THANKS, I GUESS: WHAT CONSUMERS COMPLAIN ABOUT WHEN THEY COMPLAIN ABOUT GIFTS

Deborah Y. Cohn, Ph.D., New York Institute of Technology

ABSTRACT

Gift buying in the United States is a billion-dollar business that has implications for brands, retailers, marketers and consumers. This research contributes to our understanding of gifts that cause dissatisfaction and complaining. In particular, the situation in which gift givers intentionally purchase unwanted gifts and recipient's reactions to them are examined. This study employs two methods of data collection: 1) phenomenological in-depth interviews and 2) netnography of an online community. The scholarly contributions of this study are twofold. First, the research lends support for the idea that inaccurate gift preference prediction is not always a mistake and is often a deliberate act. The second contribution of this study is the extension of consumer gift-giving and gift receiving knowledge by the development of the taxonomy of five types of deliberate inaccurate gift preference prediction: 1) threats to self-concept, 2) to you – for me, 3) aggression, 4) ritual and obligation, and 5) bragging rights.

Key Words: *Consumer Behavior, Gift Giving, Complaining, Dissatisfaction*

INTRODUCTION

In 2015, the National Retail Federation in the US expected holiday retail sales to hit $630.5 billion (Allen 2015). Furthermore, it was expected that individual American shoppers will spend, on average, close to $600 on gifts during the 2015 winter holiday season. Not all gifts are the perfect gift for the recipient. As evidence, one out of every three gift recipients in the US (34.8%) returned at least one gift item during the 2013 holiday season with the total dollars of returned gifts estimated at $262.4 billion (not including fraudulent returns) (The Retail Equation, 2014). This figure does not include unwanted gifts that are not returned but kept in a closet, regifted, sold, donated, or thrown away. Given the total dollars spent on unwanted gifts, researchers and marketers need to understand more about consumer gifting behavior that results in dissatisfaction. To meet this goal, the dual-method study described here seeks to extend the knowledge of consumer gifts that cause dissatisfaction and complaining. Research evidence suggests that a recipient's acceptance of a gift is based on an evaluation of the givers intention and an interpretation of the gift message (Belk and Coon 1993; Schiffman and Cohn 2009; Sherry 1983). In particular, this study examines cases of gift dissatisfaction from gift giving in which the giver is not motivated to give a gift that will delight the recipient and recipient perceive this as intentional. In terms of organization, first, the contributions of this study are outlined. Next, the literature review and conceptual framework is presented. This is followed by the details of the dual-method qualitative study and the development of the Taxonomy of Inaccurate Preference Prediction. The paper concludes with a general discussion and marketing recommendations.

CONTRIBUTIONS & OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

This research is the first known consumer study to investigate when givers intentionally purchase unwanted gifts and recipient's reactions to them. Gift exchanges when the giver is aiming to give a gift that

does not match the recipient's desires are examined and analyzed.

Dahl and Peltier (2015) have provided an historical review of articles published in the Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior. They suggest that "…it seems as though the field would benefit from examining factors which impact consumers' (dis)satisfaction formation across a variety of product/service scenarios to enhance our understanding of the underlying psycho-social factors as well as other moderating influences." To this end, this research examines dis(satisfaction) and complaining behavior in the context of gift giving. Furthermore, they suggest that research into how "consumers use…digital communications channels to publicly share complaints/compliments, what influence this has on individual consumers who engage in public sharing of complaints/compliments…(and that) research in this area should also help firms identify how to manage the complaint resolution process" (Dahl and Peltier 2015). This research provides new insights into the public sharing of complaints. It differs from previous research into digital complaints in that the complaints studied here are about products and services received as gifts. The taxonomy developed here can serve marketers to better understand the basis for gift complaints in order to work towards resolving complaints. Furthermore, along with new insights into purposeful unwanted gifts, retail, managerial and marketing implications are provided.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The gift purchase decision is one in which one person or group makes a purchase decision on behalf of another individual or group (Schiffman and Cohn 2009). Cruz-Cárdenas (2012) points out the importance of the recipient's evaluation of the gift givers intentions and the gift givers message. Researchers have assumed that a gift that does not reflect a recipient's preference occurs unintentionally through misperceptions, inability to accurately predict preferences, and unanticipated responses and is thus considered a failed gift (Belk, 1976; Cruz-Cárdenas et. al. 2015; Lerouge and Warlop 2002; Ward and Broniarczyk 2011; Zhang and Epley 2012). This assumption appears to be a mistake since gift givers are not always motivated to be accurate in their predictions (Otnes et. al. 1994; Schiffman and Cohn 2009). As outlined by the "gift selection decision tree," before gift selection is decided, consumers ask themselves if they want to give the recipient a desired gift (Schiffman and Cohn, 2009). This research examines the branch of the gift giving decision tree when the answer to that question is "no." Research evidence suggests that deliberate inaccurate preference prediction occurs in superficial relationships (Otnes et. al. 1993; Otnes et. al. 1994). Furthermore, receivers tend to positively evaluate the thought behind bad gifts (Zhang and Epley 2012).

