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Savoring an Upcoming Experience Affects Ongoing and Remembered Consumption Enjoyment

Five studies, using diverse methodologies, distinct consumption experiences, and different manipulations, demonstrate the novel finding that savoring an upcoming consumption experience heightens enjoyment of the experience both as it unfolds in real time (ongoing enjoyment) and when it is remembered (remembered enjoyment). This theory predicts that the process of savoring an upcoming experience creates affective memory traces that are reactivated and integrated into the actual and remembered consumption experience. Consistent with this theorizing, factors that interfere with consumers’ motivation, ability, or opportunity to form or retrieve affective memory traces of savoring an upcoming experience limit the effect of savoring on ongoing and remembered consumption enjoyment. Affective expectations, moods, imagery, and mindsets do not explain the observed findings.
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Consumers spend considerable time and money on ordinary (e.g., a trip to the movies, video games), special (e.g., vacations, anniversary parties), and extraordinary (e.g., skydiving, white water rafting) consumption experiences (Bhattacharjee and Mogilner 2014; Hirschman and Holbrook 1982). Indeed, the contribution of experiential purchases to the gross domestic product of developed economies is significant. In 2015, for example, U.S. consumers spent $182 billion on club memberships and theatre, amusement park, and museum experiences alone (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis). Consumers also value the opportunity to enhance their enjoyment of consumption experiences (Clarkson, Janiszewski, and Cinelli 2013). Recent research has further suggested that, compared with material purchases, experiential purchases lead to greater consumer satisfaction and well-being (e.g., Dunn and Norton 2013; cf. Nicolao, Irwin, and Goodman 2009).

It is vital for marketers to maximize consumers’ real-time (ongoing) and remembered enjoyment of consumption experiences (Schmitt 1999). The more enjoyable such experiences are, the more likely consumers are to repeat them (increasing revenue) and to share their experiences with others (reducing marketing costs; Moore 2012). Creating positive consumption experiences also protects companies against commoditization and heightens their profits (Pine and Gilmore 2011). Indeed, marketers from Disney (Cockerell 2008; The Disney Institute and Kinni 2011) to Starbucks (Michelli 2007) spend significant organizational and monetary resources to create consumption experiences that are maximally pleasurable, whether it is by reducing services lines, perfecting experiential product attributes, designing ideal consumption environments, or training employees on the best delivery of experiences (Schmitt 1999).

We add to this substantive domain by identifying a novel and managerially implementable factor—specifically, savoring an upcoming consumption experience. Five studies
show that savoring an upcoming experience positively affects ongoing and remembered consumption enjoyment. We observe these effects using (1) real and meaningful consumption experiences that participants actually live through (e.g., spring break, movies, on-line video games, hotel stays), (2) diverse research methodologies (e.g., field study, lab experiments, secondary data), (3) different consumer populations (students, online participants, a J.D. Power traveler panel), and (4) diverse manipulations of savoring.

Our findings offer important marketing implications because marketers might encourage consumers to savor a consumption activity in advance of its occurrence. For example, Viking River Cruises and Lindblad Expeditions encourage savoring prior to upcoming trips by sending destination-specific interactive presentations, reading lists, or language videos of useful phrases for different countries along the cruise. Automakers, such as BMW, create tools that enable buyers to follow the assembly of their car and to watch its progress as the car is being shipped across the Atlantic (Boeriu 2009). Sensory-rich brand names, preannouncements of new products or product variants, reminders of upcoming events and experiences, evocative ads, and even explicit instructions to savor are other tactics that may encourage savoring. Blogs, product/service reviews, and media stories can also encourage consumers to savor an upcoming consumption experience (e.g., a restaurant, a movie, a sporting event).

Our findings also make novel theoretical contributions: (1) we conceptually differentiate savoring an upcoming experience from potentially related constructs, such as anticipation, imagery, moods, mindsets, and affective expectations; (2) we examine how savoring an upcoming experience affects ongoing and remembered enjoyment of that experience; (3) we show that savoring produces effects that differ from and go beyond those of affective expectations; and (4) we develop novel theory to explain when and why savoring an upcoming
experience produces the predicted effects on enjoyment.

**Theoretical Background and Hypotheses**

**What Is Savoring?**

We formally define savoring as a cognitive process involving awareness of current pleasure from a target-specific consumption experience. One can savor an upcoming experience, an ongoing experience, or a past experience (Bryant and Veroff 2007). We focus on the former and define savoring an upcoming experience as a cognitive process involving awareness of current pleasure from a target-specific, future consumption experience. When people savor an upcoming consumption experience, they are aware (in the moment) that they feel pleasure from this upcoming experience. Thus, while the content of savoring is affective (involving pleasure), the process of savoring is cognitive (involving awareness). Moreover, savoring does not reference just any positive feelings—only feelings linked to the savored consumption experience itself. In this way, savoring is target specific.

**Prior Research on Savoring.** Prior research on savoring consumption experiences is quite limited. Researchers have studied how savoring an ongoing experience (e.g., savoring the experience of eating a cake vs. eating while distracted) heightens enjoyment of that experience (Le Bel and Dube 2001). Other research has suggested that savoring an upcoming positive experience can make waiting for the experience more pleasant (see Chew and Ho 1994; Kumar, Killingsworth, and Gilovich 2014; Loewenstein 1987; Lovallo and Kahneman 2000). These findings explain why consumers might choose to delay positive future experiences (e.g., knowing whether they have won the lottery): the wait itself may be
experienced positively (Chew and Ho 1994; Loewenstein 1987).

Savoring an Upcoming Consumption Experience and Related Constructs

We ask a novel question: Does savoring an upcoming experience affect how much people enjoy the experience as it unfolds and how enjoyable they remember it to have been? Before describing our theory, we first distinguish savoring from potentially similar constructs.

Anticipation. Savoring an upcoming experience likely involves anticipation. However, the two constructs are distinct. First, not all anticipated experiences are judged to be positive. Anticipating unpleasant experiences would evoke dread rather than pleasure. Second, although savoring involves anticipation, savoring’s focus is on the current state of pleasure (i.e., the here and now), not on the anticipated experience. Furthermore, anticipating a future experience can lead to impatience, whereas savoring lessens the pain of waiting (e.g., Chew and Ho 1994).

Imagination. Relatedly, whereas savoring an upcoming experience might involve imagining an upcoming future, savoring is more specific. One can imagine many things, both real and fantasy based (Martin 2004). Savoring emphasizes real-world outcomes, not fantastic ones, and it is target specific. It involves not just any imagined future experience, but a specific upcoming experience. Finally, imagery can occur without awareness of one’s current state of pleasure. Savoring, by definition, requires such awareness.

Moods and Mindsets. The notion that savoring is target specific also distinguishes savoring from moods and mindsets. Savoring might induce a positive affective state by making consumers aware of their current feelings. However, unlike moods, savoring references the upcoming consumption experience. Research has suggested that a mindset carries over to affect judgments of unrelated situations (Xu and Wyer 2007). Thus, positive
moods and mindsets should affect enjoyment of any future movie experience. In contrast, savoring an upcoming experience (e.g., watching a Minions movie) should only affect enjoyment of that particular experience, not any experience (e.g., watching a different movie).

