122
- Qiu, L., Pang, J. & Lim, K. H. (2012). Effects of Conflicting Aggregated Rating on eWOM Review Credibility and Diagnosticity: The Moderating Role of Review Valence. *Decision Support* Systems, Volume 54(1), 631-643.
- Read, K. (2007). "Corporate Pathos": New Approaches to Quell Hostile Publics. *Journal of Communication Management, 11, 332-347.*
- Reynolds, B. (2002). Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication. *Centers for Disease Control and* Prevention, Atlanta GA
- Sims, R. (2009). Toward a Better Understanding of Organizational Efforts to Rebuild Reputation Following an Ethical Scandal. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90, 453 – 472.*
- Siomkos, G. and Shrivastava, P. (1993): Responding to Product Liability Crises. *Long Range* Planning, 26 (5). 72-79.
- Stafford, G., Yu, L. & Armoo, A.K. (2002). Crisis Management and Recovery: How Washington, DC, Hotels Responded to Terrorism. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly 43, 27–40*
- Soscia, I.(2007). Gratitude, Delight, Or Guilt:The Role of Consumers' Emotions in Predicting Post Consumption Behaviors. *Psychology&Marketing*, 24(10), 871–894
- Spence, P. R., Westerman, D., Skalski, P., Seeger, M., Sellnow, T. & Ulmer, R. R. (2006). Gender and Age Effects on Information Seeking after 9/11. *Communication Research Reports, 23,* 217–223
- Stafford, M. R., & Day, E. (1995). Retail Services Advertising: The Effects of Appeal, Medium, and Service. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(1), 57-71.
- Suls, J., R. Martin(2005). The Daily Life of the Garden-Variety Neurotic: Reactivity, Stressor Exposure, Mood Spillover, and Maladaptive Coping. *J. Personality* **73**(6) 1485-1510.
- Sundaram, D. S., Mitra, K., & Webster, C. (1998). Word-of-Mouth Communications: a Motivational Analysis. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25(1), 527-531.
- Thirumalai, S. & Sinha, K. (2011). Product Recalls in the Medical Device Industry: An Empirical Exploration of the Sources and Financial Consequences. *Management Science*, *57 (2)*, 376-92.
- Tucker , L . & Melewar , T .C. (2005). Corporate Reputation and Crisis Management: The Threat and Manageability of Anti-Corporatism. *Corporate Reputation Review* ,7 ,377 387
- Turk, V., Jin, Y., Stewart, S., Kim, J., Hipple, J.K (2012) Examining the Interplay of an Organization's Prior Reputation, CEO's Visibility, and Immediate Response to a Crisis. *Public Relations Review*. *Elsevier. 38 (4), 574-583*
- Ulmer, R. R., Seeger, M. W. & Sellnow, T. L. (2007) Post-Crisis Communication and Renewal: Expanding the Parameters of Post-Crisis Discourse. *Public Relations Review, 33, 130–134*
- Van der Meer, T. G., & Verhoeven, J. W. (2014). Emotional Crisis Communication. *Public Relations Review*, 40(3), 526-536.
- Van Heerde, Harald, Kristiaan Helsen and Marnik G. Dekimpe (2007): The Impact of a Product-Harm Crisis on Marketing Effectiveness, *Marketing Science, 26 (2): 230-245*
- Veale, R., Quester. P., Karunaratna, A. (2006) The Role of Intrinsic (Sensory) Cues and the Extrinsic Cues of Country of Origin and Price on Food Product Evaluation. 3rd International Wine Business & Marketing Research Conference, Montpellier
- Walsh, G., Mitchell, V.-W., Jackson, P.R., Beatty, S.E. (2009) Examining the Antecedents and Consequences of Corporate Reputation: a Customer Perspective. British Journal of Management 20 (2) 187–203.

- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of the Structure, Causes and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work. *Research in Organizational Behavior (pp. 1-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press*
- Wilcock, A., Pun, M., Khanona, J. & Aung, M. (2004). Consumer Attitudes, Knowledge and Behaviour: a Review of Food Safety Issues. *Trends in Food Science & Technology 15, 56–66*Wynne, A., G.
- Hoffer (1976). Auto Recalls: do They Affect Market Share? Applied Economics 8(3) 157-163.
- Yoo, C., & MacInnis, D. (2005). The Brand Attitude Formation Process of Emotional and Informational ads. Journal of Business Research, 58(10), 1397–1406.
- Zeelenberg, M.,&Pieters, R. (2004). Beyond Valence in Customer Dissatisfaction: A Review and New Findings on Behavioral Responses to Regret and Disappointment in Failed Services. *Journal of Business Research*, *57*(4), 445–455.
- Zhao, H.H., Gao, Q., Wu, Y.P., Wang, Y., Zhu. X.D (2014). What Affects Green Consumer Behavior in China? A Case Study from Qingdao. *Journal of Cleaner Production 63 (2014) 143-151*

Appendix A: Survey

Beste Respondent,

Bedankt dat u wilt meedoen aan dit onderzoek.

