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Sense of Online Betrayal, Brand Hate, and Outrage Customers’ Anti-Brand Activism

Abstract
The current study develops a research model and explores the correlation between customer sense of online betrayal, brand hate, and anti-brand activism. The outrage customers’ anti-brand behaviors consist of negative online word of mouth, online public complaining, and online boycott. Data from an online survey of 383 online shoppers were used to test seven proposed hypotheses. The partial least square–structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was adopted to assess the measurement and structural model. The findings showed that the sense of online betrayal positively and significantly affects brand hate and anti-brand behaviors. In addition, brand hate is also the leading cause of customers’ anti-brand actions. The present study highlights the mediation role of brand hate in eliciting revenge from consumers subjected to online betrayal. This study also gives some recommendations to customers to stop the misconduct behaviors of online betrayals, such as spreading their betrayal cases to friends and relatives via social media, then asking for supports and help from governmental and legal agencies and participating in boycotts; raising boycott movements against the betraying brand should be considered as the most extreme punishment.

INTRODUCTION
Currently, concepts of customer-brand relationship have emerged and attracted academic researchers and practitioners; however, most studies focus on the “bright” side (Curina et al., 2020; Fetscherin, 2019), whereas the negative characteristics, including brand hate, brand avoidance, brand distrust, brand retaliation, and brand boycott, seem to have been less studied (Nguyen, 2021). Customer demand for brand reparation of product/service failures (Grégoire & Fisher, 2008) get even with the firm for fairness (Lee et al., 2013) as the compensation for psychological and beneficial loss (Reimann et al., 2018) tend to increase along with the development and spread of online communities.

The sole aim of businesses anywhere is to pursue the profit maximization regardless of the adverse side effects on society’s well-being and sustainability. On the first hand, firms have been creating and providing goods and services to improve society’s quality of living and well-being (Ibarra et al., 2018). However, Castillo et al. (2021) claimed that under the pressure of maximizing the gains, firms must face the options of breaking ethical barriers and social standards to attract more customers and exploit more profit from current customers. First, to appeal to customers, firms often use misleading advertisements to
promote and advertise products though the reality is different with publicity. That is the reason why advertising has been commonly considered the art of telling lies. Besides, when spending less, firms try to sell deficit value products/services to customers. Customers will consume the low-quality products and the price may be slightly lower than the average price on the marketplace. Thus, customers perceive the inequality between spending and gain. All the above actions are categorized as customer betrayal. The issue tends to be extremely serious in an online business environment where the buyers and sellers do not interact face-to-face. However, according to Jain et al. (2020), the online environment reserves the ability of information spreading and community attracting much higher the offline one.

Dedicated customers have negative emotions when experiencing a sense of betrayal, such as disgust, anger, and feelings of loss (Fetscherin, 2019). These feelings are critical dimensions of brand hate. From the positive side of brand lovers who spend money, time, and effort to support and buy products, betrayed customers become brand haters. Then, a series of anti-brand actions could be used against the telling lies and misconducting brands (Kucuk, 2019). The anti-brand activism consists of multilevel actions, such as mild-level brand avoidance, brand switching, and brand patronage reduction, whereas the more extreme actions are a negative word of mouth, public complaining, retaliation, and revenge. During the typical situation of customer dissatisfaction, mild-level anti-brand actions are often adopted, yet when taking the sense of being betrayed, the negative emotion could rise to the highest level of hate, and fighting back responses could be adopted. Therefore, the current study deals with customer sense of online betrayal, customer brand hate, negative online word of mouth, online public complaining, and online boycott behaviors.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

1.1. Customer sense of betrayal (SOB)

_Sense of betrayal_, the so-called perceived betrayal, is defined in the literature of psychology as “a breach in honoring an expected behavior or norm associated with trust” (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). Customer sense of betrayal occurred when people perceive their expectations in purchasing and consumption are not met or when they assume brands telling a lie to them, taking advantage of them (Caldwell et al., 2009), cheating, trying to exploit, breaking promises, and disclosing confidential information (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). It was also the customer’s negative feelings when they perceived a firm intentionally violates the fairness norm or standard necessary in the context of the typical relationship (Finkel et al., 2002; Ward & Ostrom, 2006). Therefore, Grégoire and Fisher (2008) stated that customer sense of betrayal is considered an emotional reaction which illustrates why loyal customers confront brands and become their most critical opponents.