Affective Expectations. Finally, savoring is distinct from “affective expectations,” defined as predictions about how good a consumption experience will make one feel (e.g., Wilson et al. 1989). Although savoring might induce affective expectations, affective expectations emphasize how a consumption experience is likely to make one feel in the future. In contrast, savoring emphasizes the pleasure one feels in the present moment. Moreover, affective expectations can enhance how good consumers remember an experience to have been without necessarily changing the enjoyment of the ongoing experience (e.g., Wirtz et al. 2003). As we explain next, we predict that savoring an upcoming experience will affect not just remembered enjoyment, but also ongoing enjoyment.

Savoring an Upcoming Experience Uniquely Alters Consumption Enjoyment

Predicted Effects on Consumption Enjoyment. Why might savoring an upcoming consumption experience affect ongoing and remembered consumption enjoyment? When people savor, they must use information processing resources and prior knowledge to elaborate on aspects of the upcoming experience (see Schacter and Addis 2007). Prior research has suggested that elaborative processing strengthens memory traces; the greater the elaboration, the stronger the memory traces (Bradshaw and Anderson 1982). If memory traces are strong, they may be re-activated when the experience actually occurs. Reactivation of these memories may then be integrated into one’s reaction to the ongoing and remembered consumption experience. The process invoked here is similar to that in information integration models, which specify how information is combined (e.g., Anderson 1981; Kardes and Kalyanaram 1992). In summary, we
expect that when consumers savor an upcoming experience, memory traces of this previously savored experience are reactivated and integrated into the ongoing and remembered consumption experience. This theorizing leads us to predict that:

\[ H_1: \text{Savoring an upcoming positive experience enhances consumption enjoyment of the experience (a) while it is ongoing and (b) retrospectively.} \]

Savoring an upcoming experience is likely to use elaborative processing that involves anticipation (Schlosser and Shavitt 2002) and imagery processing (MacInnis and Price 1987). Thus, savoring requires that consumers have sufficient motivation, ability, and opportunity (Greenwald and Leavitt 1984; MacInnis and Jaworski 1989) to engage in elaborative processing (Schacter and Addis 2007). For example, limited knowledge of a future consumption experience or limited time or processing resources to savor the upcoming experience should limit its effect on consumption enjoyment. Furthermore, distractions during the actual experience may be detrimental to retrieving memory traces created during savoring, thus hampering the effect of prior savoring on enjoyment. Formally, we predict:

\[ H_2: \text{Reducing consumers’ motivation, abilities, or opportunities to elaborate on an upcoming consumer experience or to reactivate affective memories of the previously savored experience should dampen the effect of savoring on ongoing and remembered consumption enjoyment.} \]

If savoring creates affective memory traces that are subsequently retrieved and integrated into the actual consumption experience, savoring should enhance not just remembered but also actual consumption enjoyment. This prediction differs from prior research on affective expectations (e.g., Schwarz and Xu 2011; Wirtz et al. 2003). Prior research has found that remembered enjoyment aligns with one’s expectations of the experience, but ongoing consumption enjoyment is not affected. We predict that savoring an upcoming experience causes memory traces of pleasure from the savored experience to be
reactivated and integrated into both the ongoing and remembered consumption experience. This also implies that the effect of savoring on enjoyment should endure over time, unlike short-lived mood and mindset explanations. Our prediction is also different from marketer-induced false memories (e.g., Braun 1999), in which postexperience advertising information becomes incorporated into and alters what people remember. We suggest that consumers’ own affective memory traces created from preconsumption savoring are reactivated when the experience actually unfolds and when consumers remember it.

Overview of the Studies. Next, we report five studies designed to test H₁ and H₂ and to rule out alternative explanations (see Table 1). Study 1 uses a field study involving a multi-day experience. Results show that savoring an upcoming experience enhances enjoyment only of that particular experience, not of a different experience (as predicted by moods and mindsets). We further demonstrate that the effect is different from imagery by showing that savoring increases enjoyment of the actual experience, whereas merely imagining the experience does not. Study 2 replicates Study 1 using a different consumption experience and a more naturally occurring manipulation of savoring. Study 3 supports H₁ even when affective expectations are taken into account. Consistent with H₂, Study 3 also shows that the effect of savoring on ongoing and remembered consumption enjoyment is dampened when people lack the opportunity to retrieve affective memory traces. Study 4 provides further evidence of the affective memory trace reactivation perspective using yet a different consumption experience. We replicate H₁ and find support even when affective expectations are manipulated and when the quality of the ongoing experience varies. Study 5 replicates H₁ and supports H₂ using real-world (secondary) data, in which alternative explanations (e.g., demand effects, carry-over effects, self-generated validity effects, moods, mindsets) cannot account for the results.
Study 1: The Effect of Savoring on Enjoyment of a Real-World, Multiday Experience

Companies, such as Walt Disney World Resort Hotels, routinely distribute multiple upcoming trip reminders before consumers arrive on site (e.g., “Your Disney experience starts right now!”). Prior research has suggested that such reminders make waiting times less painful. We are interested in whether such reminders also enhance both ongoing and remembered enjoyment of the consumption experience, as predicted by H1. We suggest that reminders that encourage savoring of an upcoming experience should enhance opportunities for consumers to be aware of and encode their current state of pleasure from contemplating the upcoming experience. Such processing should, in turn, make memory traces more accessible when the consumption experience unfolds in real time and when it is remembered.

Study 1 manipulates whether participants (1) savor the upcoming experience, (2) merely imagine its future occurrence, or (3) savor a different future experience. The imagery condition enables us to demonstrate that savoring is distinct from imagining while also controlling for mood effects (either imagining or savoring an upcoming vacation should induce positive mood). The third condition, which asks participants to savor a different focal experience (specifically, summer break), enables us to test the idea that unlike moods and mindsets, the effect of savoring is target specific. Consequently, and as predicted by H1, savoring an upcoming summer break should not enhance enjoyment of spring break.

Design and Procedures

We randomly assigned 141 students who participated in the study for course credit to three conditions (savor spring break N = 48, savor summer break N = 47, imagine spring
break N = 41). Five participants did not complete remembered enjoyment ratings, resulting in a final sample of 136 participants. For seven days before spring break participants received a daily email message asking them to briefly write about their upcoming spring break or summer break in a daily journal. Participants in the savoring conditions were asked to “write about your thoughts and feelings regarding how much you’ll enjoy your upcoming Spring (or Summer) Break. Turn your attention to the good feelings you have now about enjoying your break.” Participants in the “imagine spring break” condition were asked to “think about the activities you may be involved in during the Spring Break” and to write about what they imagined they might do during the break (for all instructions, see Section A in the Web Appendix). Participants provided an average of six to seven journal entries. The number of entries provided did not vary by condition.

The day after spring break ended, participants took part in an ostensibly different study conducted by a different researcher on “college students’ leisure activities and experiences.” We also disguised the link between the two studies by including numerous, unrelated items. Other researchers have used similar procedures to reduce potential demand biases (Klaaren, Hodges, and Wilson 1994). We excluded three participants (N = 1 in the imagine-spring-break condition; N = 2 in the savoring-spring-break condition) who reported being ill during spring break. We report results that include these participants in footnote 1.

