CLAV2016
9th Latin American Retail Conference

Título do Artigo: **“Emotional Variables in Consumption of Counterfeits”**

Autor(es): ***Delane Botelho, Kirla Seronni Cardoso Ferreira, Felipe Gerhard, Lucas Lopes Ferreira de Souza, Webert Jannsen Pires de Santana***

Apoio

CAPES FAPESP FGV EAESP GVPESQUISA

Realização

FGV EAESP CENTRO DE EXCELÊNCIA EM VAREJO

Emotional Variables in Consumption of Counterfeits

Abstract:

In Brazil, the estimated trade in counterfeit products has been US$ 15 billion per year. The global market for counterfeit goods was estimated at more than US$ 600 billion in 2013, and it has also been linked to increasing global threats of drugs, arms and human trafficking, and terrorism. This paper investigates three emotional variables and their influence on attitude and behavior related to the purchase of counterfeit products. We suggest six propositions that can be tested empirically in future studies. Basically, for the emotion hope, when low income consumers hope for social status they may face the economic barrier of not affording original brands, and in such situation one alternative that emerges is buying a counterfeit product. For the emotion of fear, if it is enhanced (causing individuals to have lower propensity to risk) and hope is minimized (causing individuals lower intention to consume), the consumption of counterfeits may be diminished. Finally, the higher the guilt the higher the intention for behavior correction (not to purchase counterfeits), and such relationship may moderated by fear and hope. We provide insights for future research to test such propositions using experimental approach, so the role of the three emotions here discussed can be further understood in the counterfeit market.

Key-words: counterfeit; hope; fear; guilt; emotions.

INTRODUCTION

Counterfeits are illegally manufactured products that may be similar to the originals but are typically of lower quality in terms of performance, reliability, or durability, such as handbags and sunglasses. They are differentiated from pirated goods, which are exactly copies of the originals and are limited to technology products, such as software and other technological products (Lai & Zaichkowsky, 1999). Specifically, counterfeits are similar or identical reproductions of a trademarked brand, including packaging, labelling and trademark to intentionally mimic the original product (Phau & Tea, 2009). From the consumer's perspective, counterfeiting can be either deceptive or non-deceptive. Deceptive counterfeiting involves purchases in which consumers are not aware that the product they are buying is a counterfeit, as is often the case in categories such as automotive parts, consumer electronics, and pharmaceuticals (Grossman & Shapiro, 1988). In non-deceptive counterfeiting, which is the focus of this paper, consumers are aware that they are purchasing the counterfeit product, and it is particularly prevalent in luxury brand markets (Nia & Zaichkowsky, 2000). Consumers often distinguish counterfeits from original brands based on differences in price, quality and distribution channels, however the quality of counterfeit products has been improving over the past several years, approaching in many cases that of the original brand. This happens mainly by the shift of many luxury brand marketers in their pursuit for reducing production costs or outsourced manufacturing (Wilcox, Kim & Sen, 2009).

The global market for counterfeit goods was estimated at more than US$ 600 billion in 2013. As a comparative example, the estimate for drug trafficking in 2013 was US$ 360 billion (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2015). Although originated in categories such as apparel and luxury accessories, counterfeiting now affects a wide range of industries, and almost all product categories. The estimate for the trade of counterfeit products in 2015 worldwide is US$ 770 to US$ 960 billion, which may represent more than 8% of world trade

(Frontier Economics, 2011). In Brazil, the estimated trade in counterfeit products has been US$ 15 billion per year (International Trademark Association, 2015). The counterfeit trade has also been linked to increasing global threats of drugs, arms and human trafficking, and terrorism (Wilcox et al., 2009).

This paper investigates emotional variables and their influence on attitude and behavior related to the purchase of counterfeit products. The explanations on why consumers respond differently to the purchase of counterfeits is quite limited, and the understanding of the motivations behind the purchase of such products remains undefined in the marketing literature. Such motivations may be related to consumer emotional patterns. We suggest six propositions that can be tested empirically in future studies.

THEORY

Emotions are central in human experience, and they are somehow involved in every venture that people engage, encouraging or inhibiting specific actions. When a consumer chooses a product based on experience, she tends to emphasize emotional aspects considering subjective benefits; these same emotional aspects may also affect the choice between similar alternatives in terms of utility (Havlena & Holbrook, 1986). Even consumption activities that provide objective and tangible benefits, such as eating or dressing, may also contain a subjective, hedonic, or symbolic component (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). Understanding the nature of emotional reactions allows the comprehension of the process of brand/product choices, product or service usage and other aspects of consumer behavior.

Emotions are intense mental states of readiness that arise from appraisals one makes for something of relevance to one´s well-being, they are complex reactions to how we think we are surviving, flourishing and achieving what we wish for ourselves; they are often expressed physically, and may result in specific actions (Bagozzi, Gopinath and Nyer, 1999; Lazarus, 1991). They are often categorized in valence: i) positive emotions are associated with the realization of reaching a goal, a particular beneficial one, such as joy, hope and happiness; ii) negative emotions result from obstacles or failures to achieve a goal, such as anger, guilt and fear. Moral emotions are those that go beyond the direct interests of the self, such as pride, shame, guilt and gratitude (Haidt, 2003).

