



Print ISSN: 1738-3110 / Online ISSN 2093-7717
 JDS website: <http://www.jds.or.kr/>
<http://doi.org/10.15722/jds.22.08.202408.125>

Consumer Aggression in Online Distribution of the Game; Motivation of Negative Consumer Behaviors

Eikjoe KIM¹, Jongwoo LEE²

Received: January 17, 2024. Revised: February 28, 2024. Accepted: August 05, 2024.

Abstract

Purpose: This paper aims to reveal similarities and differences in behaviors in negative consumer-brand relationships. Thus, we focused on consumer motivation which includes intensity and direction of behaviors. The motivation for negative customer behavior has been discussed in the context of brand hate, but there is only limited research that has tried to measure it using quantitative methods. We are trying to measure customers' motivation in negative consumer-brand relationships and reveal the relationship between in-field customers' negative behaviors. **Research design, data, and methodology:** We adopt Reactive-Proactive aggression to measure the motivation of customers' behaviors in a negative consumer-brand relationship. Also, to reveal the relationship between in-field behavior and customer aggression, we survey Korean game communities to reactive-proactive aggression and behaviors, whether they participate, in each observed behavior during the serial negative consumer movements that occurred in the Korean game industry. As a methodology, we run multinomial logistic regression. **Results:** We observed 9 behaviors in this case, and we found that reactive-proactive aggression is related to participation and motivation of these behaviors. **Conclusions:** We suggest the potential of reactive-proactive aggression as motivation for customers' complex negative behaviors. Based on this potential, we hope reactive-proactive aggression could be used to reveal similarities and differences in behaviors in negative consumer-brand relationships.

Keywords : Consumer Behaviors, Consumer Aggression, Boycott, Brand Retaliation, Online Distribution

JEL Classification Code: M30, L82, L86

1. Introduction

Consumers express negative behavior to relieve their emotions and balance damage from dissatisfaction or unethical behavior caused by corporate behavior (Fetscherin, 2019; Hegner et al., 2017; Klein et al., 2004; Richins, 1983). The development of digital technology has expanded the negative impact of consumers' brand negative behavior. Consumers can share the negative experiences they have

gained from the brand with the newly acquired digital technology, causing enormous damage to the brand (Kähr et al., 2016).

Existing studies have focused on emotions as an independent variable that causes negative behavior and are attempting to organize such complex emotions via a single concept called 'brand hatred' (Kucuk, 2019; Kucuk, 2021; Yadav & Chakrabarti, 2022). On the other hand, the motivation defined as the direction and intensity of the

1 First Author, Ph. D Candidate, Business Administration, Ajou University, Korea, E-mail: holl121@ajou.ac.kr

2 Corresponding Author, Professor, Business Administration, Ajou University, Korea, E-mail: zest07@hanmail.net

© Copyright: The Author(s)

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

action has been limitedly studied in some studies (Kähr et al., 2016; Klein et al., 2004). With the development of digital technology, online distribution of services/products such as download, and subscription-based service models has become common in the gaming industry. Such changes in the distribution trend within the gaming industry have had an important influence on social activities related to games (Toivonen & Sotamaa, 2010). In this study, the main focus is to discover the motivation behind the aggressive behavior of consumers based on the incidents that have occurred in the gaming market where digital distribution is generalized.

We argue that the factor 'motivation' can better explain consumer behavior that occurs simultaneously and is multifaceted than emotion. The concept of consumer's negative behavior has already been studied in past studies related to brand avoidance (Lee et al., 2009; Thompson, Whelan & Johnson 2006), brand switch (Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2004), brand rejection (Sandıkçı & Ekici, 2009), brand retaliation (Fetscherin, 2019; Hegner et al., 2017), and brand revenge. However, the boundaries of these concepts can sometimes become ambiguous. The United Breaks Guitars case, a representative example of negative and aggressive consumer behavior, was conceptualized as brand sabotage with an active attack on brand value in previous studies, but it can also be seen as a kind of negative word of mouth as such events occur in public places.

To address this ambiguity, some studies have argued that by comparing the similarities and differences of each behavior, it can be compared and classified according to the motivation and purpose of the behavior. For example, negative word of mouth can be divided into private NWOM, which aims to alleviate one's own emotions by talking to others and warning others, and public NWOM, which aims to inform the public about a company's wrongdoing and demand changes in its behavior (Aziz & Rahman, 2022; Bayarassou, et al., 2020; Zarantonello et al., 2016). Additionally, research has also categorized negative consumer behaviors based on the motivation and purpose of brand revenge, which focuses on impulsive behavior with a goal to harm the company, and brand retaliation, which is relatively rational and seeks to restore balance (Fetscherin, 2019; Nyer & Gopinath, 2005; Zourrig et al., 2009).

