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Abstract

Within close relationships individuals feel a variety of emotions toward their partner, often including frustration. In the present research we suggest a novel way in which individuals respond to frustration with their partner is through their choice of brands. Specifically, we introduce the concept of oppositional brand choice, which we define as occurring when individuals choose a brand for themselves that is in opposition to the one they believe their partner prefers. Importantly, we posit that this effect is specific to individuals who are low in relationship power. Across several studies, including a subliminal priming lab study, we find that people who are lower in relationship power and are frustrated with their partner make significantly more oppositional brand choices. Further, we find that this effect is not due to a shift in underlying brand preferences. The current research has implications for theory in brand choice, close relationships, emotions, and social power.
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Imagine you’ve come home after a long day of work to find that your partner has left dirty dishes in the sink and clothes on the floor — again. Or, imagine that your partner borrowed your car, only to return it to you with an empty tank of gas. It is the third time this month that this has happened. How would you feel? What would you do to respond to this feeling?

Within close relationships, individuals feel a variety of emotions toward their partners (Berscheid & Ambrazzealors, 2001), and respond to these emotions in different ways. For example, when individuals are happy with their partner, they may engage in loving and affectionate actions. When individuals are afraid of or disgusted with their partner, they may engage in actions which push their partner away or separate themselves from their partner (i.e., avoidant behaviors, Hazan & Shaver, 1994). In the present research, we explore a novel way in which individuals respond to frustration with their partner, namely through their brand choices.

Frustration may be considered a (milder) form of anger (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004); and anger is a unique emotion in that it is the only negative emotion associated with approach tendencies (Carver, 2004; Harmon-Jones & Sigelman, 2001; Lazarus, 1991). Whereas sadness and anxiety are associated with rumination and aversive motivational states, anger, and by extension frustration, is associated with action and an appetitive motivational state (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Lazarus, 1991). As such, within the context of close relationships, frustration may lead individuals to want to act out against their partner (Berkowitz, 1989; Braiker & Kelley, 1979). However, because close relationships are those of repeated interactions in which individuals become mutually...
dependent upon one another (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 2004), people generally want to avoid hurting their partner or the relationship. Individuals who are frustrated with their partners thus face two conflicting desires: wanting to actively respond to frustration with their partner and not wanting to harm the relationship. In the present research, we propose one way in which individuals can, and do, actively respond to frustration with their partners in a relatively harmless manner is through the brand choices they make for themselves. Specifically, we propose that individuals respond to frustration with their partner by making oppositional brand choices. We define oppositional brand choices as ones in which individuals choose brands for themselves that is in opposition to the one that they believe their partner prefers.

Importantly, we suggest that not all people within close relationships will respond to frustration using brand choice in the same manner. Specifically, we posit that the effect of frustration on oppositional brand choices will depend upon power in the relationship. Power can be defined as the ability to control outcomes, deliver rewards and punishments, and influence others while resisting influence over oneself (e.g., Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Emerson, 1962; French & Raven, 1959; Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, & Gruenfeld, 2006; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Power in close relationships can be thought of similarly — the ability to control relationship outcomes (Anderson, John, & Keltner, 2012). Correspondingly, individuals who are relatively high in relationship power should be able to achieve their goals and get their preferred outcomes within the context of the relationship. Furthermore, research has shown that higher power individuals are more likely to express their own attitudes and opinions (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006). Using the opening example, higher power partners are more likely to tell their partner that they are frustrated with dishes left in the sink or clothes on the floor, which avoids situations reoccurring in the future. Therefore, partners who are high in power are not only more likely to achieve the outcomes they prefer, but are also more likely to make it known when their needs have not been met. Thus, within the context of a close relationship, higher power partners have multiple outlets through which they can achieve their desired outcomes and also express their frustration when they do not.