Four items assessed remembered enjoyment of spring break: the extent to which participants liked spring break (1 = “disliked it very much,” and 9 = “liked it very much”) and the extent to which spring break was fun, enjoyable, and good (1 = “not at all,” and 9 = “a great deal”). The four items were highly correlated (α = .93), and a principal component analysis suggested one underlying factor that explained 83.20% of the variance. We averaged
the four items to form a composite measure of remembered enjoyment. Although the current research emphasizes only results that pertain to H₁ and H₂, Section B in the Web Appendix provides all questions included in all studies.

**Results**

Given our predictions, we tested H₁ using planned contrasts. In support of H₁, participants in the savor spring break condition remembered the experience as more enjoyable than did those in the imagine spring break condition (M_savor-spring = 7.88, SD = 1.12 vs. M_imagine spring = 7.19, SD = 1.44; F(1, 130) = 5.10, p = .026) and the savor summer break condition (M_savor summer = 7.26, SD = 1.58; F(1, 130) = 4.59, p = .034).

**Discussion**

Study 1 supports H₁. Savoring an upcoming consumption experience enhances (remembered) consumption enjoyment. Neither purely imagining the future consumption experience nor savoring a different consumption experience (summer break) produces the same effects. These effects occur only when the savored and the focal event are the same; memory traces created when savoring a different event are not recruited during the focal event. The results also rule out mood and mindset accounts, which would predict positive carryover effects regardless of the target event. Given the procedure, demand effects are also unlikely to explain the pattern of results.

In Study 1, the actual consumption experience varied by respondent. In Study 2, we keep the consumption experience constant. We also examine whether the effects observed in Study 1 are replicated for a short (vs. a multiday) experience. Finally, we use a more subtle manipulation of savoring.
Study 2: The Effect of Savoring on Enjoyment of an Identical Consumption Experience

In Study 2, the focal consumption experience involved watching a film clip. We manipulated savoring by showing a movie trailer that was either directly related or unrelated to the film clip. A trailer, or more generally a product preview, may be a managerially relevant vehicle to induce people to savor an upcoming consumption experience. Previews should enhance consumers’ abilities to savor the upcoming experience because they provide concrete information about that experience. Given the target-specific nature of savoring, we predict that enjoyment of the clip will be greater for those who watch a related (vs. unrelated) trailer. Only the related target experience should activate memory traces of prior savoring.

Design and Procedure

Six hundred seventeen participants recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk participated in a study about watching movie trailers and movies online. Participants were told that they would watch a movie trailer and then a movie, with the computer randomly determining which trailer and movie they would watch (for stimuli, see Section C in the Web Appendix). The actual movie was either a Toy Story or Minions short movie. Movie served as a between-subject replicate. We manipulated savoring the upcoming movie by randomly assigning participants to first watch a trailer that was either related (savoring condition) or unrelated (control) to the target movie. That is, if the target movie was Toy Story, those in the savoring condition saw a Toy Story trailer, and those in the control condition saw a Minions trailer (and vice versa). A pretest (n = 83) indicated that both trailers (Minions and Toy Story) evoked a similar positive mood (M_{Minions} = 6.76, SD = 1.44, M_{Toy Story} = 6.79, SD = 1.56; F(1, 81) = .006, p = .94), they were equally well liked (M_{Minions} = 6.71, SD = 2.25, M_{Toy Story} = 6.68,
SD = 1.66; F(1, 81) = .043, \( p = .84 \)), and were perceived to be similar in quality (M_{Minions} = 7.11, SD = 1.80, M_{Toy Story} = 7.18, SD = 1.57; F(1, 81) = .038, \( p = .85 \)).

Next, participants watched the movie clip and provided ongoing enjoyment ratings using a sliding scale displayed at the bottom of the computer screen (see Section C in the Web Appendix). Participants were told to drag the slider to record moment-by-moment enjoyment of the film. The slider scale was anchored by “not at all enjoyable” and “very enjoyable.” Following Andrade and Cohen (2007), enjoyment levels were recorded every three seconds, producing 65 data points per participant. After watching the clip, participants rated their enjoyment of the film using the same items as in Study 1 (\( \alpha = .98 \)). Because prior experience can facilitate savoring, participants indicated whether they had previously seen any Minions or Toy Story movies (yes/no). We use this variable as a covariate and report least-square means and standard errors in subsequent analyses. Respondents then completed a manipulation check measure, which involved the average of two indicators of savoring (“I was feeling joy at the thought of watching this movie” and “I was aware that I felt good from the prospect of watching the movie”; anchored at 1 = “strongly disagree,” and 9 = “strongly disagree”; \( \alpha = .96 \)).

Three participants had critical technical/audio problems while watching the film and were excluded from the analysis (N = 614). We report results including these participants in the footnotes 2–4. Ongoing ratings were not recorded for six participants, and three participants failed to provide ongoing ratings; thus, analyses of ongoing enjoyment are based on only 605 observations.

Results

Manipulation check. The savoring manipulation was successful. A 2 (movie replicate:
Toy Story vs. Minions) x 2 (movie trailer: related vs. unrelated) analysis of covariance revealed a significant effect of whether participants had seen a movie of the franchise before (M_{yes} = 6.43, SD = 2.13, M_{no} = 4.97, SD = 2.47; F(1, 609) = 50.95, p < .001). The manipulation of savoring was also significant (M_{savor} = 5.91, SE = .13, M_{control} = 5.46, SE = .14; F(1, 609) = 6.15, p = .013, $\omega_p^2 = .01$). Neither the main effect of movie replicate (F(1, 609) = .24, p > .6, $\omega_p^2 < 0$) nor the interaction (F(1, 609) = 0.97, p > .3, $\omega_p^2 < 0$) were significant.²

**Ongoing enjoyment.** We used prior exposure to Minions or Toy Story movies, respectively, as a covariate, which had a strong positive effect on ongoing enjoyment (M_{yes} = 65.06, SD = 21.69, M_{no} = 52.13, SD = 24.87; F(1, 600) = 33.49, p < .001). Importantly, beyond this effect, participants in the savoring condition reported greater enjoyment while watching the movie compared with those in the control condition (M_{savor} = 61.35, SE = 1.32 vs. M_{control} = 56.51, SE = 1.37; F(1, 600) = 7.03, p < .01; see Figure 1).³

**Remembered enjoyment.** Prior exposure to Minions or Toy Story movies also had a positive effect on remembered enjoyment (M_{yes} = 7.10, SD = 1.95, M_{no} = 5.78, SD = 2.45; F(1, 609) = 48.01, p < .0001). Yet here, too, we observed the predicted effect of savoring on remembered consumption enjoyment (M_{savor} = 6.63, SE = .12 vs. M_{control} = 6.22, SE = .13; F(1, 609) = 5.75, p = .017).⁴

------- Insert Figure 1 about here -------

**Discussion**

Study 2 further supports H₁ using a common, short-lived consumption experience; a naturally occurring (non-intrusive) savoring manipulation; two replicates; and a different (non-student, online) sample. Savoring an upcoming experience heightens ongoing as well as
remembered consumption enjoyment. Consistent with Study 1, only savored experiences, not any positive experience, induced these effects. Notably, this study induced savoring simply by exposing participants once to commonly used marketing materials (i.e., trailers), suggesting that there is potential for marketers to manipulate savoring similarly in the real world.