Deze enquête maakt deel uit van mijn afstudeeronderzoek over product communicatie. Uw mening, gevoelens en houding met betrekking tot de informatie in het nieuwsbericht zullen worden gevraagd. Het is belangrijk dat u de vragenlijst zo eerlijk en volledig mogelijk invult. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Het invullen van deze enquête duurt ongeveer 10 minuten. Dit onderzoek is anoniem en uw gegevens zullen niet aan derden worden verstrekt. De resultaten zullen alleen worden

Nogmaals bedankt voor uw medewerking!

gebruikt voor academische doeleinden.

Met vriendelijke groeten,

Melissa Tutmann Master Student Communication Studies, Universiteit Twente

Als u vragen heeft, kunt u mij graag op het volgende emailadres benaderen:

m.tutmann@student.utwente.nl

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate u het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Dit incident is gepubliceerd door het bedrijf.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
Dit incident is gepubliceerd door een online nieuws kanaal.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\odot
Het betreffende bedrijf roept kaas terug.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
Het betreffende bedrijf roept douchegel terug.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
Het is de eerste keer dat het bedrijf producten moet terugroepen.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc
Het is al de tweede keer dat het bedrijf hun producten uit de handel moet nemen.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot

Hoe zou u de reactie van de spreker van het bedrijf in het nieuwsbericht beoordelen?

rationeel	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	emotioneel
formeel	\odot	\bigcirc	informeel
objectief	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	subjectief

A.u.b. Geeft u uw mening aan over het nieuwsbericht dat u zojuist gelezen heeft.

betrouwbaar	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	niet betrouwbaar
serieus	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	niet serieus
geloofwaardig	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	niet geloofwaardig

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate uw het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
lk vind mijn gezondheid belangrijk.	0	\odot	0	\odot	0
lk waardeer mijn gezondheid.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	0
lk ben mij bewust van mijn gezondheid.	0	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	0
lk gebruik dit soort product vaak.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	0
lk gebruik dit soort product dagelijks.	0	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot
Dit soort product is een belangrijk onderdeel van mijn leefpatroon.	0	O	0	0	©

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate uw het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben mij bewust van de consequenties als ik producten met schadelijke stoffen gebruik.	۲	0	0		O
lk weet dat schadelijke ingrediënten niet goed zijn voor mijn gezondheid.	O	\odot	0	\odot	\bigcirc
Ik weet dat schadelijke stoffen mijn gezondheid kunnen bedreigen.	O	\odot	0	0	0

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in hoeverre u de volgende stellingen ervaart nadat u het nieuwsbericht heeft gelezen.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Ik erger mij over het bedrijf.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
lk voel walging.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
lk ben diep verontwaardigd.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
Ik ben boos op het bedrijf.	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\odot

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in hoeverre u de volgende stellingen ervaart nadat u het nieuwsbericht heeft gelezen.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Ik voel sympathie.	0	\odot	\odot	0	0
lk ben bedroefd.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
lk heb mededogen.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
lk voel empathie.	0	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate u het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
lk zou gewoon producten van dit merk kopen.	0	0	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Vanwege de terugroepactie, zou ik voor een ander merk kiezen.	0	\odot	0	\odot	\odot
lk zou geen producten meer van dit merk kopen.	\odot	\odot	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Andere producten van het bedrijf zou ik wel kopen.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lk zou geen enkele product meer van dit bedrijf kopen.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Als ik de mogelijkheid heb, zou ik producten van het bedrijf in de toekomst kopen.	©	0	0	\bigcirc	©

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate u het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
lk zou negatief over het merk praten.	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lk zou mijn familie en vrienden over het product waarschuwen.	0	\odot	0	\odot	\odot
lk zou over het product klagen.	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lk zou positief over het merk praten.	0	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot
lk zou het product mijn familie en vrienden aanraden.	0	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lk zou anderen het product aanbevelen.	0	\odot	0	\odot	\odot