On the other hand, lower power partners have less control over the outcomes within their relationship (Fiske, 1993). Lower power partners are also less likely to directly express their emotions and opinions when their needs are not met (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006). Again using the opening example, lower power partners are less likely to tell their partner that they are frustrated they had to put the dishes away or refill the gas tank — even if it is the third time this month. Because lower power partners have fewer means by which they can achieve their desired outcomes and express their emotions, we propose that they will use brand choices as an outlet for their frustration. Research has shown that lower power individuals are more likely to be aware of the preferences, attitudes, and feelings of their high power partners (whereas high power individuals are less aware of others’ preferences; Fiske, 1993), and so making a brand choice that is in contrast to the one they believe their partner prefers carries more meaning for someone who is lower in relationship power. Therefore, we hypothesize that greater frustration will be associated with more oppositional brand choice for those who are lower in relationship power.

Although extensive research has focused on the brand as a relationship partner (e.g., Aggarwal, 2004; Fournier, 1998), in the current research we investigate how brands are used between partners. Specifically, we explore how brand choices may be used to navigate conflicting goals in close relationships — that of actively reducing frustration toward one’s partner without hurting the relationship. We highlight who is most likely to use this strategy — those lower in relationship power — and that this effect occurs when individuals are consciously or non-consciously frustrated with their partners. Finally, we highlight that lower power individuals who are frustrated with their partner are more likely to express their own attitudes and opinions (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006). Again using the opening example, higher power individuals who are frustrated with their partner are more likely to express their own attitudes and opinions (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006). Using the opening example, higher power partners who are high in power are not only more likely to achieve the outcomes they prefer, but are also more likely to express their own attitudes and opinions (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006). Using the opening example, lower power partners have less control over the outcomes within their relationship (Fiske, 1993). Lower power partners are also less likely to directly express their emotions and opinions when their needs are not met (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006). Again using the opening example, lower power partners are less likely to tell their partner that they are frustrated they had to put the dishes away or refill the gas tank — even if it is the third time this month. Because lower power partners have fewer means by which they can achieve their desired outcomes and express their emotions, we propose that they will use brand choices as an outlet for their frustration. Research has shown that lower power individuals are more likely to be aware of the preferences, attitudes, and feelings of their high power partners (whereas high power individuals are less aware of others’ preferences; Fiske, 1993), and so making a brand choice that is in contrast to the one they believe their partner prefers carries more meaning for someone who is lower in relationship power. Therefore, we hypothesize that greater frustration will be associated with more oppositional brand choice for those who are lower in relationship power.

Study 1

In order to test our hypothesis, in this study we manipulate emotion and examine the number of oppositional brand choices made across different emotion conditions depending upon relationship power. We use this strategy, instead of merely asking people if they make oppositional brand choices when they are frustrated with their partner, because research in emotions has demonstrated a “cold-to-hot” empathy gap, such that when individuals are in a “cold,” or unemotional, state they mispredict their reactions when in a “hot” state (Loewenstein, 1996).

Method

Two hundred ninety-two participants ($M_{age} = 32.0$ years, $SD = 10.2$; 52% men; $M_{relationship length} = 74.7$ months, $SD = 89.0$) from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk completed the study in exchange for financial compensation. We randomly assigned participants to an emotion condition (emotion: control, happy, frustrated).

Participants were told that there were several unrelated tasks involved in this study in order to minimize hypothesis guessing. All participants were given six target and some filler brand pairs and asked to indicate which brand their partner preferred (see Appendix for target brand pairs). Participants indicated how confident they were in their partners’ preference for the selected brand over the non-selected brand in only the six target brand categories (1 = Not at all sure, 7 = Extremely sure). Across the six target brand categories, the mean confidence in partner’s preferences was high ($M = 5.66, SD = .88$), which indicates that most participants were aware of their partner’s preferred brand, and suggests that choosing a brand that is in opposition to their partners’ preferred brand would be (at least somewhat) intentional.
Depending upon randomized condition, participants were asked to think and write about one of the following for a minimum of 60 s: a time that their partner did or said something that made them frustrated (frustrated condition), their partner’s physical appearance (control condition), or a time that their partner did or said something that made them happy (happy condition).

Participants were asked to imagine that, at that moment, they were making a choice between pairs of brands across several product categories. They were shown the same brand pairs as before. Participants selected which brand they preferred. They then completed relationship measures, including our focal measure of power in the relationship, the Personal Sense of Power scale (Anderson et al., 2012). This scale is a well-validated, commonly used measure of power, which we adapted for relationships (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; \( \alpha = 0.84 \)).

