The Effect of Price Fairness on Negative Consumption Emotion of Airline Passengers
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Abstract
Pricing remains a crucial phenomenon for companies operating in a competitive environment. When it comes to selecting a service, price often tends to be a significant consideration for most customers. The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between price fairness and negative consumption emotion of passengers towards airline services. The respondents of this study are passengers who have travelled within one year from/to or within Malaysia using full-service airlines or low-cost carriers. The data was collected using online survey. Data analysis was done using SPSS and PLS-SEM software where 197 responses were suitable for analysis. The findings show that price fairness has negative relationship with negative consumption emotion. This indicates that price fairness plays an important role in reducing negative emotion of the passengers regardless of the situation. The findings of this study can assist airline managers towards understanding the negative impact of negative emotions, and thus provide managers with insights on balancing between fair price and good service.
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Introduction
Price has been regarded as the primary competitive advantage that can motivate consumers’ choice of airline service (Park et al., 2020). The concept of price fairness is becoming more important to managers as they continuously seek for a competitive edge over others. However, the aviation business, like all other industries, is also faced with obstacles. In recent times, the aviation industry revenue has been hit with the worst of the COVID-19 outbreak (Azougagh & Rao, 2022; Gudmundsson, Cattaneo, & Redondi, 2021; Jalil, 2020; Karim, Haque, Anis, & Ulfy, 2020; M. Kim & Sohn, 2022). Kim and Kim (2018) claimed that higher revenue and greater profitability are consequences of a higher level of consumption, customers’ willingness to pay more, brand loyalty, and existing customers’ repeat purchase. Another issue of great concern for airline managers is intense competition that has also led to price-dominated rivalries between new and established airlines. Existing research posits that frequent price changes often reduce price transparency. This is eminently, particularly, for price-sensitive consumers who are often left with uncertainty as to whether they have achieved a 'fair price' or not (Bisignani, 2011). This perception often drives customers to websites seeking for a 'better deal,' focusing on price as the key feature of the product (Bisignani, 2011; He, Le, Guo, & Yin, 2019).

Kurtulmuşoğlu et al. (2016) noted that airline passengers are rational decision makers. Hence, they are often price sensitive. Recent studies have shown that travelers benefit from the competitive environment where a wide selection of airline services and affordable airline fares are available (S. Park et al., 2020). Price fairness plays an important role in the customers’ feelings towards the service providers. Emotions are known as the antecedents to customers' interpretations of the thing that unfolds or changes as a result of a crisis in all situations (Yeo, Pang, Cheong, & Yeo, 2019). It was argued that airlines do not consider one of the most important metrics: human emotions (Hadjetian, 2016). Thus, during a period like COVID-19 pandemic, service providers must ensure that service receivers have a great experience, otherwise, they will complain and tell others about their bad experience (Petzer, Meyer, Svari, & Svensson, 2012; Shen & Yahya, 2021; Svari, Slätten, Svensson, & Edvardsson, 2011; White & Yu, 2005). Making decisions on where to travel may be very exhilarating for tourists (Ortaleza & Mangali, 2021). For instance, negative emotions have been discovered to have a significant practical impact on the public's willingness and ability to travel during COVID-19 (Lamb et al., 2021). This means that negative emotions are sometimes the consequences of certain critical incidents. In view of this, the current study seeks to explore price fairness on passengers’ negative emotion during the Covid-19 period.

Literature Review

Price Fairness
Price fairness is essential in avoiding the negative effects of perceived unfair pricing policy. It is important for marketing managers to study price fairness perceptions because these perceptions are empirically linked to a variety of positive and negative outcomes (Ferguson, Brown, & Johnston, 2017). Investigation shows that price fairness is commonly combined with an appraisal of how fair a price adjustment is perceived (Graciola, Toni, Lima, & Milan, 2018). The concept of price fairness is becoming more important to managers as they continuously seek for a competitive edge over their rivals. Malc, Mumel and Pisnik (2016) stated that price fairness can help prevent unfair exploitation of the consumers. Namkung and Jang (2010) argued that price fairness is about “a consumer's overall judgment of price based on a comparison of the actual price to acceptable prices. This judgment is influenced by both social standards (that is the reference price) and self-interest (that is the adaptation level)” Price fairness refers to the passengers’ overall judgment of a reasonable and just price paid by consumers for a particular benefit or based on a comparison of the actual price to acceptable prices determined by
both social standards (reference price) and self-interest (adaptation level) (Babin, Hardesty, & Suter, 2003; Bolton, Warlop, & Alba, 2003; Hwang & Hyun, 2017; Namkung & Jang, 2010).