Interest for emotions in scientific marketing research started in the 1980s, after the publication of seminal articles in the field (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982; Ahtola, 1985). Since then, the role of emotions in the discipline has gained notoriety by stimulating new research on the subject (Richins, 1997; Bagozzi, 1997; Bagozzi, Gopinath & Nyer, 1999). While emotions originate from the individual context of interpretations (Frijda, 1987; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1991), they also play a role in motivating behavior, influencing individuals to take new decisions (Holbrook, Hirschman 1982; Ahtola, 1985).

Hope

Hope is an emotion that occurs when what one is expecting is good, something welcome and positive, beyond the control of the one who hopes (Pieper, 1994). It is present in our everyday life: we hope to look attractive, be part of a group, be safe or have a balanced life. Hope has also cognitive components, since it involves a combination of belief, which has cognitive purport, and desire, which does not (Day, 1991). It is a positive motivational state based on the success of energy directed to the motivational force (agency) and routes (pathways)

needed to achieve the desired goal, which may be the cure of a disease, graduating from university or buying a luxury handbag. Hope is the sum of this motivational force (agency) and pathways (pathways) to be taken to achieve the goal (Snyder, 2000). A goal is the final state that the individual seeks to achieve, so it must have enough value to occupy the conscious thought of the individual, so that she feels motivated to achieve it. If there is hope, there must be some uncertainty about the possibility of achieving the goal.

A number of fields have studied hope under different perspectives: i) in psychology, hope is the sum of perceived capabilities to produce routes to desired goals, along with the perceived motivation to use those routes, so people produce one or multiple routes (pathways) towards their goals, or even alternate routes when an obstacle is identified (Snyder, 2000); ii) in marketing, hope is a future oriented positive emotion that varies as a function of the degree of yearning for an uncertain, yet possible outcome, and consumers experience hope in three levels: they hope for objects, for outcomes and for selves (MacInnis & Chun, 2006). It is a construct that may affect consumer behavior and is related to outcomes that may or may not be realized: when the outcome hoped happens in the present, a person can feel joy or contentment, when it does not happen, she can feel anger, disappointment or another negative emotion. A consumer´s hope for objects is related to product acquisition, such as hope to have luxury clothes, fancy shoes or fashion sunglasses. When consumers hope for outcomes, they are trying to address current concerns, like hoping for material success, feeling more confident or losing weight. When they hope for selves, they have more macro level goals, as being successful, admired or acquiring social status.

One reason to explain counterfeit consumption could be the search for social status expressed into consumption of products, especially in low-income population, as money may be a barrier to obtain original products. Therefore, status-seeking consumers are more likely to present positive attitude towards counterfeits of luxury brands, due to incentives such as lower prices and product attributes and benefits that are similar to the original version (Phau & Teah, 2009). In addition, consumers' desire for counterfeit luxury brands may be based on social motivations (i.e., to express themselves and/or to fit in social norms), so such products may serve a social-adjustive function, when individuals consume to gain approval in social situations, a value-expressive function, helping them to express their beliefs, attitudes and values, or both (Wilcox et al., 2009). As a Brazilian example, the consumption patterns in the domain of *Funk Ostentação*, a type of music in which the MC's (master of ceremony) exhibit luxury products as expensive cars and jewelry, are financially impossible to be imitated by their fans, who mostly come from low income population. Such fans may use counterfeit products to achieve social status (Abdalla & Zambaldi, 2015). Accordingly, status-seeking is present in everyday life and people from different social classes usually find in goods and services pathways to reach or keep power and status. There is a conspicuous consumption of goods and services as a means to relate individuals to specific social classes, and the upper classes use certain objects to differentiate themselves from the other classes. At the time the lower social classes start symbolically using these objects, the upper social classes tend to abandon them and begin to seek for new products to symbolize their status (Veblen, 2007).

As people have hope to divergent goals, so they can hope, for example, for social status, through luxurious brands. In the case of low income consumers, when people hope for social status they may face the economic barrier of not affording original brands, and in such situation one alternative that emerges is buying a counterfeit product. When a high hope individual faces an obstacle (such as an economic barrier) to reach a goal (such as social status), she is more likely to consider alternative options (such as buying a counterfeit luxury

product for a cheaper price) to reach the goal, than a low hope individual. In such case hope may be seen as an antecedent for the consumer´s intention to buy counterfeits. As such, we propose that:

P1: When income is a limiting factor for a luxury original purchase, individuals with high hope to achieve social status are more likely to consider counterfeit products than individuals with less hope.

Now we turn to observe hope as a consequent of behavior or attitude. Attitudes toward one object can influence consumers´ preferences for other related object. For example, a social-adjustive attitude function toward luxury brands influence a counterfeit brand purchase, and consumers´ desire for counterfeit brands depends on whether such brands will fulfill the social goals according to their luxury brand preferences (Wilcox et al, 2009). Status evokes luxury and high quality, so consumers who are high in need for status, but do not have the financial means to buy luxury products, are especially prone to buy counterfeits as cheaper substitutes (Eckhardt, Belk & Wilson, 2015; Han, Nunes & Drèze, 2010). When a consumer desires approval in a social situation (social status) through luxury product consumption, consuming a counterfeit product will give her more hope to achieve it than consuming a non-luxury original product, since the last is not embedded with symbolic status. Thus:

P2.a: When income is a limiting factor on a luxury original purchase, consuming a counterfeit luxury product enhances more hope to achieve social status than consuming a non-luxury original product.