A variety of factors motivate deliberate inaccurate preference prediction. For example, givers are motivated by aggression, hostility (Orgel and Shengold 1968; Pollak 1964; Schwartz 1967), manipulation and attempts to gain power (Poe 1977). Still further, gifts may be given to impose an unwanted identity upon a recipient (Schwartz 1967; Sherry 1983; Sherry et. al. 1993). Particularly in close but insecure relationships accurate prediction may be a threat. For instance, it may be best to inaccurately predict preferences when accurate prediction would be distasteful and there is a desire for a continued relationship (Ickes 1993).

METHOD

This study employs two methods of data collection: 1) phenomenological in-depth interviews and 2) netnography of an online community. Both of these methods are qualitative in nature and both are designed to develop rich descriptions of experiences and their meanings with an analysis that is largely interpretive (Finlay 2012; Kozinets 2002).

Phenomenological Method

The data collection followed the conventions of the phenomenological method (Thompson et. al. 1989). A purposive sample of thirty respondents (i.e., 15 couples) was interviewed. The couples, who recently transitioned to parenthood, were chosen as part of a larger study on gifting between husbands and wives. Spouses were interviewed separately in order to facilitate an open dialogue (Hertz 1995). Each interview began with the "grand tour" question: "Can you tell me about gift giving between you and your wife (husband) over the course of time?" Responses were followed up with probing and more questions (Thompson et. al. 1989). The average interview length was approximately one hour. In addition, the interviewer wrote detailed field notes concerning the interviews. Each respondent was sent a thank you letter and a copy of the transcript in which they were encouraged to comment on their transcript (Moustakas 1994). The transcribed interviews, field notes, and additional comments by the respondents make up the 590 single spaced pages of qualitative written data.

Netnographic Method

The second method employed for data collection was netnography. Netnographic data collection consists of mining publicly available consumer generated computer mediated communication. A variety of sources are available for netnographic analysis such as chat rooms, email, social media, blogs, and message boards. Message board content was chosen for this study because it can be mined for marketing and academic research purposes (e.g., Nelson and Otnes 2005; Tsang and Zhou 2005). Specifically, it provides advantages to researchers over other computer mediated communication in that message boards (1) give researchers a great deal of available and preserved material to analyze (e.g., discussions remain online for days, weeks, months and even indefinitely), (2) do not necessarily require registration in the group to view the discussions, and (3) hundreds of members can participate (Ridings and Gefen 2004). In addition, this method is an unobtrusive, passive observation method, making it unnecessary to notify and obtain consent from the participants (Gavin et. al. 2008). The message boards chosen for this analysis are dedicated to family and domestic matters and gift giving is discussed by the participants.

A popular message board was identified by a two-pronged approach (1) advice was sought from a marketing and media expert, and (2) a search was conducted on alexa.com (a Website that lists popular Websites). Both of these sources identified Babycenter.com as the most popular parenting website. According to Alexa.com (2015), Babycenter.com is a "Resource for pregnancy and baby, offers week-by-week baby development updates, thousands of articles, and advice from other parents" (Alexa.com 2015). Next, babycenter.com was checked for forums or message boards to analyze. The individual message boards deal with a wide range of issues that concern parents. In particular, new parents (overwhelmingly new mothers) participate in these message boards. In 2015, a search with the key word *gifts* was conducted in the message boards on

Babycenter.com. Babycenter.com returned 417,797 results. Most, but not all, of the posts were relevant. Posts that were weeded out as not relevant dealt with the topic of "gifted children" or children with exceptional IQ and skills.

ANALYSIS

The analysis was undertaken in a systematic format that is similar to previous interpretive research (e.g., Brockman et al. 2008). An extensive systematic and interpretive analysis employing categorization, abstraction, comparison, dimensionalization, integration, iteration, and refutation was conducted (Spiggle 1994). As interviews were conducted and transcribed notations were made regarding any discussion of unwanted gifts and if they were perceived by the recipient as deliberately inaccurate or if the givers claimed the gift to be deliberately inaccurate. Similarly, as the online posts were read notations were made regarding discussions of unwanted gifts. An interpretive analysis was developed, refined, and reviewed. First, an individual or ideographic understanding of each interview and each online post is sought. Second, separate interviews and posts are related to each other to grasp, rather than impose meanings that emerge from the qualitative data set. In this way, the interpretation seeks to describe common patterns of experience (Thompson et al. 1989). Still further, the data was classified to identify concepts guided by the literature.