Customers’ perception of price fairness may be drawn from the Equity Theory concept (Ramaseshan & Ouschan, 2017; Konuk, 2019; Malc, Mumel, & Pisnik, 2016). Equity theory argues that parties involved in social exchanges compare the ratios of their inputs with each other into the exchange to their outcomes from the exchange (Konuk, 2019). This means that customers compare the input they contribute (for example, spending money on premium airline tickets) to the output they receive from the firm (e.g., loyalty program reward). Nonetheless, Škare and Gospić (2015) mentioned that customers’ perception of price fairness is often subjective, as such, it is influenced by various factors which determine whether a customer will perceive the price to be fair or not. Other studies have also found similar evaluating factors used by customers to determine the level of fairness of service prices (Ismagilova, Dwivedi, & Slade, 2020; Graciola et al., 2018).

In the context of the airline industry, similar scenario occurs with the passengers (Chung & Petrick, 2013). Passengers who perceive fairness in the price offered are more likely to continue using the airline even if their price has increased. This means that price is one of the primary major factors for competitive advantage to drive passengers’ interest towards an airline (Park et al., 2020). To keep customers satisfied, Martín-Consuegra, Molina, and Esteban (2007) posit that service industries such as airlines should enhance price fairness as a threshold factor as this will likely predict customer loyalty (Liao, Tseng, Cheng, & Teng, 2020). This is further supported by Chung and Petrick (2013), who argued that price fairness is often considered an antecedent of customer loyalty. This is evident in some studies which have examined the factors influencing passenger loyalty towards traditional and low-cost airlines. The study of Mikulić and Prebežac (2011) found a strong effect of price that drives passengers towards low-cost carriers. However, for full-service carriers, the customers are more focused on service elements such as frequency and on-time performance, rather than price.

Given the above findings, it shows that price fairness may positively influence behavioral loyalty (Chung & Petrick, 2013). However, competing on price alone may not be enough to maintain market leader in a fiercely competitive industry. To this end, airlines are expected to uphold service quality; they should justify that their quality is worth paying for. This will therefore minimize passengers’ sensitivity to price (Kurtulmuşoğlu et al., 2016). In a study by Malc et al. (2016), attempts were made to examine the consequences of price fairness perception, to explain the role of emotions, and to present behavioral reactions to unfair price differences. It was found that price fairness is not the only factor that influences the customers’ intention in making purchases; there are also some forms of negative behavioral factors that can directly jeopardize the sellers’ interest such as negative word of mouth, complaints, or the customers actually leaving the seller. Besides that, consumers may feel that a situation is unjust if there is unfair pricing or price change (Isabella, Mazzon, & Dimoka, 2017).

In other words, it is relatively important to understand consumers’ reference point(s) of view and how they judge price fairness. This suggests that marketers are expected to be better equipped in managing fairness in pricing (Yu & Nguyen, 2015). Xia and Monroe (2010) explained that customers are vigilant about the following characteristics when determining price fairness in any transaction: equitable, reasonable, or justifiable. Setiawan, Wati, Wardana, and Bramulya Ikhsan (2020) measured price using two dimensions; comparable options and consumer knowledge. when determining price fairness, consumers often consider other aspects of pricing when determining price fairness. These aspects include checking the similarity of ticket price offered to other consumers, or those offered by agents or similar airlines (comparable options). In addition, the passengers may also compare the price offered and their expectations as well as the facilities received (consumer knowledge). Hence, the current study defines price
fairness as the passengers’ overall judgment of a reasonable and just price paid for a particular benefit received.