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate u het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Het bedrijf is heel goed gekwalificeerd om haar taak uit te voeren.	0	0	0		0
lk vertrouw in de vaardigheden van het bedrijf.	\odot	\odot	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Het bedrijf is zeer geschikt om zijn werk uit te voeren.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Het bedrijf is niet goed gekwalificeerd.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Het bedrijf is ondeskundig in wat het doet.	0	\odot	0	\odot	\odot

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate u het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Het bedrijf is erg bezorgd om mijn welzijn.	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	
Mijn behoeften zijn belangrijk voor het bedrijf.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot
Het bedrijf doet alles om mij niet te kwetsen.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot
Het bedrijf doet alles om mij te helpen.	0	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot
Het bedrijf doet niet zijn best om mij te helpen.	\odot	\bigcirc	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Het bedrijf kijkt echt niet uit naar wat belangrijk is voor mij.	0	\bigcirc	\odot	0	\bigcirc

A.u.b. Geeft u aan in welke mate u het met de volgende stellingen eens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens	Mee oneens	Noch mee oneens, noch mee eens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Het bedrijf heeft een sterk gevoel van rechtvaardigheid.	0	0	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lk kan zeker zijn dat het bedrijf zich altijd aan zijn woord zal houden.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	0
Gezonde principes lijken het gedrag van het bedrijf te leiden.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\odot
Het gedrag en de acties van het bedrijf zijn inconsistent.	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Het bedrijf doet niet zijn best om eerlijk met anderen om te gaan.	0	\odot	\odot	\odot	\bigcirc

Wat is uw geslacht?

Man

Vrouw

Wat is uw leeftijd?



Wat is uw huidige of hoogste opleiding?

- Basisonderwijs
- O Vmbo
- Havo
- O Vwo
- Middelbaar beroepsonderwijs
- Hoger beroepsonderwijs
- O Universitair onderwijs

Uit welke Nederlandse provincie komt u vandaan?

- Groningen
- Friesland
 Drenthe
- Overijssel
- Flevoland
- Gelderland
- Outrecht
- Noord-Holland
- Zuid-Holland
- Zeeland
- Noord-Brabant
- Limburg
- Ik kom niet uit Nederland.

Appendix B: Scenarios









Politiek geval van de douchegel met de stor 'Cocamidopropyl betaine' kan leiden tot huidirritatie en uitslag. In Politiek geval van twijfel is aangeraden om een huidarts raad te plegen. Consumenten die dit product in hun bezit hebben, worden gevraagd om deze niet te gebruiken en ze meteen terug te brengen naar hun verkooppunt. Economie Het product zal dan worden terugbetaald.

Geld Een spreker van 'FreshUp' deelde mee: "Wij bieden onze oprechte excuses aan! Wij betreuren het ten zeerste oat dit product in de winkel is gekomen. Hoe dit kon gebeuren weten wij niet, maar wij zijn er wel diep geschokt van. Wij vinden het spijtig dat sommige klanten sterk zijn getroffen door dit incident. Wij hechten veel waarde aan een goede relatie met onze klanten en derhalve hebben wij inmiddels de controles nog verder aangescherpt zodat wij deze ernstige fout in de toekomst voorkomen. Alle andere producten zijn niet betrokken en kunnen dus zonder twijfel worden gebruikt."

Spaarverzekering van DELA Vaste rente 2,75%

12:35 - Burgemeester Alphen wil niet ingaan op k...

12:33 - AZ en Werder Bremen akkoord over tran...