RESULTS

Overall, gift givers and recipients in our sample complained about gifts, gift givers, and gift recipients, aired hurt feelings, and requested gift giving advice for difficult gift recipients. Furthermore, best and worst gift stories were exchanged. The taxonomy developed here highlights recipient's evaluations of gift givers intentions. It addition, gift givers discuss their motivations for giving gifts that they know will disappoint recipients. It begins with two items from Schiffman and Cohn (2009): 1) threats to self-concept, and 2) "to you – for me" as categories of deliberate inaccurate gift preference prediction. From the data set and the literature, taxonomy of five categories of deliberate inaccurate preference prediction resulting in undesirable gifts is developed: 1) threats to self-concept, 2) to you – for me, 3) aggression, 4) ritual and obligation, and 5) bragging. These categories are not mutually exclusive. What follows is a discussion of each type of gift in which the giver, on purpose, inaccurately predicted a recipient's gift preference and/or the recipient perceived this to be the case. Table 1 presents the taxonomy along with definitions of motivations and interpretations by recipients. Furthermore, representative quotes from the qualitative data set are included in the table.

Threats to Self-Concept

Self-concept is defined as the way in which a person perceives him or herself. Early research evidence suggests that we prefer brands that are congruent with our actual and ideal self-concepts (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967; Sirgy 1982). Gift givers experience an identity threat when they purchase gifts for close friends that are contrary to their own self-concept (Ward and Broniarczyk 2011). Furthermore, gift givers use gifts as a way to control self-impression management (Segev et. al. 2012). In contrast, the results presented here include gifts that are contrary to the recipient's self-concepts. Research evidence suggests that gifts can be given to impose an unwanted identity upon the recipient (Schwartz 1967; Sherry 1983; Sherry et. al.

TABLE 1:

TAXONOMY OF DELIBERATE INACCURATE PREFERENCE PREDICTION

Classification	Definition	Representative Quote	Outcome
Threats to Self-Concept: 1) fashion, 2) role, 3) gender 4) faith, 5) collection creation	Gifts are threats to the recipient self-concept.	It sounds like the gifter (sic) is trying to shove their opinions on gender down the other parents throat	Dissatisfaction
To You – For Me	Given to a recipient, often a family member, so that the giver can have access to the gift.	He kind of buys for me what he wants and I buy for him what I want.	Dissatisfaction
Aggression	Gifts chosen maliciously that do not match the recipient's preferences.	I knew she was being a passive aggressive bitch by giving me a gift she knew I wouldn't like.	Dissatisfaction
Ritual and Obligation	Purchased so that a recipient may have the opportunity to partake in gift rituals and givers can fulfil a gift obligation.	Interviewer: If you knew he wouldn't like it, why did you buy it? Respondent: Probably just so he would have something on his birthday.	Dissatisfaction
Bragging	Gifts are given to provide the giver with the ability to brag or "outgift" another giver.	Like if you give to the homeless, right afterwards posting on FB (sic) how giving you are	Dissatisfaction

1993). These five categories of threats to recipient's self-concept emerged from the qualitative data: 1) fashion, 2) role, 3) gender 4) faith, and 5) collection creation.

Fashion Threat to Self-Concept

Clothing gifts are particularly suited for the purpose of imposing an identity on a gift recipient (Manikowske and Winakor 1994). As an example, during an in-depth interview, a wife describes buying clothing gifts for her husband. She knows that her husband will not like the styles and colors of the clothes that she purchases for him and yet she purchases them anyway:

I buy (for my husband) a lot of clothes because he has horrible taste in clothes. . . . I usually buy him dress clothes. We really don't have the same taste. I got him a silk shirt that was a little too loud for him. He's very, very conservative; strictly blue, gray, black. . . . I bought him burgundy pants, really dark burgundy pants and a silk shirt—which was really nice, and he's worn it twice because I forced him to on an occasion. It looks really good but that's a little bit more than he usually likes.

This inaccurate spousal preference prediction is intended to impose a fashion style and an identity on her husband. She wants him to dress differently than he wants to dress. This is further accomplished by forcing him to wear the clothes that are not his preference. He is dissatisfied with the clothing gifts he receives from his wife.