**Negative Emotion**
Izard (1991, p.14) defined emotion as “a feeling that motivates, organizes, and guides perception, thought, and action” (Mattsson, Lemmink, & Mecoll, 2004). According to Harti (2019), emotions are considered as the main drivers in the whole process of decision-making. Consumption emotion is defined as a set of emotional responses elicited specifically during product usage or consumption experience (Sarwari, 2017). Consumption emotion may be classified as positive or negative (Jang & Namkung 2009; Mishra, Bakshi, & Singh, 2016; Richins, 1997). Negative consumption emotion is unfavorable experience of the passengers with associated feelings e.g., anger toward the airline services (Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005; Gong, Park, & Hyun, 2020; Ouyang, Gursoy, & Sharma, 2017; Tronvoll, 2011). Negative customer emotion can be associated with feelings such as anger, contempt and nervousness; as found in the study of Chebat and Slusarczyk (2005); T. Gong et al. (2020); Ouyang et al., (2017); and Tronvoll, (2011) . Negative consumption emotion such as angry consumers may have a different goal negative word of mouth (e.g., taking revenge on a service provider) compared to consumers who experience regret (for example, warning other people for having a similar negative experience) (Wetzer, Zeelenberg, & Pieters, 2007). It has also been established that customer anxiety or the actual experience of a negative emotion will diminish the likelihood of trying out new things, products, or services such as declining the usage of new technology services (Jang & Namkung, 2009; San-Martín, Jiménez, & Líbana-Cabanillas, 2020).

Given the context of the current study, the anxiety of flight passengers seems to be a complex phenomenon. It is composed of a variety of underlying factors that generally fall into two categories of personal and situational factors (Batouei, Iranmanesh, Nikbin, & Hyun, 2019). For instance, passengers are likely to express fear and anxiety; the former is an intense emotional reaction to a defined threat with comparatively shorter duration while the latter is the anticipation of threat from more abstract and vague events (Antoniadou, Sandiford, Wright, & Alker, 2018). Currently, many individuals are afraid of contracting the COVID-19 virus, and thus are more vigilant about the disease. Recent studies have shown the probable existence of a certain level of anxiety (i.e., negative emotion) in the passengers (Lamb, Winter, Rice, Ruskin, & Vaughn, 2020). Due to the small and tight space of an aircraft, the passengers who are often from different nations are placed in close proximity to each other for long periods of time. This increases their perception of contracting the virus (Powley, Hollinger, & Peel, 2020). Based on this reason, it may be concluded that the passengers’ negative emotion may pose notable obstacles for them to be satisfied (Park et al., 2019). In view of this, negative emotion in the current study is associated with the passengers’ unfavorable experience and feelings towards the airline service.

**Price Fairness and Negative Consumption Emotion**
Price fairness can be a double-edged sword; it can have either positive or negative effects on emotion. In the study of Namkung and Jang (2010), price fairness was conceptualized as a crucial component of customer sacrifice. Their finding shows that price fairness is the most important criteria for generating negative emotion. It was suggested that managers should seriously consider the importance of price fairness and its potential in avoiding negative emotion.

Isabella et al. (2017) aimed to confirm whether the participants felt were angry with regard to perceived price fairness. Based on a manipulation check, it was revealed that price change evoked negative emotions. The researchers suggested that there are different types of negative emotions associated with the perception of fairness. For example, a truly unfair perception is accompanied by strong negative emotions such as anger and outrage. The negative
feelings then often trigger negative reaction towards the seller (Yu & Nguyen, 2015). Lii and Sy (2009) conducted a study on internet differential pricing by examining its effects on consumer price perception, emotions, and behavioral responses. The findings show that a consumer’s perceived price fairness is negatively related to negative emotions, thus implying that price fairness relate negatively with emotions.

In the airline industry, the passengers’ negative emotions are often a sign of lack of satisfaction with the airline services (Park et al., 2019). These negative emotions are often triggered due to price increase or extra fees added to the passengers’ flight ticket. Reports show that this could evoke negative psychological and/or behavioral reactions (Chung & Petrick, 2013). Hence, airline companies tend to avoid issues that may trigger anger among its passengers. It is relatively important for airline companies to resolve any negative emotions in order to elicit good customer experiences (Hadjetian, 2016).