Scholars have argued that to generalize negative consumer behaviors, the negative behaviors can be classified according to their motivations and purposes, such as fight-flight and approach-avoidance. While such arguments have been accepted by many scholars, there is a lack of quantitative and specific criteria for classifying the motivations behind each behavior. Therefore, additional research is needed to establish a clear and consistent criteria for categorizing negative consumer behaviors based on their underlying motivations and purposes. Based on the conclusions obtained from past research, we focused on

quantitatively measuring the motives and purposes of simultaneous and complex behaviors occurring in the actual field.

We aim to contribute to consumers' negative behavior research in two directions. First, while most studies agree on the approach-avoidance and active-passive behavior classifications of negative consumer behavior, few studies have proposed quantitative scales to classify each behavior and applied them to an actual case. Therefore, this study aims to measure the motives of each behavior using the proactive-reactive aggression scale of psychology. And then, this study examines how these motives affect actual behavior by surveying participants of the serial negative consumer behaviors that occurred in the Korean game industry. Second, we aim to check the possibility that consumers behave with complex motives in negative consumer-brand relationships. Kucuk (2021) argues that different motivations can simultaneously affect consumer behavior. We also make the same argument by referring to various studies and the aggression theory.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Motivation of Negative Consumer-brand Relationship

In the context of negative consumer-brand relationships, brand hate integrates various negative emotions of consumers, for example, anger, fear, disgust, etc., and is used to explain consumer behaviors. Many researchers agree on this secondary emotional structure of brand hate based on the Duplex theory. Researchers use different bundles of behaviors to describe the results of brand hate. Zarantonello et al. (2016) and Zhang and Laroche (2020) studied Complaining, Negative Word of Mouth, Protest, and Patronage Reduction/Cessation as a result of brand hate, while Hegner et al. (2017) studied Brand Avoidance, Negative Word of Mouth, Brand Retaliation. Fetscherin (2019) studied behaviors such as Brand Switching, Private Complaining, Public Complaining, Brand Retaliation, Brand Revenge, and Willingness to Make Financial Sacrifices as a result of brand hate. Each study has revealed that brand hate leads to various crucial negative consumer behaviors. However, different criteria such as form and motivation are used to distinguish between the results of negative emotions, and there is a lack of clear criteria accordingly.

A handful of studies have tried to integrate various forms of consumer behavior resulting from brand hate. Grégoire et al. (2009) identified brand hate as the desire for avoidance and the desire for revenge, while Kähr et al. (2016) categorized negative consumer behavior towards brands

into instrumental aggression and hostile aggression. Bayarassou et al. (2020) used the coping strategy theory to classify the motives behind negative consumer behavior into fight-flight, resulting in revenge and avoidance. Fetscherin et al. (2021) organized the consumer-brand relationship into a brand relation wheel and categorized negative consumer-brand relationships into forms of behavior, such as share of wallet, the share of voice, and share of heart. Zhang and Laroche (2020) classified the results of brand hate according to level, ranging from the lowest level of communication of the brand to the highest level of fighting with the brand. Kucuk (2021) reviewed previous studies and claimed that the response to brand hate can be categorized into avoidance, approach, and attack.

Despite differences in the details, most of studies have shown commonalities in categorizing negative consumer behavior based on the motivations of avoidance-approach, passive-active, and instrumental-emotional. We argue that focusing on motivation is important and useful to further research. There are several reasons. First, motivation contains the direction and intensity of desired one, and it can be indexed by behavioral intention (Sheeran, 2002). Thus, motivation can affect various behavioral intention. Second, the development of ICT makes behavior of consumer more various and dynamic, thus we should better focus on motivation rather than specific behavior, which can be transformed by means and situations of individuals.

Furthermore, there are points where researchers do not agree when it comes to classifying each behavior and explaining its characteristics. Yadav and Chkrabarti (2022) treated Brand Sabotage as an extreme form of Brand Retaliation, but Fetscherin and KC (2021) and Kähr et al. (2016) treated it as a concept that can be distinguished in terms of its intensity and purpose. Additionally, concerning complaining behavior, Kucuk (2021) viewed it as expressive behavior that differs from NWOM, but Grégoire et al. (2018) argued that complaining behavior can be rational in some cases, aimed at resolving issues. It seems to be some disagreements in classifying behaviors that can be categorized by each motivation. So, we suggest specific and quantitative measure to classify each consumer behavior and explain its characteristics. To address this, we propose adopting the concept of aggression from psychology to explain consumer behaviors.

We adopted the reactive and proactive aggression approach to explain the motivation behind customers' aggressive behavior. The concept of aggression offers some advantages, first, it is a concept that has been validated for most aggressive human behavior in countless psychological research, so, we expect it will be useful to explain various customer aggressive behavior (Crick & Dodge, 1996). Second, the reactive and proactive aggression can work simultaneously on one behavior to explain the motivation of

each behavior complexly. (Anderson & Bushman, 2002)".