Since counterfeit luxury products have similar attributes of original ones, people could purchase a luxury counterfeit handbag and its benefits, such as elegance and exclusivity, leading them to experience social status. In this case, status was accomplished as an effect of a precedent action, which could be or not intentional. Thus, differently from P1, which states that higher hope motivates people to purchase counterfeit goods, in P2 we understand that the purchase of this kind of products unconsciously could promote a status feeling to consumers, and this turns stronger the hope for social status. Moreover, income may not be a defining factor in this relation, since upper and lower social classes could achieve a higher status due to purchasing of counterfeits. Then, as explained before (Veblen, 2007), upper classes will try to keep this social status, while lower classes will try to accomplish it, both through purchasing behavior. The same experience would not occur through purchase of non-luxury original goods, which are not embedded with symbolic status. So, such relationship should be tested also independent from income:

P2.b: Consuming a counterfeit luxury product enhances more hope to achieve social status than consuming a non-luxury original product.

Fear

Fear is one of the basic human emotions and can generate a positive or negative reaction depending on the perception of the situation (Plutchik, 1980; Lazarus, 1991). Fear of psychological disorganization and death has long been regarded as the major ideological and emotional force in human existence (Lazarus, 1991). Such emotion is one of the first to appear in human being development, still emerging in childhood, functioning to make individuals to escape threatening situations, so it is involved with danger and psychological

responses (Hille, Walsh & Cleveland, 2015). Four criteria are taken into account for emotions to be considered basic or primary: i) they are essentially psychological and pure; ii) they are found in all cultures; iii) they appear from birth up to one year of age; iv) they are emotions that guarantee the survival of the species, generating protection from danger, reproduction, guidance and exploration (Lazarus, 1991). The definition of basic emotions does not have a consensus in the literature, however common examples include anger, fear and love. Plutchik (1980) describes eight primary emotions: fear, surprise, sadness, disgust, anger, anticipation, joy and acceptance, and Izard (2013) listed ten primary emotions: interest-excitement, pleasure, joy, surprise, shock, stress, grief, anger, rage, disgust, revulsion, contempt, disdain, fear, terror, shame, shyness, humiliation, guilt and remorse. Most of the literature considers fear a primary emotion, so it is an emotion that every individual understands (Huang, 1998).

To understand the real meaning of fear, it may be important to differentiate it from emotions that can be similar. For example, fear and anxiety differs in the fact that fear has concrete threats, while anxiety is related to uncertain future threats (Lazarus, 1991), although some authors suggest that anxiety is part of fear (Lewis, Haviland-Jones & Barrett, 2010). Anxiety arises when there is fear for an event that the individual is not able to handle or when there is fear in an unresolved threatening situation (Lewis, Haviland-Jones & Barrett, 2010). Fear provides awareness about a specific situation, but also involves uncertainties, so individuals who are afraid are also risk averse (Lerner, Keltner, 2001). Risk occurs in situations in which decision is taken depending on future results and on the probability that the event occurs (Lopes, 1987). Besides fear being an emotion and risk perception an attitude, they also differ in that when risk is perceived individuals know the probability that something happens, and when there is fear individuals are unaware of such probability. Fear has an important intrinsic component, related to personal characteristics, while risk has an important extrinsic component to the individual. For example, in a purchase of counterfeit products, the risk is mainly related to external factors such as the functioning of product, the possibility of being arrested etc., while fear is related to how the individual feels about the occurrence of such things.

Basically there are six forms of perceived risk: i) financial (probability of losing money); ii) performance (probability that product or service does not perform as expected); iii) psychological (probability that the product or service does not suit the desired goals); iv) physical (probability that product or service is unsafe, hazardous or harmful); v) social (probability that product or service affects the individual´s image in her group); vi) time (probability that product or service causes loss of time for adaptation, exchange or search for information) (Fraedrich & Ferrell, 1992; Gomez & Rozano, 2012; Stone & Grønhaug, 1993). So risk is basically associated to the product or service, while fear is basically internal to the individual. Risk perception is analyzed in several counterfeit consumption studies (Ang et al., 2001; Wang, Zang & Ouyang, 2005; Matos, Ituassu & Rossi, 2007; Veloutsou & Bian, 2008; Michaelidou & Christodoulides, 2011; Souza et al, 2015), but fear is hardly addressed in such studies (Herstein, et al., 2015).