According to Tan et al. (2021), customers endure a feeling of betrayal consuming a product/service failure, which represents poor product/service performance, late delivery, or employees behaving rudely to customers. Reimann et al. (2018) added other reasons of taste, quality, price, and durability. The morality-related factors, which violate the norms and standards of brand-customer relationships, could be the reasons, such as riffed off, lying, misled, and cheating (Reimann et al., 2018).

From the perspective of individuals or customers, the emotional perception of being betrayed is not easy to accept and forgive because before perceiving betrayal, consumers already supported the brand by selecting and purchasing its products and services. Hence, the sense of betrayal critically negatively influences the customer attitude towards the brand and results in the extreme emotions of anger, sorrow, frustration and disappointment, dissatisfaction, and disengagement (Hedva, 2001) when the victim realizes the relationship and values mean much more minor than profit purpose of the seller (Leonidou et al., 2018). When customers believe that the brand was violating and exploiting them for profit purposes, the feelings of psychological loss, self-directed disappointment, and anger emerge (Reimann et al., 2018).
Potential antecedents of the sense of betrayal could be fairness violation (distributive, procedural, and interactional) (Grégoire & Fisher, 2008), product/service quality, employee service quality (Lee et al., 2013), customer ethnocentrism, inferred goodwill (Zhang et al., 2020), attributed responsibility, and crisis communication (Ma, 2018).

The emotional consequences of customer sense of betrayal that have been studied in the literature include negative attitude and brand hatred (Hashim & Kasana, 2019), anger (Ma, 2018), a sense of loss and brand disappointment (Reimann et al., 2018), and undesirable behaviors (Tan et al., 2021), such as spreading negative word of mouth (Bougie et al., 2003), terminating the relationship and contacts with the brand (Wiggin & Yalch, 2015; Tan et al., 2021).

1.2. Brand hate (BH)

Brand hate is commonly interpreted as intense or extreme negative emotions and impulsive responses (Kucuk, 2019). It is also the dark side of brand liking, brand love, or brand preference (Khan & Lee, 2014). According to Duplex’s Theory of Hate, brand hate has multiple components that manifest differently on different occasions (Sternberg, 2003). This theory introduced three key emotions of brand hate, such as disgust, contempt, and anger. The interpersonal hate relationship is also categorized in seven distinct taxonomies from mild to the extreme: cool, cold, hot, simmering, boiling, seething, and burning hate (Sternberg, 2003; Fetscherin, 2019). From a different approach, Zarantonello et al. (2016) contended that brand hate has two components: active and passive hate.

Brand hate could result in brand avoidance, negative word of mouth, public complaining, and brand retaliation. Consumers who avoid a brand by not consuming it at all, or moving to a competitor, are said to be engaging in brand avoidance (Hegner et al., 2017). The negative brand word of mouth, the so-called private complaining, is a casual interaction between friends and relatives about their opinions on services and products (Wetzer et al., 2007). The public complaining refers to the wider public such as state agencies, customer protection services, and the business itself (Fetscherin, 2019). According to Kucuk (2019), brand retaliation consists of several actions to damage a brand regarding financial benefits and fame.