One may wonder whether remembered enjoyment is based on participants’ preceding assessment of their ongoing enjoyment (Hastie and Park 1986; Lynch, Marmorstein, and Weigold 1988). However, the pattern of results for remembered enjoyment in this study replicates that of Study 1, in which we did not assess ongoing enjoyment. We return to this issue in the “General Discussion” section and provide meta-analytic evidence further ruling out this alternative explanation. Study 3 builds on prior studies by testing whether H₁ is supported even when affective expectations are taken into account. Study 3 also tests H₂ by examining whether factors that interfere with the retrieval of affective memory traces reduce the effect of savoring an upcoming experience on ongoing and remembered enjoyment.

**Study 3: Process Evidence (Manipulating Processing Opportunity)**

If savoring the upcoming experience creates affective memory traces, anything that interferes with consumers’ abilities to retrieve such traces should reduce savoring’s effects (H₃). To test this prediction, we added a condition that distracts participants during the consumption experience. We predict that participants who are prevented from reactivating memory traces as a result of distraction will enjoy the consumption experience less than those who savored but did not face distraction.

We also added a different control condition. Instead of comparing savoring with not
savoring, we examine whether effects of savoring an upcoming experience are comparable to savoring an ongoing experience, which has been shown to heighten consumption enjoyment (Le Bel and Dube 2001). For our proposed intervention to be of interest, the effect we study should be comparable in size to that of other interventions that may enhance the enjoyment of an experience directly and concurrently.

We also added a condition in which participants both savor the upcoming experience and the ongoing experience to test whether there is an additive effect of savoring an upcoming experience beyond the effect of savoring an ongoing experience. Finally, we examine whether savoring heightens affective expectations of the upcoming experience and, if so, whether its effects on consumption enjoyment persist even after controlling for affective expectations.

**Design and Procedures**

One hundred fifty three students participated in Study 3 in exchange for course credit. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: (1) savoring the upcoming experience only, (2) savoring the ongoing experience only, (3) savoring the upcoming experience plus savoring the ongoing experience, and (4) savoring the upcoming experience plus distraction during consumption.

*Savoring Manipulations.* All respondents were sent an email reminder about their participation in the study the day before the study began. Participants in the three “savoring the upcoming experience” conditions were told that they would watch a short animated movie based on the *Toy Story* movies. They were encouraged to enjoy the prospect of watching the movie. Those in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” condition were told that they would watch a short animated movie. The name of the movie was not mentioned and there were no instructions to savor the upcoming movie.
At the lab, participants, who sat at individual computer workstations equipped with headphones, were told that they would watch and then report their opinions of an animated short film. We showed the film’s title and provided a short description of the clip (see Section D in the Web Appendix).

Before watching the movie, participants in the three “savoring the upcoming experience” conditions were given 30 seconds to savor the prospect of watching it. We instructed these participants to be aware of how the thought of watching the movie clip soon makes them feel at that moment and to pay attention to their thoughts and feelings. Participants in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” condition spent 30 seconds answering questions on their general consumption behaviors. Manipulation check measures were identical to those used in Study 2 ($\alpha = .95$).

We also created an index of affective expectations of the film by averaging standardized responses to the items (“How much fun do you expect the movie will be?” anchored at 1 = “not at all fun,” and 9 = “very fun”; “Compared to other movies I watch, I expect this movie to be…” anchored at 1 = “below average,” and 5 = “above average”; $\alpha = .74$).

Prior to watching the movie, we told participants in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” and the “savoring the upcoming experience plus ongoing experience” to be aware of how the movie makes them feel and to pay attention to their thoughts and feelings as they watched the clip.

Distraction Manipulation. For those in the “savoring the upcoming experience plus distraction during consumption” condition, we used a well-known task (e.g., Shiv and Fedorikhin 1999) to manipulate distraction. Participants were given the number 154, and were
asked to subtract 3 from this running total each time one of the movie characters said the word “you.”

*Evaluations of the Experience.* All participants then watched the film clip and rated their ongoing and, afterwards, their remembered (α = .95) enjoyment, using the same measures as in Study 2. Those in the “savoring the upcoming experience plus distraction” condition reported the final running number from their mental calculation task before providing remembered enjoyment ratings. Participants also indicated whether they had previously seen any *Toy Story* movies. Figure 2 depicts the sequence of the manipulations and enjoyment measures.

Across the four conditions, three participants had headphones that did not work, two ignored the distraction instructions, and three provided ongoing and/or remembered enjoyment responses that were more than three standard deviations from the mean. We exclude these eight participants (final N = 145) and report the analyses that do not exclude these participants in the footnotes. One participant did not respond to the covariate, and four participants did not provide online ratings.

-------- Insert Figure 2 about here--------

*Results*

Given our predictions, we estimated planned contrasts controlling for whether participants had seen any *Toy Story* movies before to ensure consistency with Study 2 (Simmons, Nelson, and Simonsohn 2011). We report least-square means and standard errors.

*Ongoing consumption enjoyment.* Prior exposure to a *Toy Story* movie did not affect ongoing enjoyment (M_{yes} = 68.47, M_{no} = 52.81; F(1, 135) = 2.34, p > .12). Importantly, participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition (M = 64.17, SE = 4.23)
reported similar levels of enjoyment during the clip as did those in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” (M = 65.89, SE = 4.22; F(1, 135) = .15, p > .70) and “savoring the upcoming experience plus ongoing experience” (M = 68.85, SE = 4.49; F(1, 135) = 1.07, p > .30) conditions, which were not different from each other (F(1, 135) = .45, p > .50). These results indicate that the retrieval of affective memory traces results in enjoyment ratings that are not different from savoring the ongoing experience—a result that supports the managerial impact of encouraging consumers to savor an upcoming consumption experience. Moreover, asking consumers to savor both the upcoming and the ongoing experience yields no additional benefit beyond of that of asking them to savor in advance, suggesting that marketers can influence consumption enjoyment by encouraging people to savor an experience either in advance or while it is ongoing. In support of H2, those in the “savoring the upcoming experience plus distraction” condition enjoyed the clip less (M = 57.02, SE = 3.36) than did those in the other three savoring conditions (“savoring the upcoming experience only” condition: (F(1, 135) = 5.88, p < .02; “savoring the ongoing experience only”: F(1, 135) = 8.10, p < .01; “savoring the upcoming plus ongoing experience”: F(1, 135) = 11.65, p = .001; see Figure 3).5

-------- Insert Figure 3 here--------

Remembered consumption enjoyment. Prior exposure to a Toy Story movie did not affect remembered consumption enjoyment (Myes = 7.21, Mino = 6.73; F(1, 139) = 0.00). As was the case with ongoing enjoyment, participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition (M = 7.21, SE = .31) remembered having enjoyed the clip as much as those in the “savoring the ongoing experience” (M = 7.43, SE = .31; F(1, 139) = .44, p > .5) and “savoring the upcoming experience plus ongoing experience” (M = 7.54, SE = .32; F(1, 139) = 1.01, p > .3) conditions. In addition, remembered enjoyment for participants in the
“savoring the ongoing experience only” condition was the same as for participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience plus ongoing experience” condition (F(1, 139) = .12, p > .73). Finally, in support of H2, those who had savored the upcoming movie clip but were distracted (M = 6.41, SE = .28) remembered having enjoyed the movie less than did those in the other three savoring conditions (“savoring the upcoming experience only”: F(1, 139) = 5.46, p = .02; “savoring the ongoing experience only”: F(1, 139) = 8.94, p < .01); “savoring the upcoming plus ongoing experience”: F(1, 139) = 10.67, p = .001). These results replicate H1 and support H2.6