**Results**

We hypothesized that individuals who are lower in relationship power would make more oppositional brand choices than those who are higher in relationship power, and that this effect would be specific to frustration. In order to investigate this hypothesis, we created a measure of oppositional brand choice by summing the number of brand categories in which participants stated they preferred the opposite brand than the one that they said their partner preferred. This measure, which could range from 0–6, served as our dependent variable (\( M = 1.27, SD = 1.21 \)).

In line with our hypothesis, a regression analysis revealed a significant interaction between emotion condition and relationship power (mean-centered) on oppositional brand choice (\( F(2286) = 3.34, p = .039 \)). To examine the interaction, we conducted a series of regression analyses with emotion condition dummy-coded, relationship power (mean-centered), and their interaction predicting the number of oppositional brand choice. These analyses revealed a slight, non-significant increase in oppositional brand choice as power increased for the control condition (\( \beta = .14, t(286) = 1.37, p = .17 \)). There was no effect of power on oppositional brand choice in the happy condition (\( \beta = -.04, t(286) = -.40, p > .25 \)). As predicted, results revealed a significant negative effect of relationship power on oppositional brand choice in the frustrated condition (\( \beta = -.24, t(286) = -2.27, p = .02 \)) (Fig. 1). In other words, when individuals are lower in relationship power and feeling frustrated with their partner, they make significantly more oppositional brand choices than higher power partners.

We found that individuals who are lower in relationship power and frustrated with their partner are more likely to make oppositional brand choices. Because these are small, generally innocuous choices that are unlikely to repair a relationship when a major offense has been committed, we theorized that individuals would be more likely to make these types of brand choices when dealing with smaller, mundane, repeat offenses. To test this prediction, we conducted an internal analysis. Two coders rated the free responses within the frustrated condition for whether the response was a repeat offense or a one-time occurrence. The coders were reliable (\( \alpha = .77 \)), agreeing on 76 of 96 responses. We used a third coder to resolve the disagreements. Interestingly, results revealed that individuals who described being frustrated with their partner over something that happens repeatedly (e.g., “He sometimes makes decisions without consulting me, then doesn’t understand why I don’t know what he’s talking about”) made more oppositional brand choices than individuals who described a single event (e.g., “partner came home late and smelled bad and got in bed”; \( r(94) = 1.99, p < .05 \)). While these results are exploratory and we do not want to over-interpret them, they suggest an interesting area for future research in that there may be different “types” or levels of frustration, which could in turn lead to different brand behaviors.

**Study 2**

One question that arises from the previous study is whether individuals are shifting their underlying brand preferences or whether individuals are choosing brands because, as we propose, they are making an active choice against their partner. In other words, are participants thinking/acting as if, “I know my partner likes Diet Coke, but I’m feeling negatively towards them. Thus I feel negatively toward their preferred brand,” or are they thinking/acting as if, “I am choosing Diet Pepsi because, even though I still like Diet Coke, I feel negatively towards my partner and want to choose the opposite brand of the one s/he prefers?” While the latter reasoning would correspond with an active, and somewhat spiteful, response (i.e., I am actively choosing the brand I like less to avoid choosing the brand my partner prefers more as a way to “get back” at him/her), the former response would be a more passive approach (i.e., I feel negatively toward my partner, but instead
of taking direct action against my partner, I will change my attitudes toward the brand s/he likes).

Frustration is an active emotion (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Gross, 1998); we therefore hypothesize that lower power individuals who are frustrated with their partner will choose a brand in opposition to the one their partner prefers without changing their underlying attitudes toward the brand that their partner prefers. Whereas making an opposing brand choice is an active approach, changing underlying attitudes corresponds with a more passive approach. Because sadness is associated with rumination, acceptance and passive motivational states (Frijda, Kuipers, & Ter Schure, 1989), we propose consumers experiencing sadness toward their partners will change their attitudes toward their partner’s brands. In order to test these hypotheses, we manipulate frustration and sadness, and measure attitudes toward partners’ brands before and after the manipulation.