According to Hegner et al. (2017) and Nguyen (2021), possible predecessors of brand hate are negative encounter (experiential avoidance) and identity inconsistency and disagreement (moral avoidance); deficit avoidance (Lee et al., 2009a), and associated avoidance (Knittel et al., 2016). The negative experience indicates unsatisfactory happenings customers have encountered from a brand (Hashim & Kasana, 2019). The negative experience relates to product failures, dissatisfied offerings, undelivered brand promises, bad store atmosphere, or other negative associations (Lee et al., 2009a). Hashim and Kasana (2019) stated that symbolic incongruity happens when a company does not fairly express itself in accordance with the customer perception. The term “ideological incompatibility” refers to the ethical disagreement between a customer and a company (Lee et al., 2009b). When brands are seen to offer an unacceptably high cost-benefit ratio, the deficit value occurs (Nguyen, 2021). As the discussion, customer sense of betrayal seems to cover all those characteristics of brand hate’s antecedents; thus, it is considered a direct cause of brand hate (Zhang et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2021).

1.3. Anti-brand activism

Anti-brand activism is customer behaviors negatively responding to brands, such as culture jamming, active resistance, brand disapproval, and brand boycotting (Romani et al., 2015) due to customer negative perceptions and emotions associated with corporations and brands (Iyer & Muncy, 2009). The anti-brand activism, both online and offline, seriously affects the value and reputation of the brand (Parguel et al., 2010; Rodrigues et al., 2020). Customers will adopt anti-brand behaviors when they realize the presence of injustices, dishonesty, and unfair advantages in the marketplace and make attributions of the brand as exploitive or dishonest (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006).

The feelings of hate and corporate wrongdoings or incompatible behaviors are two main motivations of anti-brand activism (Romani et al., 2015; Dessart et al., 2020; Baghi & Gabrielli, 2021). Online anti-brand activism (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006) has commonly considered the movement of the whole community rather than the individual consumer. In the literature on brand hate, researchers
often examine four types of customer reactions: brand avoidance, individual complaints, public complaints, and brand retaliation. However, under the circumstance of betrayal, the reactions must be more substantial and extreme. Thus, this study analyzes the relationship between the sense of online betrayal, brand hate, and three dominant online anti-brand actions: negative online word of mouth, online public complaining, and online boycotting. Brand avoidance seems to be mild action that should not be considered the reactions of betrayed experienced customers.

1.4. Negative online word-of-mouth

Word of mouth is an essential aspect for customers who are eager to get information about the brand and its products/services (Laczniak et al., 2001). It is thought to have a more powerful and more decisive influence on customers' evaluation and perception than the commercial information provided by brands' advertisements (Martin & Lueg, 2013) because of the credibility of sources (Richin, 1984). Hence, according to Wang et al. (2010), the information provided by word of mouth is considered the best source of reference data for customers.

Although word of mouth can be positive or negative, Bone (1995) argued that the negative type is more influential than the positive one since it appears transparently. Before making a purchase decision, the customer has little knowledge and information about the product and service; thus, he/she accesses the Internet to read comments and reviews, opinions, and rankings of the others (Nuseir, 2019). When customers experience dissatisfaction with product quality, service performance, or other failures (Lastner et al., 2016), they talk and share with their friends and relatives both online and offline. That is the origin of negative online word of mouth. Customers adopt word of mouth to react to their discomfort emotions (Ribeiro et al., 2021) and revenge behavior to the brand. The negative word of mouth may occur anytime customers face troubles during their shopping journey or even in the post-purchase stage. As discussed by Azemi et al. (2020) and Roulez et al. (2019), negative word of mouth is the outcome of brand hate and customer perceived betrayal (Tan et al., 2021).

1.5. Online public complaining

According to Grégoire et al. (2010), the public complaining is mass-oriented or addresses the larger audiences. The audiences are third parties: media businesses, customer protection agencies, and public organizations that have the authority to put to justice and order brands to resolve problems (Grégoire & Fisher, 2006).