Research on price fairness presents several types of emotions resulting from the perception of unfair price such as disappointment and anger. The most severe perception of price unfairness arguably leads to anger and even vengeful behaviour (Xia, Monroe, & Cox, 2004). When a strong negative emotion, such as anger or outrage, occurs with the perception of price unfairness, it may result in certain consequences. These include the customers leaving the relationship, stronger intention to switch, and the spread of negative word-of-mouth (Lii & Sy, 2009; Xia et al., 2004; Zhan & Lloyd, 2014). Shirai’s (2009) study confirms that negative emotions have stronger relationship with negative pricing experience than with positive experience. In essence, perceived unfair price may evoke negative emotional response (i.e., anger, disappointment, and distress).

Based on the above discussion, it can be hypothesized that: price fairness has negative relationship with negative consumption emotion.

**Methodology**

Using purposive sampling, this study was limited to passengers who travelled within one year from/to or within Malaysia. Online survey was used for data collection. A total of 196 responses were suitable for analysis. In the questionnaire, five items were adapted from (Hwang & Hyun, 2014; Namkung & Jang, 2010; Palau-Saumell, Forgas-Coll, & Sánchez-García, 2016; Setiawan et al., 2020) to measure price fairness. Six items used in measuring negative consumption emotion were adapted from (Jang & Namkung, 2009; Jani & Han, 2013; Manthiou, Kang, & Hyun, 2017; Namkung & Jang, 2010; Otero-Neira et al., 2016; Su & Hsu, 2013; Su, Hsu, & Boostrom Jr, 2020; Westbrook, 1987). The constructs were measured using a seven-point Likert scale; whereby ‘1’ represents “strongly disagree” to ‘7’ for “strongly agree”. The SPSS software and PLS software were used for the analysis.

**Reliability Statistics of the Instrument**

The reliability of the questionnaire was tested. The results in Table 1 show an adequate degree of consistency for items of the research instrument. Table 1 shows the overall reliability statistics of all items and for each construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Reliability Statistic of the All Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability Statistic of the All Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reliability Statistic of each Construct</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Fairness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploratory Factor Analysis
The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted. For the factor analysis to be considered appropriate, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value should be 0.6 or above, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value should be significant (i.e., the Sig. value should be \( p < .05 \)) (Mayers, 2013; Pallant, 2010, 2020). Table 2 shows the result of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value, which is satisfactory, signaling that it can proceed with the factor analysis.

Table 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>.865</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>1595.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sekaran (2003) however, noted that communality value that is greater than 0.4 can be accepted for further analysis. Given this assumption, the outcome shows that there is an acceptable level of communality. Based on the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) that was conducted to select the adequate number of factors. Consequently, the eigenvalues were greater than 1, with varimax rotation performed at 0.5 factor loading. Finally, the rotated component matrix shows the total of 2 components were extracted (3).

Table 3: Rotated Component Matrix\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF3</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF1</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF2</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF5</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF4</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE3</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE4</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE1</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE6</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE2</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE5</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
\(^a\) Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

PLS-SEM Analysis

Measurement Model
At this stage, the assessment of the construct reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity for the study constructs were conducted. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Composite Reliability are substantial at the value above 0.5 and 0.7. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Composite Reliability are higher than 0.7. Cronbach’s Alpha is >0.7 (Garson, 2016; Hair, et al., 2017; Hair et al., 2018). In view of this, Table 4 shows the results of the constructs which indicate that the convergent validity for the model is established.

Table 4: Internal Reliability and Convergent Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings &gt;0.7</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha &gt;0.7</th>
<th>AVE &gt;0.50</th>
<th>CR &gt;0.70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price Fairness</td>
<td>PF1</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF2</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF3</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF5</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Consumption Emotion</td>
<td>NCE1</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCE2</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCE3</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCE4</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCE5</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCE6</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HTMT value above 0.9 indicates lack of discriminant validity and the value lower than 0.85 is recommended (Garson, 2016; Hair, et al., 2017; Hair et al., 2018). Figure 1 shows that the HTMT values stated are lower than 0.85 and 0.90, indicating that discriminant validity is established.