Social Role Threat to Self-Concept

Identity threat can also take the form of trying to force someone into a social role or behavior. One woman on Babycenter.com noted that her mother in law repeatedly gave her pregnancy tests for Christmas. She was telling her, not so subtly, that it was time to get pregnant and be a mom. Another mom purchased her daughter (a stay at home mom) a new business suit. She was telling her daughter she should not be a stay home mom; she should go to work. Here is a suit. This is who I want you to be:

> She also passive aggressively buys me suits and work clothes every year... I'm a SAHM (Stay at home Mom), she doesn't think that's a good choice though.

These examples point to the use of gifts to impose a new role (e.g., mother, working mother) on the gift recipient. The pregnancy test communicates that it's time to take on the role of mother. The gift of a suit is interpreted by the daughter a communication from mother to daughter that the mother wants the daughter to be working.

Gender Self-Concept Threat

Instances of inaccurate preference prediction and the presentation of unwanted gifts can be motivated by gender identity imposition. Dalakas and Shoham (2010) extended the gift and gender research of Fischer and Arnold (1990) and found that husbands and wives in Israel tend to conform to gift giving gender social norms just like in the USA. Similarly, the results of this study found that gift givers prefer to give traditional gendered gifts even when recipients would prefer and clearly stat that they want a more egalitarian or cross-gender gift. A mom asked her grown daughter what her child (i.e., the granddaughter) wanted for her birthday. The grandmother was told that the granddaughter likes "boy things." This grandmother wanted her granddaughter to like "girl things" and she gave her girly dress up clothes as a Christmas gift. In addition, in this example, mothers discuss a girl who wanted "boy things" as birthday presents:

> Wow, it sounds like the gifter (sic) is trying to shove their opinions on gender down the other parents throat…The mom who gave the gift was telling everyone at the party that she wasn't going to buy any boy things for a little girl

These gift givers have their own ideas about what is appropriate to give a girl and refused to give a gift contrary to their own ideas of what is appropriate. They were imposing a gender identity on the recipients.

Faith Self-Concept Threat

There has been little research that addresses the question of the impact of religious identity on consumer behavior (e.g., Bailey and Sood 1993; Hirschman 1983; Wright 2015). However, research evidence suggests that religion plays an important role in our consumer behavior (e.g., Mcalexander et.al. 2014). This research found that some gift givers choose faith oriented gifts based on their own religion which, in some cases, is different from the gift recipient's religion. In these cases, the recipient experiences the gift as an imposition of faith. Posters on Babycenter.com have remarked on

receiving, "A lovely guilt ladden religious book to help me 'come home to the faith.' In another instance, a "Jews for Jesus bible," was gift to someone who is neither Jewish nor Christian. Recipients complained about these unwanted gifts. They perceive the givers to have deliberately chosen to impose an unwanted religious identity on them.

Collection Creation Self-Concept Threat

Consumers who have collections of special objects consider these objects as part of their extended self (Belk, 1988). Furthermore, Belk (1988) states that "the cultivation of a collection is a purposeful self-defining act." Still further, Unruh (1983) found that the creation of a collection is one way in which consumers are remembered and are able to achieve immortality with the continuation of the collection. Therefore, it is not surprising that consumers who receive collectibles that are contrary to their self-concept would find these gifts objectionable. Givers in this data set have created collections for recipients and buy additions to the collection on each gift giving occasion. One poster on Babycenter.com notes:

> I have this one aunt who buys my daughter a precious moments collectible for… for every occasion…she told my mom once: 'I don't care what Sophie likes, I buy what I want to buy.

Another Babycenter.com writer notes:

> My aunt is a terrible gift giver for me. I don't know why, she's known me my whole life, and I have a lot of interests but she just cannot seem to get it right. When I was a kid, she used to basically force me to collect things by giving me a piece for every holiday/birthday. I vividly remember a series of statutes (sic) of a tiny shoe

with different themes. She also apparently decided I loved teddy bears when I was like 13 to 15. I did not. I had like one stuffed animal that I got the day I was born. Then I got like 10 bears in a row-gave them to the children's hospital.

It is interesting to note that the teddy bears were given away. Because collections are part of the extended self, collections that run contrary to one's self-concept are a threat to the self-concept.

To You – For Me

"To you – for me" gifts are those that are given to a recipient, often a family member, so that the giver can have access to the gift (Schiffman and Cohn 2009). Usually, it is something the giver wants and will have access to and the recipient does not. One example from Babycenter.com is a mother-in-law who gave her daughter-in-law a gift of a DNA test to determine ancestry. It was perceived that the gift giver was motivated by her own desire to know her daughter-in-law's pedigree or ancestry. The recipient, other members of the family, and strangers who commented on the post were appalled by the gift. It was not something that the recipient wanted. In another example, one woman reports that she and her mom wear the same size clothes. When she was growing up her mom would give her clothing gifts and then the mom would wear them herself. Still further, one respondent noted that *He kind of buys for me what he wants and I buy for him what I want.* These are gifts that the recipients perceive as "to you – for me" and they are not welcomed.