The online environment provides an open, fair, and transparent space to all citizens. Here customers can easier raise their voice and make complaints than in a regular offline environment. Time-saving, no cost, and less effort are advantages of an online environment. Customers no longer have to spend money or time visiting a consumer protection office or consulting an attorney. They stay at home and share their genuine discomfort stories on Facebook, Twitter, and other social media platforms. Online forums will assist them in sharing, disseminating, and consulting on consumer retribution solutions (Trip & Grégoire, 2011). In the circumstance of online betrayal, the customer may proactively adopt this action to denounce the firm's misconduct to the public and share their experience among a broader public to remind other of the brand betrayal (Grégoire & Fisher, 2006). Moreover, Fetscherin (2019) proved the significant influence of brand hate on public complaining.

1.6. Online boycotting

Consumer boycotting behavior is a prominent marketing issue. Consumer boycott is connected to corporate social responsivity (CSR) and brand vulnerability (Ali, 2021). Consumers tend to boycott big and global brands rather than local or small brands. A consumer boycott is considered a consumer's decision to refuse to buy products produced by businesses or countries (Tilikidou & Delistavrou, 2011). Klein et al. (2004) defined customer boycotting behavior as an effort made by a person or a group of people to achieve particular purposes. Such customers advise others not to buy specific goods or services. This definition emphasizes the behavior of stopping the customer's purchase. In a flat world, information is difficult to hide, especially negative information. The firms exposed to be guilty and unethical (Braunsberger & Buckler, 2011) will face the avoidance crisis
and even boycott by the consumer community (Abdelwahab et al., 2020). Customers choose boycotts as a proactive response to revenge the betraying firms and demand compensation for their feeling of loss and value deficits (Hahn & Albert, 2017). An online boycott may spread out faster than the offline because the information and updates can be delivered to others instantly regardless of time zone, region, race, nationality, social class, age, and gender differences (Delistavrou et al., 2020).

This study intends to investigate the role of customers’ feelings of betrayal while shopping online as a crucial antecedent of brand hate and anti-brand actions such as negative word of mouth, online public complaints, and online boycott efforts. Thus, the hypotheses are proposed as follows:

**H1:** Customer sense of betrayal positively affects brand hate.

**H2:** Customer sense of betrayal positively affects the negative online word of mouth.

**H3:** Brand hate positively affects the negative online word of mouth.

**H4:** Customer sense of betrayal positively affects the online public complaining.

**H5:** Brand hate positively affects the online public complaining.

**H6:** Customer sense of betrayal positively affects the online boycott.

**H7:** Brand hate positively affects the online boycott.

### 2. METHODOLOGY

A four-phase procedure was used. First, literature was reviewed to construct the general model of the study. The study collected pre-validated constructs and measurement items and developed the structured questionnaire. Six original measures were verified and altered to meet the online environment’s research setting before being translated into Vietnamese. The pilot test survey was conveniently delivered to twenty scholars, marketing practitioners, and experienced online shoppers to validate the credibility and understandability of constructs. Second, the official questionnaire was randomly delivered to 500 online shoppers via their Facebook and Instagram accounts. Gratitude online vouchers have been given to encourage the respondents. Third, the collected data were re-checked, screened to delete in-completed and non-logical responses. Finally, 383 valid responses were obtained, which can be officially used for further statistical analysis. To perform descriptive and inferential statistical processes, SPSS 25 and Smart PLS 3.3 statistical software were used.

According to the results of the analysis, 64.23% of females and 35.77% of males participated in the survey. The majority of responders (36.29%) are between 23 and 35 years old. Two smaller groups are less than 23 years old and from 36 to 45 with 26.63% and 29.77%, respectively. The group of more than 45 years old responders only occupies 7.31%. The results also indicated that 38.64% of the total are officers, whereas 28.98% are students. Workers and freelancers take a much smaller proportion with 20.10% and 12.27%. Responding to the question of “Have you ever been betrayed while shopping herbal supplements online?”, 33.42% chose the option of “experienced the betrayal” while 66.58% – “never experienced the betrayal”.