Affective expectations. We first analyzed the effect of the savoring manipulation on affective expectations. Note that we measured affective expectations after the savoring manipulation but before any other manipulation. Thus, at the point of measurement, participants in the three “savoring the upcoming experience” conditions had the same experience. Therefore, we pooled their results for this measure. Participants in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” condition had not received any manipulation at this point and represent a true baseline control. Whether participants had seen a *Toy Story* movie before as a covariate had a marginal positive effect on affective expectations (Myes = 0.10, Mno = -.35, F(1, 141) = 3.49, p = .06). Furthermore, we find that savoring the upcoming experience heightens affective expectations of watching the movie clip (M = -.03, SD = .13) relative to the baseline (M = -.42, SD = .18; F(1, 141) = 6.09, p = .015). This finding is novel because prior research has not examined the effect of savoring on affective expectations. Furthermore, affective expectations significantly predict both ongoing (b = 10.63, t(139) = 5.98, p < .001) and remembered (b = .68, t(143) = 5.17, p < .001) consumption enjoyment.7

Next, we examined whether the effect of savoring an upcoming experience on
remembered enjoyment is still significant when accounting for affective expectations. Using measured savoring as the independent variable, the model treats remembered enjoyment as the dependent variable and affective expectations and prior exposure to *Toy Story* movies as control variables. This analysis excludes the “savoring the upcoming experience plus distraction” condition because distraction hampered savoring. The covariate did not have a significant effect ($t(106) = 0.96, p > .30$); however, savoring did affect remembered enjoyment ($b = .26, t(106) = 2.92, p < .01$) even after we controlled for affective expectations ($b = .37$, $t(106) = 2.56, p = .01$).

**Discussion**

Study 3 replicates $H_1$ and supports $H_2$. Furthermore, although affective expectations influence consumption enjoyment, savoring’s effect on consumption enjoyment goes beyond that explained by affective expectations. We designed Study 4 to provide further evidence of $H_1$ and $H_2$ using yet another consumption experience. In addition, whereas Study 3 controls for affective expectations, Study 4 manipulates them.

**Study 4: Testing Robustness (Expectations, Type, and Quality of Experiences)**

Study 4 manipulates affective expectations orthogonally from savoring and focuses on a different consumption experience (playing a video game). We also examine the robustness of the effect by asking whether the effects of savoring are limited to high-quality experiences. If so, the managerial impact of savoring would be limited to situations in which experience quality is high. Study 4 also manipulates the amount of information consumers had about the
game beforehand to further test H2. We expect savoring’s effects on enjoyment to diminish if consumers are unable to savor an upcoming experience because they have limited information about it. If affective memory traces cannot be formed, they cannot be retrieved when the actual experience unfolds. This manipulation is actionable for marketers who can encourage savoring by providing more information about the savored entity. Study 4 does not measure ongoing enjoyment so as to rule out the possibility that the effects on remembered experiences are due to carryover effects from measuring ongoing enjoyment.

**Design and Procedure**

*Participants and Design.* One hundred thirty-eight undergraduate students participated in Study 4 for course credit. The study used a 2 (savoring) x 2 (affective expectations) x 2 (quality of the experience) between-subjects design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions. The focal experience was an air hockey video game. Sections E and F in the Web Appendix provide study details.

*Manipulation of Savoring.* We manipulated savoring by varying how much information was provided about the game (limited vs. extensive) and by framing the time before they played the game as either savoring time or waiting time. Consumers in the high-savoring condition were given extensive information about the experience and were told to use the delay period to savor the future experience. Those in the low-savoring condition were given limited information about the future experience and were told to wait for it to begin.

*Manipulation of Expectations.* We manipulated affective expectations about the future experience using a methodology adapted from prior studies (e.g., Geers and Lassiter 2002; Patrick, MacInnis, and Park 2007). Before they played the game, participants read a review that described the game as being either liked or disliked by most students.
Manipulation of the Quality of the Experience. We used two games that were similar in content, rules, and scoring system but that differed in graphics quality. An earlier pretest had indicated that the higher-quality graphics game provided a better experience than did the lower-quality graphics game.

Procedure. Once participants were seated at a computer, we told them that the research concerned video game preferences and that they would play a game during the study. Participants received either more or less information about the game before playing it. All participants experienced a 50 second time delay before starting the game. Those in the low-savoring condition were asked to wait for the game to begin. Those in the high-savoring condition were asked to think about how much they would enjoy the game. Following this delay, participants completed a manipulation check measure of savoring ($\alpha = .93$).

Participants then read product reviews, which were designed to create either positive or less positive expectations about the game. They rated expected enjoyment of the game (“How enjoyable [fun] do you expect the experience of playing the video game will be?; 1 = “not at all enjoyable [fun],” and 9 = “very enjoyable [fun]”; $\alpha = .92$). They then played either the higher- or lower-quality video game and indicated how much they enjoyed playing using two items from our prior studies (1 = “not at all enjoyable [fun],” and 9 = “very enjoyable [fun]”; $\alpha = .96$).

Results

Manipulation Check of Savoring. We took the measure of savoring before any other manipulation. As such, we estimated a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the manipulation of savoring as the only independent variable. As we expected, savoring was greater in the high- (vs. low-) savoring condition ($M_{\text{high savor}} = 6.18$, $SD = 1.40$ vs. $M_{\text{low savor}} =$
Manipulation Check of Expected Enjoyment. A 2 (savoring) x 2 (expectations) ANOVA on expected enjoyment supports the manipulation of expectations (F(1, 134) = 49.84, p < .001). Participants in the more positive expectations condition expected the experience to be more positive than did those in the less positive expectations condition (M_{more pos} = 6.11, SD = 1.67 vs. M_{less pos} = 4.09, SD = 1.67; \omega^2_p = 0.26). As with Study 3, participants in the high-savoring conditions had more positive expectations about the game than did those in the low-savoring conditions (M_{high sav} = 5.55, SD = 1.76 vs. M_{low sav} = 4.61, SD = 2.04; F(1, 134) = 8.17, p < 0.01, \omega^2_p = 0.05). The interaction was not significant (F(1, 134) = 0.17, p > .60).

Remembered Consumption Enjoyment. A 2 (savoring) x 2 (expectations) x 2 (experience quality) ANOVA on remembered consumption enjoyment yielded main effects of savoring (F(1, 130) = 7.59, p < .01) and experience quality (F(1, 130) = 15.06, p < .001). Participants in the high-savoring condition (vs. low; M_{high sav} = 5.52, SD = 1.94 vs. M_{low sav} = 4.56, SD = 2.16) and those who played a higher-quality game (M_{higher qual} = 5.74, SD = 1.90 vs. M_{lower qual} = 4.44, SD = 2.09) enjoyed the game more than their counterparts. These main effects were qualified by a two-way interaction of expectations by outcome (F(1, 130) = 3.82, p = .05) and a three-way interaction of savoring, expectations, and experience quality (F(1, 130) = 4.06, p < .05). To interpret our findings, we decomposed the three-way interaction into the two two-way ANOVAs depicted in Figure 4, Panels A and B.