Meer nieuws >

>

>

🕕 NU 🔁	NUzakelijk 🔄 NUsport 🕢 NUtech 📵 NUentertainment 🕕 NUlifestyle 🕡 NUgeld	🕕 NU	werk S	Inloggen					
	is me!	Nu shoppen							
	Dinsdag 04 augustus 2015 Het laatste nieuws het eerst op NU.nl Q								
	Terugroepactie douchegel van 'FreshUp'	*	AR	аí	Ď	X			
Voorpagina	Vorig jaar had 'FreshUp' ook al problemen met hun huidverzorgingsproducten en moesten deze worden	20 °C	1 NS	499,05	TV gids	0 Live			
Net binnen	teruggeroepen. Op grond van klachten van consumenten over huidirritatie en uitslag na het gebruik van hun douchegel heeft 'FreshUp' grondige productcontroles uitgevoerd. Uit voorzorg en om de veiligheid van de								
Algemeen	consument te waarborgen heeft de huidverzorgingsproducten fabrikant 'FreshUp' besloten zijn douchegel voor	Ne	t binnen		Popula	ir			
Binnenland	de tweede keer uit de handel te nemen en roept deze terug bij de consumenten omwille van de mogelijke aanwezigheid van de stof 'Cocamidopropyl betaïne'. Dat meldde het bedrijf deze maandag.	12:38 - Prijzen supermarktketen Margt 'heel norm >							
Buitenland		12:38 - Pri	jzen supern	narktketen N	larqt heel n	orm >			
Politiek	Het gebruik van de douchegel met de stof 'Cocamidopropyl betaïne' kan leiden tot huidirritatie en uitslag. In geval van twijfel is aangeraden om een huidarts raad te plegen. Consumenten die dit product in hun bezit hebben, worden gevraagd om deze niet te gebruiken en ze meteen terug te brengen naar hun verkooppunt. Het product zal dan worden terugbetaald.		12:37 - Schrijver Pirates of the Caribbean aangek >						
			12:35 - Burgemeester Alphen wil niet ingaan op k						
Economie	net product zar dan worden terugbetaald.	12:33 - AZ en Werder Bremen akkoord over tran							
Geld	Eenspreker van 'FreshUp' deelde mee: "Wij bieden onze oprechte excuses aan! Wij betreuren het ten zeerste	Meer nieuws >							
Ondernemen	dat dit product in de winkel is gekomen. Hoe dit kon gebeuren weten wij echt niet, maar wij zijn er wel diep geschokt van. Wij vinden het spijtig dat sommige klanten sterk zijn getroffen door dit incident. Wij hechten veel								
Beurs	waarde aan een goede relatie met onze klanten en derhalve hebben wij inmiddels de controles nog verder								
Griekenland	aangescherpt zodat wij deze ernstige fout in de toekomst voorkomen. Alle andere producten zijn niet betrokken en kunnen dus zonder twijfel worden gebruikt.".	Spaarverzekering van DELA							
Sport			Vaste	rente	2,75%				

Beurs dou	verdor zaake overlast voor somminge consumenten. En is tets mis gelopen tijdens de protectie van zo.000 juchegels. De oorzaak is nog onbekend. Er wordt een onderzoek gestart om de oorzaak te achter halen. vendien zullen er meer controles uitgevoerd worden om zulke fouten in de toekomst te voorkomen. De	meer met						
0.1	spreker van 'FreshUp' deelde mee: "Het bedrijf wil zijn excuses aanbieden voor het eventuele ongemak en veroorzaakte overlast voor sommige consumenten. Er is iets mis gelopen tijdens de productie van 10.000	Meer nieuws >						
Economie _{Het} Geld	uitgevoerd. Uit voorzorg en om de veiligheid van de consument te waarborgen heeft de huidverzorgings- producten fabrikant 'FreshUp' besloten zijn douchegel uit de handel te nemen en roept deze terug bij de consumenten omwille van de mogelijke aanwezigheid van de stof 'Cocamidopropyl betaïne'. Dat meldde het bedrijf deze maandag. Het gebruik van de douchegel met de stof 'Cocamidopropyl betaïne' kan leiden tot huidirritatie en uitslag. In geval van twijfel is aangeraden om een huidarts raad te plegen. Consumenten die dit product in hun bezit hebben, worden gevraagd om deze niet te gebruiken en ze meteen terug te brengen naar hun verkooppunt. Het product zal dan worden terugbetaald.	12:33 - AZ en Werder Bremen akkoord over tran						
Politiek gev		12:37 - Schrijver Pirates of the Caribbean aangek 12:35 - Burgemeester Alphen wil niet ingaan op k						
Binnenland bed Buitenland		12:38 - Prijzen supermarktketen Marqt 'heel norm						
Net binnen uitg Algemeen pro		Net binnen Popula				ir		
ove	t is de eerste keer dat 'FreshUp' producten moet terugroepen. Op grond van klachten van consumenten er huidirritatie en uitslag na het gebruik van hun douchegel heeft 'FreshUp' grondige productcontroles	20 °C	1 NS	499,05	TV gids	0 Live		
Te	erugroepactie douchegel van 'FreshUp'	*	AĤ	<u>m</u>	ě	1		
@ □	insdag 04 augustus 2015 Het laatste nieuws het eerst op NU.nl Q							