This study includes five multidimensional constructs with a total of 20 items and five demographic variables. Measurement constructs were taken from earlier studies, with several modifications to meet the actual research setting of the online environment and betrayal circumstances (Appendix A). To measure the customer sense of betrayal, the study used the findings of Lee et al. (2013), Kang et al. (2021), and Tan et al. (2021). A measurement construct for brand hate was developed from Sternberg (2003), Hegner et al. (2017), Zeki and Romaya (2008), and Zhang and Laroche (2020). The negative online word of mouth construct was adopted from Günaydın and Yıldız (2021), and Nguyen (2021), whereas the online public complaining scale was adopted from Grégoire and Fisher (2006), Grégoire et al. (2018) and Fetscherin (2019). The boycott construct was modified from Grégoire et al. (2018), Delistavrou et al. (2020), and Ali (2021).
3. RESULTS

Hair et al. (2017) proposed the following measures to assess the convergent validity of the model: composite reliability, extracted average variance, and factor loadings. The outside loadings and composite reliability should exceed 0.70, and the extracted average variance value should exceed recommended 0.50. The study determined that the measuring constructs would be more accurate and valid if three items were deleted: SOB2, BH3, and OB4, all of which had outer loading values < 0.70. The remaining 21 items have convergent validity and reliability, with outer loadings greater than 0.70 and AVE > 0.50 (Table 1).

The discriminant validity is checked in the second phase to see how dissimilar it is from other constructs (Hair et al., 2017). According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), the square root of the AVE must be more extensive than its corresponding correlation coefficients, showing satisfactory discriminant validity. Table 1 revealed that the square roots of the AVE for each variable exceed the corresponding correlations. As a result, the study assumes that the measurement model showed adequate convergent and discriminant validity. Table 2 shows the results.

Hair et al. (2017) proposed utilizing Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) to evaluate structural models for collinearity effects among each set of predictor variables, with a VIF value larger than 5 suggesting multicollinearity. The findings indicate that the lowest VIF value is 1.435 and the maximum is 2.007, both of which are less than 5, indicating no multicollinearity. Hair et al. (2016) advocated evaluating the structural model’s quality by adopting the SRMR value; the SRMR value must not exceed 0.10. The study indicates that the SRMR value is 0.055 – does not exceed 0.10 – indicating that the model fits well for hypothesis testing (Table 4).

Additionally, as shown in Table 3 and in comparison to Cohen (2013), the R2 values for BH = 0.425, OC = 0.452, OR = 0.414, and OB = 0.466 all exceeded the 0.26 threshold (Cohen, 2013). The sense of online betrayal can explain 42.5% of the variance of customer brand hate. The sense of online betrayal and brand hate can explain 45.2% of the variance of online public complaining, 41.4% the variance of negative online word of mouth, and 46.6% the variance of online boycott, respectively.

According to Akter et al. (2011), a Q2 value > 0 suggests that the model has predictive importance for a particular dependent construct. All Q2 values illustrated in Table 3 as BH (0.254), NOW (0.282), OPC (0.273), and OB (0.290) exceeded 0, indicating the brand hate, demand for reparation, brand retaliation, and boycott decision demonstrating acceptable predictive relevance.

Table 1. Internal consistency reliability and convergent validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measurement item</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of online betrayal</td>
<td>SOB (4 items)</td>
<td>0.750–0.817</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand hate</td>
<td>BH (4 items)</td>
<td>0.754–0.803</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative online word of mouth</td>
<td>NOW (5 items)</td>
<td>0.768–0.825</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online public complaining</td>
<td>OPC (4 items)</td>
<td>0.806–0.824</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online boycott</td>
<td>OB (4 items)</td>
<td>0.763–0.817</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All item loadings are significant at .001 (p < .001). CA = Cronbach’s alpha, AVE = average variance extracted, CR = composite reliability.