Method

Five hundred ninety-seven individuals (M_{age} = 35.7 years, SD = 11.4; 46% men; M_{relationshiplength} = 93.9 months, SD = 104.1), from Mturk completed the study in exchange for financial compensation.

Participants were asked to provide their partner’s favorite brand across various categories, including six target categories: overall favorite, car, clothing, tea/coffee, soda, and technology. They were asked to indicate how much they liked each one of their partner’s brands on a 7-point Likert scale anchored with Strongly Dislike and Strongly Like. Participants completed the same power measure as used in Study 1 (Anderson et al., 2012; α = .91) and the same filler tasks. Participants were randomized to the same three emotion conditions used in the previous study, except instead of a happy condition, we included a sad condition. Participants were asked to indicate how positively or negatively they felt about their partner’s favorite brand in each of the six target categories and filler brands on a 7-point Likert scale. Lastly, we included demographic items.

Results

In order to test whether participants’ are changing their attitudes toward their partners’ brands depending upon the specific negative emotion felt, we created an initial and a post-manipulation brand attitudes measure. Specifically, we averaged the responses on the six target categories. Regression analyses were the same as in Study 1, except we included the initial brand attitudes measure as a covariate and the post-manipulation brand attitudes measure served as our dependent variable.

Results revealed a significant interaction (F(2590) = 3.23, p = .040). Examining the interaction, we find that there was a marginally significant positive effect of power on brand attitudes within the control condition (β = .07, t(590) = 1.87, p = .062). There was a significant positive effect of power on partner brand attitudes within the sad condition (β = .14, t(590) = 3.30, p = .001). In other words, in line with our predictions, when individuals are feeling sad toward their partner and power in the relationship decreases, individuals report more negative attitudes toward their partner’s brands. Importantly, there was no effect of power on partner brand attitudes within the frustrated condition (β = −.01, t(590) = −.13, p > .25).

This study provides additional support for our theory in regards to frustration and also highlights different ways individuals use brands more broadly to respond to negative emotions within their close relationships. In addition, this study distinguishes our theory from Balance Theory (Heider, 1958). While Balance Theory predicts that any type of negative feelings toward one’s partner should result in negative attitudes toward a partner’s preferred brand, in contrast, our theory predicts that there will be different effects on brand attitudes and choice depending upon the specific negative emotion. The current findings support our theory as individuals who were lower power and sad had, on average, more negative attitudes toward their partner’s brand, whereas, individuals who were lower power and frustrated did not have more negative attitudes.

Study 3

In the previous studies we used a conscious recall paradigm. In our final study we use a subliminal priming paradigm to expand on our previous findings and examine whether non-conscious frustration toward one’s partner results in the same effects. Previous research has highlighted that emotion concepts can be non-consciously activated (e.g., Zemack-Rugar, Betman, & Fitzsimons, 2007) and that non-consciously activating close relationships influences behavior (Chartrand, Dalton, & Fitzsimons, 2007; Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2003; Shah, 2003). However, this is the first research, that we are aware of, to non-consciously link a partner’s name with emotion concepts and examine whether non-consciously activating a significant other and an emotion simultaneously will produce behavioral results that parallel the conscious experience of an emotion at the hands of a significant other.

In this study, we again include a sad emotion condition. Because frustration and sadness are associated with different motivational states (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Frijda et al., 1989), we hypothesize that there will be different effects of power on oppositional brand choice depending upon the specific negative emotion. Similar to our previous finding, we predict that, as relationship power decreases, individuals will make significantly more oppositional brand choices in the frustrated condition. We do not predict this effect for the sad or control conditions.

Method

One hundred thirty-six individuals came to the lab. Participants had to speak English as a first language and be in a relationship for at least six months. Nine participants were excluded due to not meeting study requirements, leaving 127
are significant positive effect of power on oppositional brand choice within the control condition ($\beta = .31$, $t(121) = 1.70$, $p = .091$), such that as power in the relationship decreased, the number of oppositional brand choices also decreased. In other words, when individuals are (non-consciously) sad with their partner, they make fewer oppositional brand choices as power in the relationship decreases. Importantly, and in line with predictions, there was a significant negative effect of power on oppositional brand choice in the frustrated condition ($\beta = -.31$, $t(121) = 1.99$, $p = .048$). In other words, individuals who are (non-consciously) frustrated with their partner made significantly more oppositional brand choices as power in the relationship decreased. Overall, these results highlight that relationship power has different effects on brand choice depending upon the specific negative emotion experienced within the relationship.