In consumer behavior, fear is often studied thought its appeal, so fear appeal is used to reduce consumption of products such as cigarettes, alcohol and drugs (Witte & Allen 2000; Passyn & Sujan, 2006; Binney & Brennan, 2010; Williams, 2012a, b). Although fear appeal is recognized as one of the main ways to draw individual attention (Dillard, 2016; Passyn, & Sujan, 2006), such appeal is controversial in the literature, since some authors argue that the greater the fear, the greater the persuasion (Witte & Allen, 2000). Others advocates that moderate fear has the highest possibility of persuasion, while very low or very high fear

decreases persuasion (Dillard, 2016; Ray & Wilkie, 1970). This happens because, for example, low-fear messages probably do not cause behavioral changes, and high-fear messages may stimulate the escaping from the situation, so the attention to the message is almost null. Despite the widely used practices of fear appeal, its effectiveness in behavioral change is not proven (Dillard, 2016). So, some authors suggested that the use of fear appeal along with other emotions may have a greater impact in consumer´s attention to avoid specific consumption (such as counterfeit). Fear appeal may also serve to produce an emotional connection (attachment) to a product or brand (Dunn & Hoegg, 2014). Thus, the use of fear appeal as a way to generate fear in a person for she to change her behavior can create the opposite desired effect; so when consuming, the individual may pervade such fear and build attachment to the product. Therefore, the use of fear appeal should be better understood so take the most advantage of its usage.

There can be no fear without hope, nor hope without fear (Spinoza, 1960). The occurrence of the two can generate positive and negative results (MacInnis & Chun, 2006). The relationship of hope with fear depends on whether one believes that something will happen or not, and whether the result is negative or positive. In line with this thought, Reimann et al. (2014) consider fear and hope as antagonistic emotions, but they can be observed in the same event. Figure 1 shows the two emotions happening simultaneously. Suppose the positive outcome is to lose weight, and the negative outcome is to cause damage to the body. If consumers think the positive outcome will occur (quadrant 1), there is high hope; if consumers think the negative outcome will occur (quadrant 3), there is high fear; if consumers think the positive outcome will not occur (quadrant 2), there is low fear; and if consumers think the negative outcome will not occur (quadrant 4), there is high hope.

Figure 1 - Outcomes and the relationship between fear and hope.

		Consumers think that the outcome:	
		Will occur	Will not occur
The outcome is considered:	Positive	1 **Losing weight** High Hope	2 **Not losing weigh** Low Fear
	Negative	3 **Causing damage** High Fear	4 **Not causing damage** High Hope

Source: Adapted from MacInnis and Chun (2006).

Showers (1992) observed that people who focus on negative outcomes felt emotionally worse than those who focus on positive ones. Thus, asymmetries between fear and hope can lead consumers to consume products that facilitate avoiding negative results. Finally, when the person becomes more hopeful that something positive will occur, fear about something negative will occur diminishes (MacInnis & Chun, 2006). So, fear along with the hope presents differences in the results expected by consuming a product. In the case of counterfeits the importance of this aspect may be notable: if the individual is fearful, but the

outcome is positive, the product attachment is strengthened, so the consumer may develop identity with the counterfeit product. Kim, Cho & Johnson (2009) found that those who consumed counterfeit previously tend to repeat consumption, so focus should be devoted to avoid the consumption for the first time or to ensure that consumption has negative results (Perez Castaño & Quintanilla 2009; Bian & Moutinho, 2009;). Thus we propose that:

P3: Fear appeal is effective only when the outcome will occur, and will be negative, so no attachment to the counterfeit product is developed.

This proposition suggests that fear appeal has the ability to change behavior, but its improper use may generate opposite effect. For example, in the case of controlled drugs is taken without prescription and the outcome is as expected, an attachment to the drug may be developed. Thus, the fear appeal should be used mainly in cases in which the outcome is negative. In the case of government advertisements to reduce consumption of counterfeits, they should focus on the damage to the consumer (such as the case of counterfeit sun glasses that are harmful to the eyes).

Fear and hope are important issues in risk taking (MacInnis & Chun, 2006; Reimann et al, 2014.). The higher the fear, the lower the propensity to risk; and the higher the hope, the higher the propensity to risk (Reimann et al., 2014). So those three variables may be useful to understand the consumption of counterfeits. In previous research on counterfeit consumption, although consumers perceive risk, they still have high favorable attitude towards the product and, therefore, high purchase intention. If fear is enhanced (causing individuals to have lower propensity to risk) and hope is minimized (causing individuals lower intention to consume), the consumption of counterfeits may be diminished. So, we propose that:

P4: The greater the hope that the outcome will be positive and the lower the risk perception that something negative will happen, the higher the purchase intention of counterfeits.

P5: The greater the fear that the outcome will be negative and the higher the risk perception that something negative will happen, the lower the purchase intention of counterfeits

So risk perception may be evaluated as a moderator in the relationship between hope, fear, and purchase intention of counterfeits.

Guilt

Negative valence emotions include guilt (Lazarus , 1991), which is characterized as a negative condition experienced by the individual in response to adverse events and judged as deserved (Roseman, 1984). It is often related to harmful situations, such as addictive (Elliott, 1994), compulsive (O'Guinn & Faber, 1989) and impulsive consumption (Rook, 1987). The experience of positive events judged as undeserved by the individual may also lead her to feel guilty. In common to both ways of experiencing it, is the emergence of a state of dissonance between actions taken and their perceived consequences, which inform the individual about the violation of personal or social normative standards (Tangney et al., 1996).