![Figure 1: Assessment of Discriminant Validity](image)

**Structural Model**

A Collinearity Assessment was assessed in the second stage with PLS analysis for the structural model. The variance inflation factor (VIF) of each indicator should be less than 5 (Hair et al., 2017). Table 5 shows that the VIF values are less than 5, indicating that the study has no collinearity issue.
Table 5: Lateral Collinearity Assessment (VIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Emotion</th>
<th>Price Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Fairness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To signify the hypothesized relationship between price fairness and negative consumption emotion, path coefficient estimates were obtained. The researcher applied the bootstrapping technique (n=197, sample 5000) as recommended by Hair et al. (2018) and Hair et al. (2017). Table 6 shows the results of the path coefficient, standard error, and t-statistics for the structure model. The results show that the hypothesis was supported at one percent confidence level (p<0.01), which means that price fairness has a negative relationship with negative consumption emotion. Table 6 shows the result for hypothesis testing, and Figure 2 shows the R² for negative consumption emotion value of 0.062.

Table 6: Hypotheses Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T-values</th>
<th>P-values</th>
<th>5% (LLCI)</th>
<th>95% (ULCI)</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price Fairness -&gt; Negative Emotion</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>4.189</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>4.189</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:***p<0.01, **p<0.05,

Figure 2: R Square

Results and Discussion
This study examined the relationship between price fairness and negative consumption emotion. In terms of pricing fairness, airline fees has recently become a controversial issue (Chung & Petrick, 2013). Studies have shown that often times, unreasonable price would negatively influence customer attitude and behaviour towards the service providers (Ahn, Lee, Back, & Schmitt, 2019). Factors such as perceived price can push the customers away from their current airline (Jung, Han, & Oh, 2017). The customers can travel at a reasonable price while also
enjoying essentially good service from the airline. The main factor that makes the respondents to change from one airline to another is the price (Susanty, Puspitasari, & Putera, 2020). The intensity of price fairness perception correlates with the severity of its consequences (Malc et al., 2016).

Based on these outcomes, the hypothesis “Price fairness has negative relationship with negative consumption emotion” is supported. There is a negative significant relationship between price fairness and negative emotion at one percent confidence level (p<0.01). This finding is in line with extant literature. For instance, Namkung and Jang (2010) discovered that price fairness has negative effect on negative emotions. Lii and Sy (2009) found that price fairness relates negatively with emotions. It is also important to note that pricing that is perceived as unfair can result in negative behavioral responses (Jin, Merkebu, & Line, 2019; Xia et al., 2004). The findings of the current study also show that price fairness has significant negative effect on negative emotions. This outcome is somehow anticipated as this may be attributed to the current COVID-19 situation. The passengers’ negative emotions (for example anger, frustration, and regret) lead to switching intention (Hoang, 2020). For instance, customers who pay a higher price show stronger intentions to switch stores, to complain, and to spread negative word-of-mouth when price difference gets larger (Zhan & Lloyd, 2014).

During a pandemic like COVID-19, firms should focus more on providing the right price to reduce negative emotions. This suggests that passengers’ emotions are influenced by price fairness; they exhibit approach behaviour if they have a positive consumption emotion about their flight experience, or avoidance behaviour if they are subjected to a negative consumption experience. By accommodating consumption emotions (such as negative emotions), it can better reflect the psychological processes that contribute to customer approach behaviour towards airline companies during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Implication**

Based on the findings of the current study, understanding the elements that drive the passengers’ emotion is critical in marketing. When planning marketing programs to enhance customer positive emotions and reduce negative emotions, airline companies should consider the factor of ensuring price fairness. The findings of the current study can help managers to pay more attention on the importance of price fairness to increase positive consumption emotion. From the findings of the current study, the passengers’ perception related to price ticket must be considered in setting the price of the ticket as passengers compare the price with other companies to determine whether the price is a fair price. So, it is important to ensure that the airline’s laws and regulations are clear regarding price fairness. The findings could also help the airline industries to spend more efforts targeting at raising passengers’ positive emotions and decreasing negative emotions, not only from the aspect of price especially during the Covid-19 pandemic.

**Research Limitation and Future Research Direction**

The current study has its own limitations. This study examines only one factor that could have an impact on negative emotions. Future study could examine other factors such as safety during the Covid-19 pandemic. Besides that, the current study considers both full-service airlines and low-cost carriers. If a separate study is conducted on either full or low-cost carriers, the results may show different relationships among the variables.

In the airline industry, there are still other aspects that future studies can further investigate during a pandemic like the Covid-19. Other factors that can directly influence passenger emotions and can be investigated further includes risk perception. It is also suggested that a separate study can be carried on either full-service airlines or low-cost carriers to find if there are differences in the findings.
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