Table 2. Discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BH</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>OPC</th>
<th>SOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOB</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. R², Q², and SMRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/constructs</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$Q^2$</th>
<th>SMRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH (Brand hate)</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOW (Negative word of mouth)</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC (Online public complaining)</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB (Online boycott)</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Gronemus et al. (2010), path coefficients represent the magnitude of difference in the dependent variable as a function of each independent variable. Table 4 demonstrates that all path coefficients were statistically significant due to their $p$-values being less than 0.05. As a result, all hypotheses of this study are supported. Hair et al. (2017) recommended considering the effect size ($f^2$) for each path. According to Cohen (2013), the $f^2$ values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 mean different kinds of effects (small, medium, and large, sequentially).

The findings show the positive and significant relationship of all proposed hypotheses as the $\beta$-values of all paths are greater than 0, and the $p$-values are all lesser than 0.05. Moreover, the analysis also shows the large impact of customer sense of betrayal on brand hate due to the $f^2 = 0.738 > 0.35$. The relationship between the sense of online betrayal and online complaining, online retaliation, and online boycott show the medium to large direct effects as the $f^2 = 0.308, 0.168, \text{and } 0.225$ allocate in the range value from 0.15 to 0.35. All other paths show the small to medium direct effects due to the $f^2$, respectively, are 0.034, 0.084, and 0.090.

Table 4. Hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$f^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$</td>
<td>SOB $\rightarrow$ BH</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>19.314</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$</td>
<td>SOB $\rightarrow$ NOW</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>9.898</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$</td>
<td>BH $\rightarrow$ NOW</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>2.924</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$</td>
<td>SOB $\rightarrow$ OPC</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>9.041</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$</td>
<td>BH $\rightarrow$ OPC</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>5.452</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_6$</td>
<td>SOB $\rightarrow$ OB</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>8.633</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_7$</td>
<td>BH $\rightarrow$ OB</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>5.319</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Modeling results
4. DISCUSSIONS

The majority of past research has been on analyzing how the antecedents such as economic, political, and product-related factors affect customer’s brand hate and its outcomes as anti-brand activities. However, only several articles investigated the customer’s emotions and reactions when experiencing the betrayal situation. Hence, this study offers novel insights into customer sense of betrayal in the online shopping environment. Customer sense of online betrayal has been proved to have a significant and positive effect on brand hate and anti-brand activism, e.g. negative word of mouth, public complaints, and boycott decision. Among three punished behaviors, customer sense of online betrayal has the most substantial influence on negative online word of mouth intention, then the online boycott decision and the online public complaining. The paper adds to the literature and provides practitioners with recommendations.

The current study extends the knowledge of customer betrayal in the online business environment. Customer sense of online betrayal was confirmed to be an influencing factor of brand hate and anti-brand online activism. These findings corroborate findings of Grégoire and Fisher (2006), Hegner et al. (2017), Hahn and Albert (2017), Abdelwahab et al. (2020), and Günaydin and Yıldız (2021). Interpersonal brand hate also was found, leading to anti-brand online responses. These findings support Hegner et al. (2017), Fetscherin (2019), Zhang and Laroche (2020), and Nguyen (2021). In addition, the present study examined the online boycott as an extreme action of brand revenge. The online boycott constructs used in this study were developed from an offline environment and adjusted to fit with online environment characteristics. In summary, for customers who experience a sense of betrayal when shopping online, brand hate emerges, and they will seriously take anti-brand actions against and punish betraying brands as a way of demanding fairness and brand reparation. From a managerial standpoint, this study indicates that when a brand engages in unethical or fraudulent activity to abuse, exploit, deceive, or betray clients, they will experience unpleasant emotions and start anti-brand actions. Therefore, the business should pay attention to actions against the misconducted behaviors. First, posting negative reviews, feedback, and rankings on social network individual accounts is often the first anti reaction of customers. Second, they send betrayal cases and disputes to consumer production, government, and legal agencies to seek support and consult. Then, the information of the betrayal cases also could be presented in online public groups where people often share their own stories and wait for the comment of other members. This method is costless but very effective.