Guilt is defined as an emotion arising from the failure of self-regulatory processes, due to the default values and internalized principles by the individual (Lazarus, 1991; Baumeister,

Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994). Even though there is no consensus in the literature about whether guilt has or not universal characteristics, there is some agreement about the influence of social factors on the guilt formation process. Unlike some basic emotions, such as anger and fear, guilt derives from cognitive faculties of the individual related to moral issues (Rodríguez- Torrez et al., 2005; Tracy & Robins 2007). Thus, the emotion originates from incongruities between the right and wrong conceptions held by the individual, concepts that are socially constructed. By requiring the acquisition of social components to its origin, guilt is understood as an interpersonal emotion, in contrast to uniquely intrapersonal emotions (Baumeister, Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994). The essential features of interpersonal emotions, as well as their delimitations, are defined by the presence or action of another individual. Moral standards of conduct, constructed from the assimilation of socially shared norms, are internalized and influence the manner, intensity and moment of their emergence. On the other hand, although intrapersonal emotions may also be socially molded, they have less influence of social context, being categorized as more basic or instinctive emotions, such as fear or hope (Lazarus, 1991; Baumeister, Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994).

Unlike shame, in which the individual evaluates global issues related to the self or to the ideal self, guilt arises from a moral transgression due to a specific action or a desire to do it (Lazarus, 1991; Lewis, 2008). So, guilt is defined as a self-conscious emotion directed to behavior (Lazarus, 1991; Lewis, 2008). It is determined from the submissiveness of the individual to cognitive processes of self-evaluation, in which are simulated alternative options of behavior or critical evaluations of past actions consequences (Baumeister, Stillwell & Heatherton, 1994; Tracy & Robins 2007). Self-conscious emotions, such as guilt, shame, pride and embarrassment, have received far less attention than others in the marketing literature, mainly due to the difficulty of presenting types of events that encourage individuals to feel such emotions (Lewis, 2008). Unlike fear or happiness, which are achieved in more or less uniform events among people, self-conscious emotions require events that are often identified by only individuals themselves (Lewis, 2008).

Emotions related to self- accountability processes (i.e. guilt, regret, pride) are able to motivate changes in behavioral intentions of consumers (Passyn & Sujan, 2006; Antonetti & Maklan, 2014). When in conjunction with other emotions, they act in a vital way in the search for individual behavior changes - either approach or avoidance (Antonetti & Baines, 2015). Guilt is an emotion that may predict an individual's post-consumption behavior (Soscia, 2007). In the case of counterfeit products, consumers experiencing stronger moral emotions, especially guilt and shame, have less intention of purchasing such items (Zampetakis , 2014). Similarly, during situations of consumption of non-deceptive counterfeit products, moral emotions are the most strongly experienced (Kim , Cho & Johnson , 2009).

However, the great challenge to instill guilt in a particular practice of consumption is the need of the individual to submit herself to cognitive processes of self-assessment, since the contexts that are able to take her to morality consider her actions should be almost individually customized (Lewis, 2008; Antonetti & Baines, 2015). Similarly, although it is characterized as an emotion more useful to stimulate corrections in specific actions, guilt has lower intensity than other moral emotions, as shame for example, which may hinder the necessary motivation to behavior changes (Lewis, 2008). The individual will only feel guilty if she becomes aware of the actions taken, or desired, if in fact they infringe internalized moral standards from social norms. After that, however, as it is categorized as a painful emotion, she seeks to resolve the guilt through conscious processes or unconscious self-protection, either directed to the behavior or the emotion itself (Antonetti & Baines, 2015). If

the self-protection is directed to emotion, the individual creates counter-arguments that detract from the need to change their behavioral intentions. On the other hand, by focusing on the dissolution of the behavior, the individual seeks not to repeat the same acts in order to not experience guilt again (Lazarus, 1991; Tangney et al., 1996). As self- accountability processes operate only from a complex combination of factors, including moral aspect, specific context and inclination to solving a behavior, other emotions must act together with guilt to reduce counterfeit consumption behavior (Antonetti & Baines, 2015) .

To change a specific behavior, the use of fear and hope in association with guilt would bring more decisive results, as they are able to enhance or reduce its effect on individuals with low involvement with social standards. Thus, if an individual has high fear and low hope, both represent a kind of shortcut to achieve guilt; on the other hand, a high intensity of hope and a low intensity of fear may hinder their reach. One of the mechanisms of social pattern transmission is fear, which can be directly translated into guilt (Freud, 1963). Guilt and fear are capable of influencing consumer behavior, they are emotions that operate on the action and perform together in the perception of self-responsibility (Passyn & Sujan, 2006; Williams, 2012b). Guilt comes after self-assessment of the negative consequences of an action, opening room for fear to act so that such actions are not repeated. Hope, on the other hand, may create barriers to guilt and, consequently, to behavior changes. When hope is high, the individual may prepare counter-arguments to weaken the negative consequences of an event, if it has not been successful (MacInnes & Mello, 2005). This setting can hinder an individual's engagement in self-accountability processes, softening the intensity of guilt. In this case, it seeks self-protection directed to emotion, instead of changing a specific behavior (Antonetti & Baines, 2015).