2.2. The Reactive-proactive Aggression

Aggression refers to behaviors performed to harm another person (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Dollard et al., 1939; Feshbach, 1964). Feshbach (1964) categorized aggressive behavior into Incidental, Instrumental, and Hostile types, but Anderson and Bushman (2002) emphasized the importance of intention and proposed classifying aggression into hostile-instrumental or reactive-proactive types. These two types of aggression differ in their motives, goals, and underlying processes (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Crick & Dodge, 1996; Lorenz et al., 2021). In this research, we follow Anderson & Bushman's classification, reactive-proactive aggression.

Reactive aggression is characterized by a tendency to react emotionally and passively to unpleasant stimuli and to attack others as a means of self-protection, it is referred to as hostile aggression. Proactive aggression is a form of aggression that is planned and carried out with a specific goal in mind and is characterized by rational and active behavior. This is often referred to as instrumental aggression. The reactive-proactive distinction is not mutually exclusive. Thus, some behaviors can be explained by both types of motives. We use the term reactive-proactive categories, which refers to a developed strategic scale, for the purpose of conducting quantitative research (Miller & Lynam, 2006).

The reactive-proactive aggression classification is similar to the passive-active or hostile-instrumental categorization of negative behaviors in the consumer-brand relationship, but it differs from the avoidance-approach or flight-fight categories based on coping strategy. The difference lies in the intention of harming other, as flight or avoidance behaviors do not necessarily involve intentions to harm the brand, whereas reactive aggression requires consumers to intentionally harm the brand in response to the company's negative behavior (Anderson et al., 1995; Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Miller & Lynam, 2006). Negative behaviors of consumers that fall into the flight or avoidance categories do not necessarily cause harm to the brand or company but rather aim to escape from negative situations (Bayarassou et al., 2020; Zarantonello et al., 2016). Behaviors such as patronage reduction or non-repurchase intention cannot be explained as aggression if consumers do not intend to harm the company.

The reactive-proactive dichotomy aligns with former marketing literature. Kähr et al. (2016) already introduced hostile-instrumental aggression considered the same dichotomy as reactive-proactive. The reactive-proactive dichotomy also divides aggressive behaviors as active and passive, which Zarantonello et al. (2016) have suggested. Also, Aziz and Rahman (2022) and Kucuk (2021) argue that

mixed motivations, such as instrumental and expressive simultaneously, can be. As we mentioned in the introduction, the reactive-proactive dichotomy is not mutually exclusive and considers consumers can be thoughtful and emotional at the same time. So, it also aligns with the argument of Aziz and Rahman (2022) and Kucuk (2021).

3. Hypotheses Development

As we discussed in literature review, we follow the Anderson & Bushman's classification, the reactive-proactive aggression. The reactive aggression is aggression which aim to do protect self and occurred emotionally. vice versa proactive aggression is aggression which aim to get own goal and tend to rationally. Our research examines how each type of aggression affects negative consumer behaviors. We studied the series of events that occurred in the Korean gaming industry in 2021. The issue began with discrimination against Korean and foreign users in a certain game, which then evolved into various negative behaviors by users due to the game service company's unfaithful attitude. These negative behaviors spread to other brands and led to protests across multiple game brands in the form of boycotts, demonstrations, and others. We classified the common behaviors observed in various online game brands during this series of consumer behaviors using the terminology previously used in academia and examined which types of aggression each behavior was influenced by. These series of consumer behaviors commonly included the following actions.

Negative word-of-mouth (NWOM) about service failures by companies is one of the actions that consumers can take to relieve their emotions or demand action from the brand, and it is telling other about the unsatisfactory product and service (Richins, 1983; Grégoire et al., 2015; Hegner et al., 2017). In the case we are studying, we can find two different types of NWOM, Public and Private. Private NWOM were behaviors such as complaining to friends, relatives, or other close relationships who are also game users. Also, there are Public NWOM expressing dissatisfaction in public online spaces where anyone can see. These types of complaints contain free posting individuals' opinion on each game brands communities, the selection of community representatives who officially publicized consumers' grievances to game brands, and the media in the form of a statement. We classified these behaviors as Private/Public NWOM in our study.

In the case of the Korean game industry, Public NWOM in communities is motivated by proactive aggression in the sense that consumers confirm each other's opinions and demand the brand to change their action, while also having reactive motivation to alleviate damaged emotions and

protect their self-esteem by attacking brands for inappropriate behavior. Otherwise, Private NWOM usually aims to venting emotions and protect near ones from negative experiences, rather than to communicate with companies. Therefore, we assume that Private NWOM is associated with reactive aggression.

H1a: Reactive aggression positively affects intention and participation for private NWOM.

H1b: Reactive aggression positively affects public NWOM.

H1c: Proactive aggression is positively related to public NWOM.