Further, this study highlights that conscious and non-conscious emotion within close relationships can produce similar effects on behavior, including affecting brand choice.

**General discussion**

Although previous research has focused on verbal or physical responses to frustration (Berscheid & Ammazzalorso, 2001; Frijda et al., 1989; Lazarus, 1991; Levenson, 1992), in the present research, we propose and explore a novel way in which individuals respond to frustration with their partners, namely through their brand choices. Overall, we demonstrate that people use brands and brand choices to manipulate interpersonal relationship factors, including emotions within relationships. Although we focused on frustration and relationship power, these findings open the door to new research further examining how brands are used to navigate factors within close relationships, either consciously or non-consciously.

The present research is not without limitations. First, we asked participants to choose between pairs of brands that we pre-selected. Although these pairs of brands consisted of two well-known, large market share brands within each category, perhaps participants did not view them as being in opposition to one another. We repeated the analyses using confidence in partners’ preferences as a control variable, and find the same results; however, it is important for future research to expand upon these brand categories and pairings. Another limitation of the present work is that the choices participants made were theoretical — they did not actually receive the products they selected. Future research might explore the robustness of these types of choices when there are required investments of time and/or money.

Are oppositional brand choices effective? In an initial study, we found some evidence to suggest that making oppositional brand choices can reduce relationship frustration (see MDA for information regarding this study), which might lead to greater satisfaction in the relationship. However, there is other research to suggest that convergence in preferences is associated with greater relationship satisfaction (e.g., Gonzaga, Campos, & Bradbury, 2007), which suggests that a shift in underlying preferences may be the more effective strategy over time. As the current research only examined brand choices at one point, future research could investigate the effectiveness of different brand strategies within close relationships over shorter and longer time periods, i.e., cross-sectional vs. longitudinal research. It would be quite interesting if the most satisfying strategy in the short run (i.e.,
making an oppositional choice) was not the strategy that led to the best outcomes in the long run.

We theorized and found evidence to suggest that oppositional brand choice is most likely to be used by lower power partners who may not have many alternative ways to vent their frustration. By examining how individuals who are low in relationship power use brand choices to respond to frustration, these studies begin to respond to requests for a more interpersonal perspective on consumer behavior (Simpson, Griskevicius, & Rothman, 2012), and contribute to theory in emotions, close relationships, and social power. However, future research could further investigate the effects of social power on oppositional brand choices. For example, would lower power individuals who are frustrated with their partner still choose opposite brands when they are in the presence of their high power partners? Previous research has found that individuals who are low in power are more likely to acquiesce to the preferences and opinions of high power partners (e.g., Keltner et al., 2003), which suggests that they might not. In addition, we asked participants to make a brand choice for themselves, and not their partner, thus the term oppositional. Future research could examine whether there are differences between oppositional and “spiteful” brand choices. If someone were to make a truly “spiteful” choice, then one would choose the brand that is in opposition to the brand that the partner likes when the partner actually has to consume it. Because low power partners may be less likely to act out against their high power partners (Simpson et al., 2012), there might be a reversal of the present effects, such that high power partners are more likely to make “spiteful” brand choices, while lower power partners are more likely to make oppositional ones.