In summary, despite guilt is characterized as an important factor in changing individual behavior, it is necessary the awareness of the actions taken and the use of coping strategies directed to the behavior to correct the conduct. The uniqueness of this combination and the relatively low intensity of guilt to drive the individual to correct the behavior require that other emotions are used together to induce the individual to more easily undergo self-accountability processes (Lewis, 2008; Antonetti & Baines, 2015). Guilt may not alone be able to drive individual behavior change, but may influence intentions to change it. However, behavioral correction may be achieved only after the initial stimulus caused by guilt. The individual only undergoes self-accountability processes if they are motivated by the experience of emotion. These processes, in turn, induce the individual to re-evaluate and correct the behavior, which will actually be corrected if there is the presence of emotions such as fear and hope.

P6: The higher the guilt the higher the intention for behavior correction (not to purchase counterfeits), and such relationship is moderated by fear and hope.

FINAL REMARKS

Despite some recent Brazilian studies in the area (Souza et al., 2015), most studies in the marketing literature investigates consumption of counterfeit products in developed countries such as the US (Wilcox et al, 2009; Marcketti & Shelly, 2009), or comparisons between developed countries and China (Bian & Veloutsou, 2007). More understanding of the motivations behind the counterfeit purchase remains undefined in the marketing literature

(Wilcox et al., 2009). Such reasons may be related to consumer emotional characteristics, so here there may be a theoretical contribution of this article.

Understanding the mechanisms that explain the motivations individuals have to purchase or not counterfeits may have several implications. Practical implications for all stakeholders interested in the market: government, consumers, producers and retailers. The government should be active in implementing laws against counterfeiting because it affects: i) the level of employment (about two million jobs fail to be created in Brazil because of counterfeit in 2014), ii) tax evasion (according to the National Council to Combat piracy, 2014, Brazil fails to collect US $ 40 billion a year to piracy and counterfeiting), iii) the protection of consumers (counterfeiting causes damage to the consumer, since the products are lower quality and do not have a warranty) and iv) foreign direct investment (for example, Ralph Lauren company stopped investing in Brazil because of product counterfeiting). Producers and retailers can develop communication campaigns in an effort to raise awareness of consumers about the benefits of legal trade for the economy, for the maintenance of employment and the consumer's own welfare.

This paper has some limitations. Besides being strictly theoretical, we do not clarify for which categories other than luxury brands our propositions are adequate. Future research should test them using experimental approach, so the role of the three emotions here discussed can be further understood in the counterfeit market. We hope to stimulate future research that verify our propositions and provide empirical evidences that contribute to investigate this phenomenon in marketing and consumer behavior contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Abdalla, C. C., & Zambaldi, F. (2015). Ostentation and funk: An integrative model of extended and expanded self theories under the lenses of compensatory consumption. *International Business Review*.
2. Ahtola, O. T. (1985). Hedonic and Utilitarian Aspects of Consumer Behavior: An Attitudinal Perspective. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *12*(1), p. 7-10.
3. Albers-Miller, N. D. (1999). Consumer misbehavior: why people buy illicit goods. *Journal of consumer Marketing*, *16*(3), p. 273-287.
4. Ang, S., Cheng, P., Lim, E. A., & Tambyah, S. (2001). Spot the difference: consumer responses towards counterfeits. *Journal of consumer Marketing*, *18*(3), 219-235.
5. Antonetti, P. & Baines, P. (2015). Guilt in Marketing Research: An Elicitation–Consumption Perspective and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *17*(3), p. 333-355.
6. Antonetti, P. & Maklan, S. (2014). Feelings that make a difference: How guilt and pride convince consumers of the effectiveness of sustainable consumption choices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *124*(1), p. 117-134.
7. Bagozzi, R. P. (1997). Goal-Directed behaviors in marketing: Cognitive and emotional perspectives. *Psychology & Marketing (1986-1998)*, *14*(6), p. 539.
8. Bagozzi, R. P., Gopinath, M., & Nyer, P. U. (1999). The role of emotions in marketing. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *27*(2), 184-206.
9. Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: an interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, p. 243-267.
10. Bian, X., & Moutinho, L. (2009). An investigation of determinants of counterfeit purchase consideration. *Journal of business research*, *62*(3), 368-378.