Boycotts generally have the proactive purpose of urging changes in a company's behavior and punishing the company by reducing its sales (Klein et al., 2004; Neilson, 2010). However, according to some studies, consumers may also reactively boycott a product if they associate it with negative feelings that could harm their well-being (Ali, 2021). Therefore, while boycotts typically have a utilitarian purpose driven by proactive aggression, some boycotts may also be reactively motivated by consumers' negative perceptions of the brand.

In this case, we have identified two actions that can be categorized as boycotts: signing up to participate in the boycotts and deleting in-game items or characters. To understand the complex nature of consumer boycotts, we surveyed both behaviors. Previous studies argued that boycotts typically have a specific purpose. Signing up to participate in a boycott is typically motivated by proactive aggression but may also be driven by reactive aggression (Ali, 2021; Klein et al., 2004; Neilson, 2010). On the other hand, deleting in-game items or characters does not appear to have a clear rational or purposeful motivation, but rather seems to be driven by emotional and impulsive reactions to negative emotions about the brand. Therefore, while this behavior can still be considered a boycott, we believe that it is mainly related to reactive aggression and only slightly related to proactive aggression.

H2a: Reactive aggression positively affects intention and participation in signing up for a boycott.

H2b: Proactive aggression positively affects intention and participation in signing up for a boycott.

H2c: Reactive aggression positively affects intention and participation in deleting in-game item and characters.

Although not all brand switching has the aggressive motivation, some consumers intend to harm their original brand by switching to a competitor when experiencing dissatisfaction (Bechwati & Morrin, 2003). The previous study differentiated brand switching into active alternatives

seeking retaliation against a company and reactive switching as a means to maximize personal benefits by considering the competitive brand as a substitute. Park et al. (2013) argued that when brand images lead to self-contraction and convey negative resources, they motivate avoidance of the brand to prevent the resulting pain.

Therefore, we expected a relationship between brand switching and reactive aggressiveness. However, as brand switching with the intention of harming a company is not aimed at achieving objectives beyond personal damage recovery or changing a company's behavior, it is unlikely to be associated with proactive aggressiveness.

H3: Reactive aggression positively affects intention and participation in brand switching.

Suing against a brand in a third-party institution is an intense behavior that demands punishment for the brand through legal or public systems and demands compensation for the damages suffered by consumers. Unfortunately, we could not find previous studies and theories related to lawsuits and consumer behavior, but we consider it as a brand retaliation aggressive action in that it aims to retaliate against the company which contain various actions Brand retaliation can be distinguished from brand revenge in that it is more rational, long-term, and seeks fairness regarding the damages suffered by the brand. On the other hand, brand revenge is impulsive, short-term, and focused on relieving one's emotions (Fetscherin, 2019; Zourrig et al., 2009). We anticipate suing brand will be associated with proactive aggression. that it can be considered as brand retaliation (Kucuk, 2019; Kucuk, 2021).

H4a: Proactive aggression is positively related to suing a brand through an external organization.

In the given case, we observed another complex and unique behavior, which was a demonstration using display trucks and a meeting with brand representatives. Due to Covid-19, direct protests were not possible, so most game communities cooperated to raise money and hired trucks to tour the areas associated with the brand. Through this, they denounced the brand's behavior and demanded a meeting between brand representatives and consumer representatives. While previous research viewed these actions as part of a boycott (Klein et al., 2004), we considered it different because the consumers were not demanding that others not purchase from the brand, but rather that the brand's actions be improved. We created a separate item for this reason. We believed that the truck protest and meeting would be related to proactive aggression.

H5: Proactive aggression is positively related to display

truck demonstrations and meetings.

Kähr et al. (2016) associated brand sabotage with reactive (hostile) aggression, but according to some studies, there is also a perspective that views brand sabotage as an extreme form of brand retaliation (Yadav & Chkrabarti, 2022). In the Korean game industry case, we identified two actions that aim solely to damage the brand. One is called "review terror," where intentionally low ratings are given to the game by consumers, bringing its overall rating down to a suspiciously low level. We considered this behavior to have both the nature of brand sabotage and public NWOM, so we believed it had both proactive and reactive aggression. The second action involves pressuring influencers who create videos related to the brand or who have been commissioned to create ads for the company. Many influencers who received the company's ads were pressured to retract their videos and issue apologies for their association with the brand. Based on the study of Kähr et al. (2016), we believed that these actions were associated with reactive aggression.

H6a: Reactive aggression is positively related to negative reviews.

H6b: Proactive aggression is positively related to negative reviews.

H6c: Reactive aggression is positively related to publishing negative reactions.