The boycott is the “knockout” and most extreme action both from brand and financial benefits. Customer boycott (both online and offline) seems to be an effective method to hurt unethical firms and prevent them from betraying other customers. Raising or participating in the online boycott movement or being an active member of the online boycott group are recommended actions that betrayed customers should consider halting the spread of online betrayal. Not only limited in the scope of an individual or small group of consumers as in offline environment, but the online environment also supports spreading the negative word of mouth, attracting the concerns of communities and governmental agencies, then the boycott movement. When being boycotted and avoided by the online community, brands have little chance to hide their dishonest behaviors, explaining their failures, and controlling the crisis. The customer sense of online betrayal is just the starting point for a big fire of brand attack. Hence, the lesson that any brand must keep in mind is never betraying customers in any aspect because the customer is the benefactor who spend time, effort, and money to support the brand and buy products; betrayed customer is the direct and shortest way to the end of the business life cycle.

CONCLUSION

For profit-maximizing purposes, businesses tend to execute misconducted behaviors such as selling deficit value products and broadcasting misleading advertising information that triggers a sense of betrayal. Notably, in the online business environment, the betrayal behaviors seem to be more severe than
the typical offline businesses due to the missing face-to-face interactions between the sellers and the buyers. This study shed light on customer sense of betrayal in the online shopping environment and addressed a gap in marketing research by examining the role of customer perception of betrayal as the leading cause of customer’s brand hate and anti-brand behaviors. The research results confirmed the positive effects of customers’ sense of betrayal on customer brand hate and negative online word of mouth, public online complaining, and online boycott.

The current study investigates three types of anti-brand behavior of customers (negative online word of mouth, public online complaining, and online boycott) in responses to a misconducted brand. Hence, other behaviors could be examined additionally, such as forgiveness, brand switch, rejection reconciliation, or demands for repairing. Regarding brand hate, the effects of betrayal perception on each level of hate should also be considered for more profound understanding of customer’s emotional reactions in terms of feeling loss.
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### APPENDIX A. Measurement constructs

#### Table A1. Sense of online betrayal (SOB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOB1</td>
<td>I felt cheated by a brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOB2</td>
<td>A brand tried to abuse me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOB3</td>
<td>A brand told lie about its products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOB4</td>
<td>A brand took advantage of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOB5</td>
<td>I was intentionally betrayed by a brand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table A2. Brand hate (BH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH1</td>
<td>I am disgusted by a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH2</td>
<td>I don’t tolerate a betraying brand and its company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH3</td>
<td>The world would be a better place without a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH4</td>
<td>I am totally angry about a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH5</td>
<td>A betraying brand is awful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table A3. Negative online word of mouth (NOW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONW1</td>
<td>I discourage friends and relatives to buy a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONW2</td>
<td>I say negative things about betraying brands to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONW3</td>
<td>I recommend not to buy betraying brand to whom seeks my advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONW4</td>
<td>I post negative comments on official websites of betraying brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONW5</td>
<td>I leave a low rating/ranking to the betraying brand’s official fan page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table A4. Online public complaining (OPC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPC1</td>
<td>I inbox to representatives of a brand to complain about the failures of the betraying brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC2</td>
<td>I sent emails and online messages to the customer protection office to complain about the betrayal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC3</td>
<td>I asked for support and consult from government and lawyer agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC4</td>
<td>I encourage others to share my betrayal to the whole online community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table A5. Online boycott (OB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB1</td>
<td>I will join an anti-fan group on the Internet against betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB2</td>
<td>I will never again buy any product of a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB3</td>
<td>I feel guilty if I buy the product of a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB4</td>
<td>I feel ashamed when others know me consuming the product of a betraying brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB5</td>
<td>For me, boycotting is effective means to demand a betraying brand repairing its misconducts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>