For the higher-quality experience, a 2 (savoring) x 2 (expectations) ANOVA revealed only main effects of savoring (F(1, 63) = 5.86, p < .02) and expectations (F(1, 63) = 5.19, p < .03) but no interaction (F(1, 63) = 0.25, p > .60). Specifically, those in the more positive
expectations conditions remembered the experience as more enjoyable than did those in the less positive expectations conditions (M_{more\ pos} = 6.26, SD = 1.82 vs. M_{less\ pos} = 5.17, SD = 1.84). These results replicate prior findings in the literature and Study 3 by showing that affective expectations can enhance remembered enjoyment of positive experiences. We also replicate our previous studies, showing that enjoyment of the video game was greater among participants in the high-savoring conditions (M_{high\ sav} = 6.26, SD = 1.69 vs. M_{low\ sav} = 5.10, SD = 1.97). As in our previous studies, when the experience is generally high in quality, savoring enhances enjoyment, and it does so independent of expectations.

For the lower-quality experience, a 2 (savoring) x 2 (expectations) ANOVA revealed only a significant interaction between savoring and expectations (F(1, 67) = 5.24, p < .03). When expectations were high, participants in the high-savoring condition enjoyed the video game more than did those in the low-savoring condition (M_{high\ sav} = 5.18, SD = 2.17 vs. M_{low\ sav} = 3.34, SD = 2.49; F(1, 67) = 7.20, p < .01), in support of H1. When expectations were low to begin with, however, there was no effect of savoring (M_{high\ sav} = 4.36, SD = 1.55 vs. M_{low\ sav} = 4.72, SD = 1.79; F(1, 67) = .29, p > .50).

----------- Insert Figure 4 about here-----------

Discussion

Study 4 supports H1 using a novel experience (playing a video game) without asking participants to rate their ongoing enjoyment. Furthermore, while savoring affects expectations, its effects on remembered consumption enjoyment remain significant even after we account for expectations, which we manipulated independently. The effects are also robust across conditions that vary in the quality of the experience. We again observe an effect of savoring on enjoyment of higher-quality experiences. This effect replicates for lower-quality
experiences when expectations are high, but not when they are low. Therefore, savoring may still have an effect even for lower quality experiences, albeit on a more limited basis. Notably, we find that enjoyment in the low-quality/no-savoring condition is greater when expectations were low vs. high (4.7 vs. 3.3, respectively). This finding seems to reflect a well-known effect of expectation/disconfirmation in the absence of savoring.

Our final study further tests H2 in a real-world context involving enjoyment with a hotel experience. We use secondary data in which demand effects, self-generated validity, or carryover effects of measurement cannot explain the results.

**Study 5: Additional Process Evidence**

Study 5 tests H1 and H2 using data from the J.D. Power Hotel Guests Satisfaction Survey. The survey assessed the purpose of respondents’ hotel stay (i.e., leisure, business, or conference travel) and how much they enjoyed it. We reasoned that leisure (vs. business or conference) travelers would be more motivated to savor their upcoming trip because it is pursued for pleasure (vs. work). The 2009 and 2010 surveys also measured how far in advance hotel guests booked their stay (i.e., the “booking window”). We argue that the longer the booking window, the greater the opportunity respondents had to savor this experience. While leisure travelers may be more motivated to savor an upcoming trip than business travelers are, savoring may affect enjoyment only when these consumers also have sufficient opportunity to savor (i.e., have a longer booking window). We predict an interaction, such that enjoyment for leisure travelers (those with the motivation to savor) will increase as the booking window increases (as the opportunity to savor increases), but we do not predict such an increase for business travelers.
Data Set and Measures

The analysis utilized hotel enjoyment ratings of 71,929 hotel guests (53,258 leisure travelers and 18,671 business/conference travelers) who booked the hotel themselves. The survey tracked when consumers booked their hotel room (1 = “within a week prior,” 2 = “one–two weeks prior,” 3 = “three–four week prior,” 4 = “one–two months prior,” 5 = “three–six months prior,” 6 = “seven–nine months prior,” 7 = “ten–twelve months prior,” and 8 = “more than one year prior”). Remembered enjoyment of their hotel experience was measured on a ten-point scale anchored by “Unacceptable” and “Outstanding” using the item “Thinking back through your entire experience staying at this hotel, how would you rate your overall hotel experience?” We focus on travelers who booked less than a year prior to the trip (total N = 71,783; leisure travelers N = 53,135, coded as 1; non-leisure travelers N = 18,648, coded as 0). We treated booking window as a continuous variable (M = 2.42, SD = 1.33). Note that the median booking window was the same for both leisure and business travelers (Mdn = 2), though the mean was slightly higher for leisure travelers (M = 2.43, SD = 1.31) compared with business travelers (M = 2.37, SD = 1.29, t = 5.62, p < .0001), meaning leisure travelers booked slightly earlier (for details, see Section G in the Web Appendix). We center the booking window at the scale point of 4 (“one–two months prior”) so that 0 represents time at this effective mid-point of the scale (Spiller et al. 2013). All results also hold when controlling for per night hotel cost.

Results

Regressing the hotel enjoyment score on the type of travelers, the booking window, and their interaction revealed an effect of traveler type (b = .158, t = 6.12, p < .0001). Leisure travelers (M = 7.82, SD = 1.91) enjoyed the hotel stay more than business travelers did (M =
7.74, SD = 1.84). Consistent with H2, we observed the predicted interaction between traveler type and booking window (b = .055, t = 4.43, p < .0001; Figure 5). To explore the interaction, we examined the slopes of the booking window at each level of traveler type. The slope was significant and positive for leisure travelers (b = .066, SE = .006, t = 10.60, p < .0001) but insignificant for business travelers (b = .011, SE = .011, t = 1.02, p > .30). Thus, leisure travelers (who had more motivation to savor) enjoyed their stay more if they booked their trip earlier (had greater opportunity to savor). Business travelers, who are likely less motivated to savor a trip in advance, did not benefit from a longer booking window.8

--------- Insert Figure 5 about here ---------

Discussion

Study 5 supports H1 and H2 using real-world (secondary) data; in addition, demand effects, self-generated validity, or carryover effects of measurement cannot explain the results. Although we cannot completely rule out that those who are enthusiastic about the trip may book further in advance of the trip and end up enjoying the trip more, our findings support our theory that savoring an upcoming experience affects consumption enjoyment only when consumers have motivation (they are leisure travelers) and opportunity (they have a longer booking window) to savor. Note that although leisure travelers book on average slightly earlier than business travelers did (i.e., had slightly more opportunity to savor), this is just another aspect that differs between business and leisure travelers in general. Importantly, the interaction of time and traveler type—specifically, the significant linear trend of booking window for leisure but not business travelers—supports the claim that motivation, not just opportunity, is necessary for savoring to occur. Although the size of the predicted interaction is relatively small, small effects at an individual level may lead to large effects in the aggregate. Furthermore, these hotel guests
were not likely to have been exposed to marketing tactics that encouraged them to savor their upcoming trip. Marketing actions (such as those noted in the introduction) that explicitly encourage savoring might intensify the effect we observe.