4. Methodology

4.1. Sample

This study examines the conflict between consumers and game brands in the Korean game industry in 2021. The sample consisted of consumers who had played games that had problems during that period. Despite being limited to one industry and region, this incident was considered valuable as a research subject because it included different brands and could examine various negative consumer behaviors simultaneously. The study focused on users of six game brands that showed aggressive behavior and conducted an online survey on each game's online community, with 238 respondents participating. After excluding 21 respondents who did not use the game and 10 who responded untrustworthily, a total of 207 samples were analyzed. The consumers of this issue engaged in various forms of negative behavior, and since different negative behaviors (negative word of mouth, boycott, etc.) and aggression could be compared in one case, the sample was deemed appropriate. For the detail, we attach table 1.

Table 1: Case Summary

Aggressive Behavior	Participate		Intend to participate but did not		Did not participate and did not intend to	
Private NWOM	102	(49.28%)	17	(8.21%)	88	(42.51%)
Public NWOM	91	(43.96%)	33	(15.94%)	83	(40.10%)
Boycott_Signing	97	(46.86%)	36	(17.39%)	74	(35.75%)
Boycott_Breaking product	29	(14.01%)	34	(16.43%)	144	(69.57%)
Brand Switching	66	(31.88%)	47	(22.71%)	94	(45.41%)
Suing the brand	18	(8.70%)	48	(23.19%)	141	(68.12%)
Demonstration	66	(31.88%)	49	(23.67%)	92	(44.44%)
Brand Sabotage_Negative Reaction	65	(31.40%)	18	(8.70%)	124	(59.90%)
Brand Sabotage_Negative Review	76	(36.71%)	31	(14.98%)	100	(48.31%)

4.2. Measurement

We used the Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPAQ), developed by Raine et al. (2006), to measure reactive-proactive aggression, which we manipulated as the purpose and motivation of behaviors. For each type of aggression, we selected four items from the RPAQ, excluding those deemed inappropriate for explaining brand aggression. Although aggression is behavior in the conceptual definition, the core factor we aimed to measure was motivation and purpose. Therefore, we asked consumers to rate how similar their behavior and RPAQ items were when they recalled their behavior during that time.

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis for each aggression item. As a result, there were no issues with the reactive aggression items. However, for the proactive aggression items, the item "Fight for status" was classified as reactive aggression, so it was excluded from the analysis. The factor analysis performed after excluding this item had a sufficient KMO value (0.848), and the results of Bartlett's test were also appropriate (χ^2 : 636.304, df: 21, p-value: 0.000). The Cronbach's alpha values for the proactive aggression items and reactive aggression items were 0.729 and 0.869, respectively.

To observe the relationship between various consumer behaviors and aggression, we categorized behaviors commonly observed in various brands during the game industry problem in 2021 based on existing academic concepts and surveyed the participation and intention of each behavior (Klein et al., 2004). Through this process, we aimed to compare behaviors that could be classified as the same but expressed differently according to different motivations.

4.3. Method

We used the Multinomial Logistic Regression technique

to analyze the hypotheses. Logistic Regression is a method used to reveal and predict the relationship between continuous independent variables and categorical dependent variables. Compared to the OLS (Ordinal Least Squared) Regression, which is also used for the same purpose, Logistic Regression requires milder statistical assumptions. It is widely used in many social science studies due to its robustness in the case of non-normal distribution assumptions, which are ensured by random sampling, making it less statistically restrictive (Peng et al., 2002). In this study, we used Multinomial Logistic Regression to predict categorical dependent variables that have two or more outcome values and sequentially compared and tested the two values other than the base value (not participating in aggressive behavior).

The independence variable is measurement of reactive and proactive aggression, and the dependence variable is asking consumer that whether "participate to negative behavior" or just "have intention but not participate" or "do not have intention to participate". We run Multinomial Logistic Regression for each behavior we have observed with SPSS 22.

4.4. Results

When examining the overall goodness of fit of the model, the model consisting of each type of aggressive behavior and aggression showed a significant improvement compared to the intercept only model. Additionally, there was no significant difference between the saturated model and the model including the two types of aggression, indicating that the two types of aggression are sufficient in explaining the various consumer behaviors observed (also, see Table 2).

Table 2: Goodness of fit test

Comparison test with saturation model

Comparison test with intercept only model

Independent Variable	Comparison test with saturation model				Comparison test with intercept only model				
		Chi-Squared	df	p-value	Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Squared	df	p-value
Private NWOM	Pearson	285.515	280	.398	only Intercept	328.257			
	Deviance	265.892	280	.718	Final model	300.704	27.553	4	.000
Public NWOM	Pearson	291.917	280	.300	only Intercept	365.038			
	Deviance	283.411	280	.432	Final model	321.806	43.231	4	.000
Boycott_ Signing	Pearson	257.310	280	.831	only Intercept	370.000			
	Deviance	271.668	280	.628	Final model	309.488	60.511	4	.000
Boycott_ Breaking product	Pearson	292.480	280	.292	only Intercept	305.061			
	Deviance	252.832	280	.877	Final model	278.563	26.497	4	.000
Brand Switching	Pearson	282.986	280	.439	only Intercept	367.967			
	Deviance	304.473	280	.151	Final model	350.619	17.349	4	.002
Suing the brand	Pearson	326.626	280	.029	only Intercept	309.696			
	Deviance	218.535	280	.997	Final model	241.998	67.698	4	.000
Demonstration	Pearson	263.536	280	.752	only Intercept	381.672			
	Deviance	268.954	280	.672	Final model	312.580	69.092	4	.000
Brand Sabotage_ Negative Reaction	Pearson	293.867	280	.273	only Intercept	329.309			
	Deviance	234.092	280	.979	Final model	262.509	66.800	4	.000
Brand Sabotage_ Negative Review	Pearson	287.960	280	.359	only Intercept	364.455			
	Deviance	270.484	280	.647	Final model	306.708	57.747	4	.000