Aggression

As expected, some respondents report that they maliciously choose gifts that do not match the recipient's preferences.

One poster on Babycenter.com notes that these gifts are meant to purposefully offend the recipient. Sometimes, the gifts intentionally match the giver's own preferences and are chosen "out of spite." As previous research suggests, these purchases can be interpreted as an act of aggression (Poe 1977; Pollak, 1964). Furthermore, psychological reactance theory might explain this behavior. It has been suggested that when "a gift is perceived as a threat, the recipient may respond with resentment or overt aggression" (Manikowske and Winakor 1994 p 24). For example, in response to a "to you-for me" gift one respondent noted that she purchased for her husband another "to you for me" gift out of spite:

> Then, I guess, maybe out of spite . . . for Father's Day. . . It was something that I kind of wanted more for myself. . . . In his heart he knew that I bought it because I wanted it.

Furthermore, follow-up revealed that the couple that was exchanging spiteful gifts eventually divorced. Spiteful gifts are a symptom of a deteriorating relationship. In another example, from the Babycenter.com data set, a teenager got in a fight with her parents right before Christmas. Her mom gave her a pocket knife, a Hershey bar and a card that said "good luck in the wild." This parent was clearly angry at her daughter and gave her a gift to communicate that she would not be able to survive on her own. Furthermore, recipients interpret these gift communications as givers being *passive-aggressive*:

> I think my favorite was my XMIL (ex-mother-in-law). She asked my XH (ex-husband) if I liked Pandora bracelets and he told her that no I always said how much I hated them (no offense if you like them, they are just so not my style). So guess what I

got for my birthday that year? Yep, a bracelet. And I know how expensive those things are so I had to act super grateful even though I knew she was being a passive aggressive bitch by giving me a gift she knew I wouldn't like.

In this case of intentional inaccurate preference prediction, the recipient perceives the gift as an act of aggression because the giver purposefully gave the recipient a branded product that is not in accordance with her preferred style and that she specifically expressed disliking.

Ritual and Obligation

With an absence of malice some respondents intentionally choose gifts that do not match their spouse's preferences. This class of deliberate inaccurate gift preference prediction is purchased so that a recipient may have the opportunity to partake in gift rituals and givers can fulfil a gift obligation. Macklin and Walker (1988) define gift giving as either spontaneous or in fulfillment of an obligation. A great deal has been written about the obligations of gift giving (Mauss 1954; Levi-Strauss 1956; Goodwin et al. 1990; Wolfinbarger 1993; Park 1998). Furthermore, Chinese consumers experience gift giving obligations as part of the culture (e.g., Wang et. al. 2007). Still further, gift givers find "picky" people to be difficult gift recipients (Otnes et. al. 1993). As a result, givers inaccurately predict preferences so that the difficult recipient can participate in gift opening rituals:

> (My husband's) birthday is in May. I bought him an outfit for work and I think a pair of shorts and a couple of tee shirts. He kept the tee shirts because he likes tee shirts like this. Everything else went back. . . . When I was buying it, I had gone with my sister and I said, "he's not going to

keep any of these, they're going back." I knew he was going to.
Interviewer: If you knew he wouldn't like it, why did you buy it?
Probably just so he would have something on his birthday.

In this case, the ritual of giving and receiving a birthday gift is more important than the actual gift item.

A poster on Babycenter.com discussed the clash between one family's gifting rituals and a new family member's rituals. This occurs when someone new joins the family (e.g., marries in) and wants to continue their family of origin's rituals and traditions. A new sister-in-law planned on giving handmade Christmas ornaments to her new nieces. The parents were appalled at the suggestion since their family ritual is that only parents give ornaments to their children. The gift ornaments had no connection to the preferences of the recipients or the preferences of the parents of the recipients.

The ritual of "white elephant" was discussed by posters on Babycenter.com. A white elephant gift is part of a group exchange ritual in which each participant brings a low-cost gift and the gifts are randomly exchanged within the group, generally in a party atmosphere. The gifts tend to be humorous or gag gifts and are unwanted items. Givers asked for advice for white elephant gifts. One Babycenter.com poster notes:

My work holiday party is doing a white elephant gift exchange. We are only supposed to spend $5 (which is near impossible), and funniest gift wins a good prize.