11. Brennan, L., & Binney, W. (2010). Fear, guilt, and shame appeals in social marketing. *Journal of business Research*, *63*(2), 140-146.
12. Burnett, M. S. & Lunsford, D. A. (1994). Conceptualizing guilt in the consumer decision-making process. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *11*(3), p. 33-43.
13. Chaudhry, P. E. & Stumpf, S. A. (2011). Consumer complicity with counterfeit products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *28*(2), p. 139-151.
14. Dahl, D., Honea, H., & Manchanda, R. (2003). The nature of self-reported guilt in consumption contexts. *Marketing Letters*, 14, p. 159-171.
15. Dillard, J. P., Li, R., Meczkowski, E., Yang, C., & Shen, L. (2016). Fear Responses to Threat Appeals Functional Form, Methodological Considerations, and Correspondence Between Static and Dynamic Data.*Communication Research*, 0093650216631097.
16. Dunn, L., & Hoegg, J. (2014). The impact of fear on emotional brand attachment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *41*(1), 152-168.
17. Eastman, J. K., Fredenberger, B., Campbell, D., & Calvert, S. (1997). The Relationship between Status Consumption and Materialism: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Chinese, Mexican, and American Student. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *5*(1), 52-66.
18. Eisend, M. & Schuchert-Güler, P. (2006). Explaining counterfeit purchases: A review and preview. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, *12*(6), p. 1-25.
19. Elliott, R. (1994). Addictive consumption: Function and fragmentation in postmodernity. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *17*(2), p. 159-179.
20. Fraedrich, J. P., & Ferrell, O. C. (1992). The impact of perceived risk and moral philosophy type on ethical decision making in business organizations.*Journal of Business Research*, *24*(4), 283-295.
21. Freud, S. (1963). *The problem of anxiety* (H. A. Bunker, Trans.). New York: Norton. (Original work published 1936).
22. Fridja, N. H. (1987). Emotion, cognitive structures and action tendency. *Cognition and Emotion*, *1*, p. 115-143.
23. Frontier Economics (2011). Estimating the global economic and social impacts of counterfeiting and piracy. Disponível em: http://www.iccwbo.org/Advocacy-Codes-and-Rules/BASCAP/BASCAP-Research/Economic-impact/Global-Impacts-Study/. Acesso em: 1/7/2015.
24. Gómez, M., & Rozano, M. (2012). Consumer Dynamics in a Nonmature Generic Drugs Market A Causal Model Explaining Intention to Purchase in Spain. *Drug Information Journal*, *46*(2), 207-215.
25. Grossman, Gene M. and Carl Shapiro (1988), "Foreign Counter feiting of Status Goods," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 103 (February), 79-100.
26. Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. *Handbook of affective sciences*, *11*, 852-870.
27. Havlena, W. J., & Holbrook, M. B. (1986). The varieties of consumption experience: comparing two typologies of emotion in consumer behavior. *Journal of consumer research*, 394-404.
28. Herstein, R., Drori, N., Berger, R., & Barnes, B. R. (2015). Anticounterfeiting Strategies and Their Influence on Attitudes of Different Counterfeit Consumer Types. *Psychology & Marketing*, *32*(8), 842-859.
29. Hille, P., Walsh, G., & Cleveland, M. (2015). Consumer Fear of Online Identity Theft: Scale Development and Validation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *30*, 1-19.
30. Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *The Journal of Marketing*, 92-101.
31. Holbrook, M. B. & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of consumer research*, p. 132-140.

32. Huang, M. H. (1998). Exploring a new typology of advertising appeals: basic, versus social, emotional advertising in a global setting. *International Journal of Advertising*, *17*(2), 145-168.
33. International Trademark Association (2015), "Fact sheets protecting a trademark", available at: www.inta.org/TrademarkBasics/FactSheets/Pages/Counterfeiting.aspx. Acesso em: 4/4/2016.
34. Izard, C. (Ed.). (2013). Emotions in personality and psychopathology. Springer Science & Business Media.
35. Kim, J. E., & KP Johnson, K. (2014). Shame or pride? The moderating role of self-construal on moral judgments concerning fashion counterfeits. *European Journal of Marketing*, *48*(7/8), 1431-1450.
36. Kim, J. E., Cho, H. J., & Johnson, K. K. (2009). Influence of moral affect, judgment, and intensity on decision making concerning counterfeit, gray-market, and imitation products. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, *27*(3), 211-226.
37. Lai, K. K. Y., & Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1999). Brand imitation: do the Chinese have different views?. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *16*(2), 179-192.
38. Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Emotion and Adaptation, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
39. Lee, S. H. & Yoo, B. (2010). Antecedents of Attitudes toward Counterfeits of Luxury Brands: a Consumer Misbehavior Model Perspective. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *37*, p. 847-848.
40. Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *81*(1), 146.
41. Lewis, M. (2008). Self-Conscious emotions. In *Handbook of emotions* (3rd edition). Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J. & Barrett, L. F. New York: The Guilford Press.
42. Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J. M., & Barrett, L. F. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of emotions*. Guilford Press.
43. Lindsey, L. L. M. (2005). Anticipated guilt as behavioural motivation. *Human Communication Research, 31*, p. 453–481.
44. Lopes, L. L. (1987). Between hope and fear: The psychology of risk. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *20*(3), 255-295.
45. MacInnis, D. J. & De Mello, G. E. (2005). The concept of hope and its relevance to product evaluation and choice. *Journal of Marketing*, *69*(1), p. 1-14.
46. MacInnis, D. J., & Chun, H. E. (2006). *Understanding hope and its implications for consumer behavior: I hope, therefore I consume*. Now Publishers Inc.
47. MacInnis, D. J., & Chun, H. E. (2007). *Understanding hope and its implications for consumer behavior: I hope, therefore I consume*. Now Publishers Inc.
48. Matos, C., Ituassu, C., & Rossi, C. A. (2007). Consumer attitudes toward counterfeits: a review and extension. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *24*(1), 36-47.
49. Michaelidou, N., & Christodoulides, G. (2011). Antecedents of attitude and intention towards counterfeit symbolic and experiential products. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *27*(9-10), 976-991.
50. Nia, A., & Lynne Zaichkowsky, J. (2000). Do counterfeits devalue the ownership of luxury brands?. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *9*(7), 485-497.
51. O'Guinn, T. C., & Faber, R. J. (1989). Compulsive buying: A phenomenological exploration. *Journal of consumer research*, p. 147-157.
52. Passyn, K. & Sujan, M. (2006). Self-accountability emotions and fear appeals: motivating behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, p. 583-589.
53. Perez, M. E., Castaño, R., & Quintanilla, C. (2010). Constructing identity through the consumption of counterfeit luxury goods. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *13*(3), 219-235.