We conducted a multinomial logistic regression analysis on the items, and all hypotheses, except H2c, were supported. Detailed results are described in table 3. Deleting in-game items/characters was found to be unrelated to both types of aggression. Contrary to our hypothesis, Brand

Sabotage Negative Reaction has a high correlation not only with reactive aggression but also with proactive aggression. Through these results, we confirm that proactive and reactive aggression can act simultaneously or separately depending on the purpose and motivation of each behavior.

Table 3: Wald chi-squared test result

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	Std. Error	p-value	Exp(B)	
Private NWOM	Participate	Intercept	-1.495	.385	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.340	.105	.001	1.404
		Proactive Aggression	.156	.112	.164	1.169
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-2.291	.632	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.051	.186	.784	1.052
		Proactive Aggression	.158	.192	.410	1.171
Public NWOM	Participate	Intercept	-2.212	.433	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.351	.113	.002	1.420
		Proactive Aggression	.356	.123	.004	1.428
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-2.622	.542	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.334	.142	.018	1.396
		Proactive Aggression	.217	.155	.161	1.243
Boycott_ Signing	Participate	Intercept	-2.359	.449	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.399	.126	.002	1.490
		Proactive Aggression	.450	.133	.001	1.569
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-3.373	.595	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.586	.152	.000	1.796
		Proactive Aggression	.266	.163	.102	1.305

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	Std. Error	p-value	Exp(B)	
Boycott_ Breaking product	Participate	Intercept	-3.043	.566	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.202	.133	.131	1.223
		Proactive Aggression	.211	.147	.151	1.235
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-3.648	.599	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.317	.129	.014	1.372
		Proactive Aggression	.278	.141	.049	1.320
Brand Switching	Participate	Intercept	-1.480	.405	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.299	.112	.008	1.348
		Proactive Aggression	.046	.119	.698	1.047
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-1.867	.456	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.306	.123	.013	1.358
		Proactive Aggression	.052	.131	.693	1.053
Suing the brand	Participate	Intercept	-5.303	.905	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.297	.169	.079	1.346
		Proactive Aggression	.588	.198	.003	1.801
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-4.820	.683	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.367	.124	.003	1.444
		Proactive Aggression	.628	.148	.000	1.873
Demonstration	Participate	Intercept	-3.040	.503	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.071	.124	.568	1.073
		Proactive Aggression	.738	.146	.000	2.092
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-3.460	.557	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.410	.127	.001	1.507
		Proactive Aggression	.442	.149	.003	1.556
Brand Sabotage_ Negative Reaction	Participate	Intercept	-3.432	.520	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.547	.119	.042	1.291
		Proactive Aggression	.256	.126	.000	1.727
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-5.470	.933	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.693	.185	.148	1.314
		Proactive Aggression	.273	.189	.000	1.999
Brand Sabotage_ Negative Review	Participate	Intercept	-2.966	.480	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.410	.113	.000	1.506
		Proactive Aggression	.396	.126	.002	1.486
	Intend to participate but did not	Intercept	-3.685	.624	.000	
		Reactive Aggression	.359	.143	.012	1.431
		Proactive Aggression	.404	.158	.011	1.498

5. Conclusion

As mentioned in the introduction, the negative behavior of consumers has become more complex due to the development of the Internet, and its influence has become stronger. Accordingly, the boundaries between each concept were ambiguous in comparing and classifying the existing concepts of consumer negative behaviors by applying them

in the field. Our study borrowed the concept of Reactive-Proactive Aggression in psychology and attempted to compare the similarities and differences between behaviors occurring in the actual field by matching the motives of each behavior, eventually confirming that each behavior can be compared and classified by two motivations.

6. Discussion

6.1. Theoretical Implications

In our study, we introduced the concept of reactive-proactive aggression, which explains different motives and purposes for each aggressive behavior. Additionally, we proposed and quantitatively measured the concept of aggression, which has the same direction as previous studies on consumer motivation that were divided into passive-active, hot-cold, emotional-rational, and other categories (Fetscherin, 2019; Grégoire et al., 2010; Kucuk, 2021).