The goal of the gift is to amuse the group, not to predict a recipient's preference. This poster went on to say that she did not want to participate but was obligated.

Bragging

In the case of bragging, gifts are given to provide the giver with the ability to brag or "outgift" another giver. Babycenter.com posters negatively comment about givers who post their fabulous gifts on Facebook in order to brag about their generosity. One respondent noted:

Gifts are given for bragging rights. Like if you give to the homeless, right afterwards posting on FB *(sic)* how giving you are with an example.

In addition, parents feel that grandparents who are told not to buy certain "big toys" for the grandchildren do so anyway in order to "outgift" the parents. In this case, the grandchildren want the big toys, however, the parents do not want their children to have these toys. This is especially salient when parents specifically tell grandparents not to buy a specific gift for their children, and they buy it anyway.

DISCUSSION

The scholarly contributions of this study are twofold. First, the research lends support for the idea that inaccurate gift preference prediction is not always a mistake. As discussed, a variety of motivations lead to inaccurate preference prediction. Givers will admit they are not motivated to be accurate and recipients evaluate these gifts as deliberately inaccurate. Previous gifting research assumes that inaccurate gift preference prediction is a mistake due to the difficult nature of predicting others' preferences. Even in close relationships when gift givers want to give gifts that delight the recipient, accurate preference prediction can be challenging. This research highlights that inaccurate gift preference prediction is often deliberate, or perceived as deliberate by gift recipients. The second contribution of this study is the extension of consumer gift-

giving and gift receiving knowledge by the development of the taxonomy of five types of deliberate inaccurate gift preference prediction. The classification developed here includes: 1) threats to self-concept, 2) to you – for me, 3) aggression, 4) ritual and obligation, and 5) bragging rights. These five types are not mutually exclusive. For example, gifts in each of the categories are experienced as aggressive in nature. In addition, a "to you - for me" gift can be based on aggression and pose a threat to one's self concept. Furthermore, five types of recipient self-concept threats are identified and discussed: 1) fashion, 2) social role, 3) gender, 4) faith, and 5) collection creation. Recipients who evaluate givers as deliberately predicting their preferences inaccurately tend to be dissatisfied with the gift. Furthermore, recipients view these gifts negatively and will use online forums such as the ones provided by Babycenter.com to complain about these givers and gifts.

MARKETING RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

These findings provide interesting implications for marketers. It is suggested that marketers find better ways to provide service to consumers who have received unwanted gifts. Assisting consumers in the disposal of unwanted gifts can lead to the purchase of preferred items and store loyalty. A reverse channel for unwanted gifts can take the form of re-gifting, donating, and exchanging. For example, consumers can feel good about donating unwanted gifts to those who are less fortunate. Consumers are often reluctant to return gifts due to cultural stigmas associated with these actions. However, marketers can turn this around by creating positive associations with gift returns, such as connecting these actions with charitable donations.

Marketers can provide services to assist with these efforts and reward consumers for their participation in donation efforts. In addition, during high gift shopping season (e.g., leading up to Christmas) marketers can provide "gift experts" to counsel gift givers on the down sides of deliberate inaccurate gift preference prediction. Marketers who find ways to encourage buying gifts that will not be returned or assist gift recipients in doing something positive with unwanted gifts are sure to be the winners in the retail gift buying season.

What are ways in which marketers can address these types of consumer complaints? It has been suggested that marketers need to monitor online discussions of their brands in order to respond to problems (e.g., Schiffman et. al. 2008). As previous research suggests, marketers need to reach out to consumers who complain (e.g., Yen 2016). When consumers complain about gifts, marketers can offer exchanges and donation opportunities to turn dissatisfaction into satisfaction and delight with a brand or company.

Future research can employ quantitative tests for the constructs presented here. Quantitative tests of the constructs can verify the prevalence of each of the intentional inaccurate gift preference prediction categories. Furthermore, future research can examine the correlation of each of the deliberate inaccurate gift preference prediction constructs to relationship type, relationship strength, and personality characteristics. Still further, relationship outcomes (e.g., severed ties) from deliberate inaccurate preference prediction can be determined. In addition, research can examine what happens to the gift objects in these situations (e.g., regifting, disposal, leaving in a closet, and donations). There are additional aspects of gift preference prediction and the impact on relationships can be explored. In particular, gift

preference prediction avoidance (i.e., gift registry, discussing preferences, and recipients stating their preferences) has yet to be examined and could lead to positive outcomes for marketers. A widely unexplored area of consumer behavior is its relationship to religion and faith. The use of gifts as a tool for proselytizing and as a tool for socialization and instruction of faith from parents to children can be explored. Most importantly, marketers need to explore the effect gift satisfaction and complaining behavior has on the brand. When consumers post negative reactions to branded items it can have a negative effect on the brand image. This effect warrants further research in order to reverse any negative effects that complaining about unwanted gifts can have brand equity.