**General Discussion**

**Review of Findings and Implications**

Five studies using diverse methodologies, different types of consumers, varying experiences, and diverse savoring manipulations show that savoring an upcoming consumption experience heightens ongoing and remembered enjoyment of the consumption experience (H1). These effects cannot be explained by moods or mindsets. Whereas savoring can induce positive affective expectations of the experience (itself a novel finding), savoring affects consumption enjoyment even after affective expectations are taken into account. Consistent with our theorizing, we find that factors that interfere with consumers’ motivation, ability, or opportunity to either savor the upcoming experience or retrieve affective memories of the previously savored experience limit the effect of savoring on ongoing and remembered consumption enjoyment (H2).

Because we examined the effect of savoring across a variety of contexts and diverse savoring manipulations, we estimated the average effect size of savoring on remembered enjoyment by conducting a mini meta-analysis (Goh, Hall, and Rosenthal 2016). In this meta-analysis, we focused on Studies 1 to 4, which manipulated savoring, and compared the focal savoring condition with the most appropriate control condition (e.g., in Study 3 we compare the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition with the “savoring the upcoming experience
For each study, we used the means and standard deviations of each condition to compute Hedges’ $g$ (Hedges and Olkin 2014). We then calculated a weighted mean, using inverse variance weights to assign more weight to studies with larger samples (Lipsey and Wilson 2001). Overall, we find that savoring the upcoming experience heightens remembered enjoyment, with a mean effect size of .265 (95% confidence interval [CI] = [.134, .396]). We expanded this meta-analysis to include three additional studies not reported in the article. Two were earlier versions of Studies 1 and 2, and one is similar to Study 4, in which a delay prior to playing a video game was framed as either waiting time or savoring time, and the length of delay was manipulated. The mean effect size across all these studies is .30 (95% CI = [.194, .407]). Average effect sizes did not differ between included versus all studies ($Q = .8472, p > .35,$ calculated using Wilson’s (2005) macro).

One may wonder whether asking participants to provide online measures in some of our studies heightened the effect of savoring on remembered enjoyment. However, we did not find any evidence for such an effect. The mean effect size for studies using online measures is .246 (95% CI = [.128, .363]) in the expanded meta-analysis and .192 (95% CI = [.042, .342]) for the studies reported in the article. The mean effect size for studies that did not use online measures was larger: .544 (95% CI = [.296, .792]) across all studies and .491 (95% CI = [.225, .758]) for those reported here. The difference in effect size was significant across all studies ($Q = 4.538, p = .033)$ but only marginally significant for the studies we report in this article ($Q = 3.668, p = .056$). As such, there is no evidence that taking online measures heightened the effect of savoring on remembered enjoyment and, indeed, some evidence indicates that it reduced the effect.

Beyond their theoretical implications, our findings are managerially significant.
Positive consumer experiences and subsequent satisfaction have been linked to increased word-of-mouth (Moore 2012), customer retention (Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos 2005), return on investment (Anderson, Fornell, and Rust 1997), and earnings (Yeung and Ennew 2000). As such, tactics that encourage consumers to savor the prospect of using their product or service may positively affect marketers’ bottom-line performance.

Encouraging consumers to savor an upcoming experience would seem to be relevant to marketers in several industries: inducing consumers to savor can make waiting time more pleasurable (as previous research on savoring shows) and can heighten enjoyment of the actual experience (as we show). Moreover, various tactics might induce savoring. For example, Illumination Entertainment set up the *Minions* Facebook page nine months before the movie’s release, alerting consumers about the trailer release and continuously posting new pictures of the Minion characters. The World of Coca-Cola museum in Atlanta plays a preview video that provides consumers with information about an upcoming movie they will watch in the “4-D” theater. Similarly, the *Simpsons* ride at Universal Studios uses a “preshow” by showing queuing customers cartoons of the Simpsons family taking the same ride. Universal’s new *Harry Potter and the Escape from Gringotts* ride encourages savoring by gradually building a storyline while waiting, taking queuing consumers into various rooms that resemble different parts of the Hogwarts Castle (as featured in the *Harry Potter* movies). Starbuck’s Roastery and Tasting Room in Seattle is also designed to encourage consumers to savor pleasurable, multisensory coffee experience in advance of enjoying it (roaster.starbucks.com). Such tactics might not only help firms manage service delays but also make the focal experience more enjoyable. Firms with access to consumers’ contact data (e.g., Viking River Cruises) can use advertising, email marketing, social media, or other
communications such as those we used in Study 1 to encourage savoring and its positive downstream consequences on consumption enjoyment (see also Chun 2011).

Limitations and Further Research

Our findings differ from those of Ofir and Simonson (2001), who find that expecting to evaluate an upcoming experience reduces satisfaction because negative aspects of the experience are more likely to be noticed. Instead, savoring an upcoming experience creates positive affective traces, which are later retrieved and integrated into the ongoing consumption experience, increasing consumption enjoyment. Although expecting to evaluate an experience and savoring involve fundamentally different processes, the parallel between these two phenomena is notable and worthy of further research.

Future studies might test the underlying process mechanism involving affective memory traces using mediation, rather than through moderation as was done in this article. Researchers should also explore whether different aspects of savoring (e.g., the time between savoring and the event, the number of savoring occasions) affect consumption enjoyment. It is possible that encouraging savoring too early before a consumption experience is ineffective because consumers are less able to retrieve those memory traces created during savoring. In addition, there may be contexts in which the pain, displeasure, or impatience associated with a wait outweighs the positive effect of savoring. For example, an externally imposed wait may create not only pleasurable anticipation, but also an aversive wait experience, eventually detracting from remembered enjoyment in the long run (Nowlis, Mandel, and McCabe 2004). Further research could also examine situations in which consumers may experience complex emotions and explore whether an active effort to savor an upcoming experience could transform an otherwise aversive experience to a positive one.
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Footnotes

1 The results hold when excluded participants are added. Those in the savor spring break condition remembered the experience as more enjoyable than did those in the imagine spring break condition (M_{savor spring} = 7.80, SD = 1.16 vs. M_{imagine spring} = 7.14, SD = 1.47; F(1, 133) = 4.79, p = .03) and those in the savor summer break condition (M_{savor summer} = 7.26, SD = 1.58; F(1, 133) = 3.50, p = .06).

2 These effects were replicated when data from all respondents are included (prior exposure effects: M_{yes} = 6.44, SD = 2.13, M_{no} = 4.97, SD = 2.48; F(1, 612) = 50.60, p < .0001; savoring effects: M_{savor} = 6.05, SE = .12 vs. M_{control} = 5.63, SE = .13; F(1, 612) = 5.22, p = .023, \omega_p^2 = .01). No other effects were observed.

3 These effects were replicated when data from all respondents are included (prior exposure effects: M_{yes} = 65.06, SD = 21.69, M_{no} = 52.14, SD = 24.81; F(1, 604) = 33.20, p < .0001; savoring effects: M_{savor} = 60.95, SE = 1.33 vs. M_{control} = 56.35, SE = 1.38; F(1, 604) = 6.23, p = .013).