There are two academic significances to our study. First, we introduced the RPAQ from psychology into the marketing context to create a quantitative indicator of aggression that includes motives and purposes. The proactive-reactive aggression concept is a universal concept that explains the motivation for aggressive behavior in various fields, while RPAQ is a representative scale for measuring these two types of aggression. Although there is a need for improved measurements that are suitable for the marketing context, we believe that this approach can still be useful for explaining negative behavior (Allen & Anderson, 2017; Feshbach, 1964; Lorenz et al., 2021; Miller & Lynam, 2006; Raine et al., 2006).

Secondly, our study attempted to classify various aggressive behaviors that can be observed in the field based on the motivations and purposes. Although we did not classify well-conceptualized behaviors with existing academic rigor, we provided a starting point for future research on negative consumer behavior by examining the motives and purposes of complex and diverse forms of behavior that have occurred.

As shown in the study conducted by Toivonen and Sotamaa (2010, May), the online distribution of games has had a significant impact on the changes in consumer's social behaviors. In practical terms, our study revealed that there are different consumer reactions depending on the level of aggression. Reactive aggression occurs in response to insults or threats to the consumer, so companies should immediately stop insulting or threatening the consumer, which is an emotional aspect that consumers place importance on. Proactive aggression occurs when consumers want practical benefits from companies or have the opportunity to negotiate, so companies should carefully identify the desired compensation through realistic conversations with consumers. Making appropriate responses based on the consumers motivation may help improve consumer-brand relationship (Siret & Sabadie, 2022). We believe that the advancement of digital technology makes communication easier between consumers (gamers) and that aggressive behavior occurs faster, more quickly, and collectively than in the past analog

era. It is a wise choice for companies to pay attention to this and understand the motivation of the consumers

6.2. Limitation

We have applied the concept of aggression from psychology to the field of marketing. However, we have identified some items that are not suitable for the marketing context during this process. Therefore, we suggest that in future researches, the main focus shall be on the development of appropriate scales that suits the context of marketing. Additionally, our study has limitations as it only focuses on the consumer within the gaming industry of Korea and does not provide a comprehensive result that can be applied to different consumer behaviors that can be observed in other fields or academic concepts, but rather explains them as observed behaviors. Thus, our study raises academic questions and provides a starting point, rather than offering universal theories for each behavior. To generalize and apply these findings in different fields from both an academic and practical perspective, research on various industries in different regions should be conducted.

While our study targeted gamers and a specific group of customers who directly interact with the brand, it is worth noting that even consumers who do not use the brand directly may exhibit aggressive behavior when exposed to inappropriate brand behavior. Studies such as Kähr et al. (2016) support this notion. Hence, follow-up research should expand the scope of the study to include consumers in general, not just those who use the brand

Furthermore, our study does not explain the relationship between aggression and brand hate, which is an active area of research in the marketing context. Therefore, future research should investigate the connections between brand hate and aggression.

References

- Ali, B. J. (2021). Impact of consumer animosity, boycott participation, boycott motivation, and product judgment on purchase readiness or aversion of Kurdish consumers in Iraq. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 55(2), 504-523.
- Allen, J. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2017). Aggression and violence: Definitions and distinctions. *The Wiley handbook of violence and aggression* (1-14), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd Chichester, UK.
- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 27-51. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231>
- Anderson, C. A., Deuser, W. E., & DeNeve, K. M. (1995). Hot temperatures, hostile affect, hostile cognition, and arousal: Tests of a general model of affective aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1(5), 434-448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295215002>
- Aziz, R., & Rahman, Z. (2022). Brand hate: a literature review and