REFERENCES

Alexa.com (2015) An Amazon.com company, Alexa Internet, Inc. 1996 – 2016.

Allen, K.G., (2015), "National Retail Federation Forecasts Holiday Sales to Increase 3.7%," *NRF News*, October 8, 2015

Bailey, Jessica M., and James Sood (1993), "The Effects of Religious Affiliation on Consumer Behavior: A Preliminary Investigation," *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 5 (Fall), 328–52.

Belk, Russell W. (1976), "It's the Thought that Counts: A Signed Digraph Analysis of Gift-Giving," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3 (December), 155-162.

Belk, Russell. W. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.

Belk, Russell W. and Gregory S. Coon (1993), "Gift Giving as Agapic Love: An Alternative to the Exchange Paradigm Based on Dating Experiences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (December), 393-417.

Brockman Beverly K, Taylor Valerie A., Brockman Christopher M. (2008), "The price of unconditional love: consumer decision making for high-dollar veterinary care," *Journal of Business Research*, 61(5):397–405.

Cruz-Cárdenas, Jorge. (2012), "Use and disposition of a gift and the recipient's feedback in a collectivist environment," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 25, 130-148.

Cruz-Cárdenas, Jorge. González, R., and M. Teresa del Val Núñez, (2015), "The use of disliked gifts from a consumer behavior perspective," *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 68, Issue 7, July 2015, 1635-1637.

Dahl, Andrew and Jimmy Peltier. 2015. "A Historical Review and Future Research Agenda for The Field of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, & Complaining Behavior." *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 28: 5-25.

Dalakas, V., & Shoham, A. (2010). Gender-role views and gift-giving behaviors in Israel. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 27(4), 381-389.

Finlay, Linda. "Debating phenomenological methods." *Hermeneutic phenomenology in Education.* Sense Publishers, 2012. 17-37.

Fischer, E. and Arnold, S.J. (1990), "More than a labor of love: gender roles and Christmas gift shopping", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 17 3, December, pp. 333-45

Gavin, J., Rodham, K. and Poyer, H., 2008. The presentation of "pro-anorexia" in online group interactions. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18 (3), pp. 325-333.

Goodwin, C., Smith, K.L. and Spiggle, S. (1990), "Giftgiving: consumer motivation and gift purchase process", in Goldberg, M.E., Gorn, G. and Pollay, P. (Eds), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 18, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, pp. 690-8.

Grubb, E. and Grathwohl, H. (1967). Consumer self-concept, symbolism and market behavior: A theoretical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 31(4), 22-27.

Hertz, Rosanna (1995), "Separate But Simultaneous Interviewing of Husbands and Wives: Making Sense of Their Stories," *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(4), 429-451.

Hirschman, Elizabeth. C. (1983). Religious affiliation and consumption processes. *Research in Marketing*, 6, 131-170

Ickes, William (1993), "Empathic Accuracy," *Journal of Personality*, 61(4), (December), 587-610.

Kozinets, Robert V. (2002), "The Field Behind the Screen: Using Netnography for Marketing Research in Online Communities," *Journal of Marketing Research*: 39(1), (February), F61-72.

Lerouge, D., and Luk Warlop (2002), "The Perils of Predicting Partners' Product Preferences," in AP - *Asia Pacific Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 5, eds. Ramizwick and Tu Ping, Valdosta, GA : Association for Consumer Research, 222.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1956), "The principle of reciprocity," Sociological Theory, Macmillan, New York, NY

Macklin, N.C. and Walker, M. (1988), "The joy and irritation of gift-giving", *Proceeding of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Academy of Marketing Science, Montreal, pp. 67-86.

Manikowske, Linda and Geitel Winakor (1994), "Equity, Attribution, and Reactance in Giving and Receiving Gifts of Clothing," *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 12(4), (Summer), 22-31.

Mauss, M. (1954), The Gift, Cohen and West, London

McAlexander J, Leavenworth Dufault B, Martin D, Schouten J. (2014), "The Marketization of Religion: Field, Capital, and Consumer Identity". *Journal of Consumer Research*, October 2014;41(3):858-875.

Moustakas C. Phenomenological research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1994.

Nelson, M. R., & Otnes, C. C. (2005). Exploring cross-cultural ambivalence: A netnography of intercultural wedding message boards. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(1), 89-95.