4 These effects were replicated when data from all respondents are included (prior exposure effects: M_{yes} = 7.08, SD = 1.97 vs. M_{no} = 5.78, SD = 2.45; F(1, 612) = 47.92, p < .0001; savoring effects: M_{savor} = 6.63, SE = .12 vs. M_{control} = 6.19, SE = .13; F(1, 612) = 6.52, p = .011).

5 We observed similar effects when data from excluded respondents were included. Prior exposure had no effect (M_{yes} = 66.80, M_{no} = 48.01; F(1, 147) = 3.28, p = .072). Participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition (M = 57.58, SE = 4.70) reported similar levels of ongoing enjoyment as did those in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” condition (M = 62.98, SE = 4.73; F(1, 147) = 1.19, p > .20) and slightly lower levels than did those in the “savoring the upcoming plus ongoing experience” condition (M = 67.66, SE = 4.96; F(1, 147) = 4.19, p = .04). “Savoring the ongoing experience only” and “savoring the upcoming plus ongoing experience” yielded similar levels of online enjoyment (F(1, 147) = .89, p > .30).

6 Not excluding participants weakens the results, though the pattern remains the same. Prior exposure had no effect (M_{yes} = 7.03 vs. M_{no} = 6.73; F(1, 147) = 0). Participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition (M = 6.85, SE = .36) remembered having enjoyed the clip as much as those in the “savoring the ongoing experience only” condition (M = 7.31, SE = .36; F(1, 147) = 1.50) and marginally less than those in the “savoring the ongoing experience” condition (M = 7.54, SE = .38; F(1, 147) = 3.31, p = .07). Remembered enjoyment for participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition was the same as for participants in the “savoring the upcoming experience plus ongoing experience” condition (F(1, 147) = .35, p > .5). Finally, those who had savored the future movie clip but were distracted (M = 6.45, SE = .32) remembered having enjoyed the movie less than did those in the “savoring the upcoming experience only” condition (F(1, 147) = 1.08, p = .3).

7 Prior exposure to a Toy Story movie had no effect on affective expectations (M_{yes} = .02, M_{no} = -.35; F(1, 149) = 2.0, p = .16). Savoring the upcoming experience had a marginal effect on affective expectations (M = -.09, SD = .14) relative to this baseline control (M = -.40, SD = .19;
F(1, 149) = 3.43, p = .07). Affective expectations predict ongoing (b = 12.46, t(151) = 6.98, p < .0001) and remembered (b = .93, t(151) = 7.06, p < .0001) enjoyment.

8 The critical interaction was replicated when we treated booking window as a seven-level categorical (vs. continuous) variable (F(6, 71,769) = 3.87, p < .05). We estimated both linear and quadratic trends for each traveler type, assuming, for simplicity, equal spacing of booking window. For leisure travelers, the linear trend was significant (b = .38, SE = .08, t = 5.01, p < .0001) but the quadratic trend was not (b = .07, SE = .07, t = 1.06, p > .28). For business travelers, neither the linear (b = .15, SE = .12, t = 1.22, p > .2) nor the quadratic (b = .11, SE = .11, t = 1.03, p > .30) trend was significant.

9 Note that, given our interest, we did not include conditions that tested the robustness of our effect (i.e., low-quality experience in Study 4).

10 Note that Studies 2 and 4 were factorial studies. A separate analysis used adjusted effect sizes for these studies (Morris and DeShon 1997), which lead to slightly different estimates (effect size = .260, 95% CI = [.129, .391]).
**TABLE 1**
OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
<th>Study 4</th>
<th>Study 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumption</strong></td>
<td>Spring break</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>Video game</td>
<td>Hotel stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Field study</td>
<td>Online experiment</td>
<td>Online experiment</td>
<td>Lab experiment</td>
<td>Secondary data: J.D. Power Hotel Guests Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design/independent variables</strong></td>
<td>(1) Savor an upcoming spring break (opportunities to savor an upcoming experience), (2) savor summer break (opportunities to savor a different experience), and (3) imagine upcoming spring break</td>
<td>Savor actual movie (vs. a different movie) x Movie replicate</td>
<td>(1) Savoring the upcoming experience only, (2) savoring the ongoing experience only, (3) savoring the upcoming experience plus savoring the ongoing experience, and (4) savoring the upcoming experience plus distraction during consumption</td>
<td>Savoring ability (high vs. low) x Affective expectations (more positive vs. less positive) x Experience quality (higher vs. lower)</td>
<td>Traveler type (motivation to savor) x Booking window (opportunity to savor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variables</strong></td>
<td>Remembered enjoyment of spring break</td>
<td>Ongoing and remembered enjoyment of the movie</td>
<td>Ongoing and remembered enjoyment of the movie</td>
<td>Remembered enjoyment of the game</td>
<td>Remembered enjoyment of hotel stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>Savoring an upcoming experience enhances remembered consumption enjoyment only when the savor and experienced events are the same; Imagery alone does not produce the effects.</td>
<td>Savoring an upcoming experience enhances ongoing and remembered enjoyment only when the savor and experienced events are the same.</td>
<td>Savoring an upcoming experience induces as much enjoyment as savoring the ongoing experience; distraction during the experience (which interferes with an ability to retrieve affective memory traces of savoring) eliminates the effect of savoring the upcoming experience.</td>
<td>Savoring an upcoming experience enhances remembered enjoyment regardless of the quality of the experience, except when consumers have less positive expectations to begin with.</td>
<td>Enjoyment was greatest for consumers who had both the motivation to savor (leisure vs. business travelers) and the opportunity to savor (longer booking window)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique study advantages</strong></td>
<td>Supports H1 using a real-life, multi-day experience, distinguishes savoring from imagery, tests the target-specific property of savoring, and addresses mood and mindset accounts</td>
<td>Supports H1 using a short experience, provides a subtle manipulation of savoring (limits demand explanation), and addresses mood and mindset accounts</td>
<td>Supports H1 and H2 and controls for affective expectations</td>
<td>Supports H1 with a different consumption experience, manipulates (controls for) affective expectations, manipulates the quality of the experience, and addresses mood and mindset accounts</td>
<td>Supports H1 and H2 using real-world secondary data; there is no potential for demand effects, self-generated validity, or carryover effects of measurement to explain the results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1
Ongoing Enjoyment Ratings of the Movie (Study 2)

Notes: Enjoyment was measured every three seconds on a 0–100 scale.
FUGIRE 2
Sequence of Manipulations and Enjoyment Measures (Study 3)
FIGURE 3
Ongoing Enjoyment of the Movie by Condition (Study 3)

Notes: Enjoyment was measured every three seconds on a 0–100 scale.
FIGURE 4
The Effect of Savoring and Expectations on Remembered Enjoyment (Study 4)

A. Higher-Quality Experience

B. Lower-Quality Experience

Notes: Error bars denote standard errors. Enjoyment was measured on a 1-9 scale.
FIGURE 5
2009 and 2010 J.D. Power Hotel Guests Survey: Enjoyment with the Hotel Stay by Traveler Type and Booking Window (Study 5)

Notes: Error bars denote standard errors. Enjoyment was measured on a 1-10 scale.