- future research agenda. *European Journal of Marketing*, 56(7), 2014-2051. [10.1108/EJM-03-2021-0189](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2021-0189)
- Bayarassou, O., Becheur, I., & Valette-Florence, P. (2020). Fight or flight: coping responses to brand hate. *The Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(3), 492-511. [10.1108/JPBM-08-2019-2519](https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-08-2019-2519)
- Bechwati, N. N., & Morrin, M. (2003). Outraged consumers: Getting even at the expense of getting a good deal. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13(4), 440-453. <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP130411>
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms in reactive and proactive aggression. *Child development*, 67(3), 993-1002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01778.x>
- Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., & Sears, R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Feshbach, S. (1964). The function of aggression and the regulation of aggressive drive. *Psychological Review*, 71(4), 257-272. [10.1037/h0043041](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043041)
- Fetscherin, M. (2019). The five types of brand hate: How they affect consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 116-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.017>
- Fetscherin, M., & KC, R. P. (2021). Anti-consumption in the context of brand relationships. *Strategic Change*, 30(1), 53-58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2386>
- Fetscherin, M., Veloutsou, C., & Guzman, F. (2021). Models for brand relationships. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(3), 353-359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-04-2021-012>
- Grégoire, Y., Ghadami, F., Laporte, S., Sénécal, S., & Larocque, D. (2018). How can firms stop customer revenge? The effects of direct and indirect revenge on post-complaint responses. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46, 1052-1071. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-018-0597-2>
- Grégoire, Y., Laufer, D., & Tripp, T. M. (2010). A comprehensive model of customer direct and indirect revenge: Understanding the effects of perceived greed and customer power. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38(6), 738-758. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-009-0186-5>
- Grégoire, Y., Salle, A., & Tripp, T. M. (2015). Managing social media crises with your customers: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Business Horizons*, 58(2), 173-182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2014.11.001>
- Grégoire, Y., Tripp, T. M., & Legoux, R. (2009). When customer love turns into lasting hate: The effects of relationship strength and time on customer revenge and avoidance. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(6), 18-32. <https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmk.73.6.18>
- Hegner, S. M., Fetscherin, M., & van Delzen, M. (2017). Determinants and outcomes of brand hate. *The Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 26(1), 13-25. DOI:10.1108/JPBM-01-2016-1070
- Hu, M., Qiu, P., Wan, F., & Stillman, T. (2018). Love or hate depends on who's saying it: How legitimacy of brand rejection alters brand preferences. *Journal of Business Research*, 90, 164-170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.006>
- Kähr, A., Nyffenegger, B., Krohmer, H., & Hoyer, W. D. (2016). When hostile consumers wreak havoc on your brand: The phenomenon of consumer brand sabotage. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(3), 25-41. <https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmk.80.3.25>
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C., & John, A. (2004). Why we boycott: Consumer motivations for boycott participation. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(3), 92-109. <https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmk.68.3.92>
- Kucuk, S. U. (2019). Consumer brand hate: Steam rolling whatever I see. *Psychology & Marketing*, 36(5), 431-443. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21175>
- Kucuk, S. U. (2021). Developing a theory of brand hate: where are we now?. *Strategic Change*, 30(1), 29-33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2385>
- Lee, M. S., Motion, J., & Conroy, D. (2009). Anti-consumption and brand avoidance. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 169-180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.024>
- Lorenz, K., Latzke, M., & Salzen, E. (2021). *On aggression*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003209249>
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2006). Reactive and proactive aggression: Similarities and differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(8), 1469-1480. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.paid.2006.06.004>
- Neilson, L. A. (2010). Boycott or buycott? Understanding political consumerism. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 9(3), 214-227. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.313>
- Nyer, P. U., & Gopinath, M. (2005). Effects of complaining versus negative word of mouth on subsequent changes in satisfaction: The role of public commitment. *Psychology & Marketing*, 22(12), 937-953. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20092>
- Park, C. W., Eisingerich, A. B., & Park, J. W. (2013). Attachment-aversion (AA) model of customer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(2), 269-274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2013.01.002>
- Peng, C. J., Lee, K. L., & Ingersoll, G. M. (2002). An introduction to logistic regression analysis and reporting. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670209598786>
- Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Liu, J. (2006). The reactive-proactive aggression questionnaire: differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression in adolescent boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(2), 159-171. DOI:10.1002/ab.20115
- Richins, M. L. (1983). Negative word-of-mouth by dissatisfied consumers: A pilot study. *Journal of marketing*, 47(1), 68-78.
- Sandikci, Ö, & Ekici, A. (2009). Politically motivated brand rejection. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 208-217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.028>
- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-behavior relations: a conceptual and empirical review. *European review of social psychology*, 12(1), 1-36.
- Siret, I., & Sabadie, W. (2022). Public complaining: A blessing in disguise? Educational calling as a benevolent process that gives consumers voice on brands' social media. *Journal of Business Research*, 150, 476-490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.05.084>
- Thomson, M., Whelan, J., & Johnson, A. R. (2012). Why brands should fear fearful consumers: How attachment style predicts retaliation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(2), 289-298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.04.006>

- Toivonen, S., & Sotamaa, O. (2010). Digital distribution of games: the players' perspective. In *Proceedings of the international academic conference on the future of game design and technology* (199-206). Vancouver, Canada. ACM
- Yadav, A., & Chakrabarti, S. (2022). Brand hate: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(5), 1992-2019. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12772>
- Zarantonello, L., Romani, S., Grappi, S., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2016). Brand hate. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25(1), 11-25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-01-2015-0799>
- Zeelenberg, M., & Pieters, R. (2004). Beyond valence in customer dissatisfaction: A review and new findings on behavioral responses to regret and disappointment in failed services. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(4), 445-455. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(02\)00278-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00278-3)
- Zhang, C., & Laroche, M. (2020). Brand hate: a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(3), 392-414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-11-2018-2103>
- Zourrig, H., Chebat, J., & Toffoli, R. (2009). Consumer revenge behavior: a cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 995-1001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.08.006>