Orgel, Shelley and Leonard L. Shengold (1968), "The Fatal Gifts of Medea," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 49(2-3), 379-383.

Otnes, Cele, Tina M. Lowrey, and Young Chan Kim (1993), "Gift Selection for Easy and Difficult Recipients: A Social Roles Interpretation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (September), 229-244.

Otnes, Cele, Kyle Zolner, and Tina M. Lowrey (1994), "In-Laws and Outlaws: The Impact of Divorce and Remarriage Upon Christmas Gift Exchange," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, 21, (eds.) Chris T. Allen and Deborah Roedder John (Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research), 25-29.

Park, S.-Y. (1998), "A comparison of Korean and American gift-giving behavior", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 6, September, pp. 557-93.

Poe, Donald (1977), "The Giving of Gifts: Anthropological Data and Sociological Theory," *Cornell Journal of Social Relations*, 12(1), (Spring), 47-63.

Pollak, Otto (1964), "Symptomatic Factors in Consumer Behavior," in Theory in Marketing, (eds.) R. Cox, Wroe Alderson and Stanley Shapiro, (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin).

Ridings, C.M., & Gefen, D. (2004). Virtual community attraction: Why people hang out online. *Journal of Computer-Medicated Communication*, 10(1)

Schiffman, Leon. G., and Deborah Y. Cohn (2009), "Are They Playing by The Same Rules? A Consumer Gifting Classification

of Marital Dyads," *Journal of Business Research*. 62 (11), 1054-1062.

Schiffman, Leon G., Elaine Sherman, and Deborah Y. Cohn (2008), "'Looking In' on Global Consumer-Users: To Develop Better Product Feature Sets," *Tenth International Conference of the Global Business and Technology Association, Madrid, Spain*. July 8- 12, 2008. 1012-1019.

Schwartz, Barry (1967), "The Social Psychology of the Gift," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 73(1), (July), 1-11.

Segev, R., Shoham, A., & Ruvio, A. (2012). What Does this Gift Say about Me, You, and Us? The Role of Adolescents' Gift Giving in Managing their Impressions among their Peers. *Psychology & Marketing*, 29(10), 752-764

Sherry Jr., John F. (1983), "Gift Giving: An Anthropological Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (September), 157-168.

Sherry Jr., John F., Mary Ann McGrath, and Sidney J. Levy (1993), "The Dark Side of The Gift," *Journal of Business Research,* 28, 225-244.

Sirgy, M. J. (1982). Self-concept in consumer behavior: A critical review. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(3), 287-300.

Spiggle, Susan (1994) "Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research,* (December) 194-203.

Tsang, A.S.L. & Zhou, N. 2005, "Newsgroup participants as opinion leaders and seekers in online and offline communication environments", *Journal of Business Research*, 58(9),1186-1193.

The Retail Equation (2014), "2014 Consumer Returns in the Retail Industry (2014), https://www.theretailequation.com/retailers/IndustryReports

Thompson, Craig J., William B. Locander, and Howard R. Pollio (1989), "Putting Consumer Experience Back into Consumer Research: The Philosophy and Method of Existential-Phenomenology," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, (September), 133-146.

Unruh, David R. (1983), "Death and Personal History: Strategies of Identity Preservation," *Social Problems*, 30(3), 340-351

Wang, Q., Mohammed, A. R., & Keng, K. A. (2007). Chinese cultural values and gift-giving behavior. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(4), 214-228.

Ward, M. K., & Broniarczyk, S. M. (2011). It's not me, it's you: How gift giving creates giver identity threat as a function of social closeness. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38(1), 164-181.

Wolfinbarger, Mary F. (1990), "Motivations and symbolism in gift-giving behavior", in Goldberg, M.E., Gorn, G. and Pollay, R.W. (Eds), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 17, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, pp. 699-706.

Wright, H. YBMs: religious identity and consumption among young British Muslims. *International Journal of Market Research*. 57, 1, 151-163, Jan. 2015

Yen, Yung-Shen. 2016. "Factors Enhancing the Posting of Negative Behavior in Social Media and its Impact on Venting Negative Emotions." *Management Decision* 54 (10): 2462-2484.

Zhang, Y., & Epley, N. (2012). Exaggerated, mispredicted, and misplaced: When "it's the thought that counts" in gift exchanges. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 141(4), 667 – 681.

Deborah Y. Cohn, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Marketing
New York Institute of Technology
School of Management
8000 Northern Blvd, Wisser 314
Old Westbury, NY 11568
516-686-7710 (office)
dcohn02@nyit.edu