54. Phau, I., & Teah, M. (2009). Devil wears (counterfeit) Prada: a study of antecedents and outcomes of attitudes towards counterfeits of luxury brands.*Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *26*(1), 15-27.
55. Pieper, J. (1994). *Hope and History*. Ignatius Press.
56. Plutchik, R. (1980),"A General Psychoevolutionary Theory of Emotion," in Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience, 1. Theories of Emotion, Robert Plutchik, Henry Kellerman, editors. New York: Academic. 3–33.
57. Ray, M. L., & Wilkie, W. L. (1970). Fear: The potential of an appeal neglected by marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 54-62.
58. Reimann, M., Nenkov, G. Y., MacInnis, D., & Morrin, M. (2014). The role of hope in financial risk seeking. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*,*20*(4), 349.
59. Richins, M. L. (1997). Measuring emotions in the consumption experience.*Journal of consumer research*, *24*(2), p. 127-146.
60. Rodríguez-Torres, R., Leyens, J. P., Pérez, A. R., Rodriguez, V. B., Quiles del Castillo, M. N., Demoulin, S., & Cortés, B. (2005). The lay distinction between primary and secondary emotions: A spontaneous categorization? *International Journal of Psychology*, *40*(2), p. 100-107.
61. Rook, D. (1987). The buying impulse. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14, p. 189-199.
62. Roselius, T.. (1971). Consumer Rankings of Risk Reduction Methods. *Journal of Marketing*, *35*(1), 56–61.
63. Roseman, I. J. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotion: A structural theory. *Review of Personality and Social P.sychology, 5*, 11-36.
64. Roseman, I. J. (1991). Appraisal determinants of discrete emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, *5*, p. 161-200.
65. Rucker, D. D., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Desire to acquire: Powerlessness and compensatory consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *35*(2), 257-267.
66. Santos, L. O. D. (2003). O medo contemporâneo: abordando suas diferentes dimensões. *Psicologia: ciência e profissão*, *23*(2), 48-49.
67. Showers, C. (1992), 'The motivational and emotional consequences of considering positive or negative possibilities for an upcoming event'. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology63, 474–484.
68. Snyder, C. R. (Ed.). (2000). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. Academic press.
69. Solomon, R. C. (2007). *True to our feelings: What our emotions are really telling us*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
70. Souza, L. L. F., Sousa, F. G. P., Ferreira, M. A. B., & Mota, M. O. (2015). O Consumo de Produtos Falsificados no Brasil. *Revista de Administração FACES Journal*, *14*(2), p. 94-112.
71. Spinoza, B. (1960), 'The Origin and Nature of the Emotions'. In: Spinoza's Ethics. Dent: Everyman.
72. Stone, R. N., & Grønhaug, K. (1993). Perceived risk: Further considerations for the marketing discipline. *European Journal of marketing*, *27*(3), 39-50.
73. Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. H. (1996). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *70*(6), p. 1256-1269.
74. Tracy, J. L. & Robins, R. W. (2007). The self in selfconscious emotions: a cognitive appraisal approach. In Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., & Tangney, J. P. (eds), *The Self-conscious Emotions – Theory and Research*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press, p. 3-21.

75. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2014). World Drug Report 2014. Disponível em: http://www.unodc.org/documents/wdr2014/World_Drug_Report_2014_web.pdf. Acesso em: 4/4/2016.
76. Veblen, T. (2007). The theory of the leisure class. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
77. Veloutsou, C., & Bian, X. (2008). A cross-national examination of consumer perceived risk in the context of non-deceptive counterfeit brands. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *7*(1), 3-20.
78. Wang, C. C. (2005). Factors that influence the piracy of DVD/VCD motion pictures. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, *6*(1), p. 231-237.
79. Wang, F., Zhang, H., Zang, H., & Ouyang, M. (2005). Purchasing pirated software: an initial examination of Chinese consumers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *22*(6), 340-351.
80. Wilcox, K., Kim, H. M., & Sen, S. (2009). Why do consumers buy counterfeit luxury brands?. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *46*(2), 247-259.
81. Williams, K. C. (2012a). Improving fear appeal ethics. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, *5* (1).
82. Williams, K. C. (2012b). Fear appeal theory. *Research in Business and Economics Journal*, *5* (1).
83. Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for effective public health campaigns. *Health education & behavior*, *27*(5), 591-615.