The current research highlighted that, depending upon relationship power, frustration and sadness have different effects on attitudes and choice toward a partner’s brand. Further, these findings also suggest that there may be differential effects based on the type or level of the specific emotion felt toward a partner. For example, in terms of frustration, the internal analysis from Study 1 highlighted that individuals who were frustrated with their partner over something that happened repeatedly made more oppositional brand choices than did someone who described an event that occurred only once. As frustration is a milder form of anger (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004), perhaps there is a minimum threshold of this emotion that lower power individuals need to feel in order to act out against their partner; and this threshold is more likely to be met when an incident occurs repeatedly. Future research could investigate different levels of frustration (and anger) to better understand consumer reactions in regard to this emotion. In terms of sadness, we found that individuals who are feeling sad toward a partner report more negative attitudes toward their partner’s brands (Study 2), yet make (marginally) fewer oppositional brand choices (Study 3). These findings suggest that whereas frustration produced similar results regardless of whether the emotion was elicited consciously or non-consciously, the effects of sadness on brand attitudes and choice may depend upon level of awareness. This idea is in line with previous research, which has found that the effects of sadness on consumer behavior vary depending upon the degree of self-focus (e.g., Cryder, Lerner, Gross, & Dahl, 2008). Furthermore, as sadness is associated with rumination (Frijda et al., 1989), previous research and the current findings suggest that conscious and non-conscious feelings of sadness toward one’s partner may differentially influence cognitive focus, including self-focus, which, may in turn influence brand attitudes and brand choice. Future research could further investigate these ideas and, more broadly, the effects of different types and levels of specific emotions within close relationships on brand behaviors.

Finally, future research could examine brand choices and brand preferences more broadly within the context of close relationships. For example, how does the expression of brand choices and preferences play out within the relationship depending upon relationship power? If lower power partners have fewer means to express their opinions (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006; Fiske, 1993), this could mean that they are less likely to enjoy the brands they prefer. How would not being able to enjoy the brands that one prefers within a close relationship affect the relationship?

In conclusion, we hope that the current findings will inspire researchers to examine additional conditions under which individuals use brands and brand choice to respond to emotions and situations within the context of close relationships.

Appendix

Additional study information Study 1

Target brand pairs from the following categories: shoes (Nike versus Adidas), coffee (Dunkin’ Donuts versus Starbucks), Soda (Pepsi versus Coke), cellphone provider (AT&T versus Verizon), toothpaste (Crest versus Colgate), computers (Apple versus Microsoft). We chose these as our target brand categories because within these categories are two well-known brands that each hold a large market share and are often viewed as competitors or “opposite” brands.

Additional study information Study 3

Procedure

In line with previous research (e.g., Bargh & Chartrand, 2000; Zemack-Rugar et al., 2007), participants were seated at a computer station in the lab. Instructions were as follows:

“This exercise will test your visual acuity. Please focus your visual attention on the center of the screen throughout the entire task. There will be a series of flashes around the screen. Indicate whether the flashes are on the left or the right of the center of the screen by pushing either the S key (left) or the L key (right) as quickly as you can after each flash. Press the spacebar to continue.”

Stimulus words were flashed parafoveally for 60 ms in one of the four quadrants of the screen (randomly). We alternated the participant’s partner’s first name followed by one of the specific
words from their assigned condition. Participants completed 64 trials (partner’s name was presented 32 times and each of the four words within the condition was shown eight times). As is recommended for reducing the visibility of the stimulus (Bargh & Chatrand, 2000), following each target word, a backward mask appeared (the letters “XQFBZRMQWGBX”). In between trials, three asterisks appeared in the center of the screen until participants pressed the space bar to move on to the next trial.

Following previous research (e.g., Custers & Aarts, 2005; Zemack-Rugar et al., 2007), we used the following words for each condition.

Frustrated condition: frustrated, annoyed, irritated, mad
Sad words: sad, miserable, depressed, gloomy
Neutral words: balanced, ordinary, regular, neutral

Results

In this study we also included a measure of reactance (Hong & Faedda, 1996). We repeated the analyses with reactance as a covariate. Results remain the same: controlling for reactance, we found that there was no effect of power on oppositional brand choices (F(2120) = 3.11, p = .048). Examining the interaction, and controlling for reactance, we find that there was no effect of power on oppositional brand choice within the control condition (β = −.01, t(120) = −0.07, p > .25) or the sad condition (β = .25, t(120) = 1.45, p < .15). However, even after controlling for reactance, there was a significant negative effect of power on oppositional brand choice in the frustrated condition (β = −.33, t(120) = −2.07, p = .041).

Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2016.10.002.
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