

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

Based on the results of the research analysis that has been conducted, the following conclusions can be drawn.

1. Consumer Animosity has a negative effect on Cognitive Judgment. This indicates that high animosity reduces objective evaluations.
2. Consumer Animosity has a positive effect on Unfavorable Affective Evaluation. This shows that heightened animosity intensifies negative emotions and fuels unfavorable judgments..
3. Cognitive Judgment has a negative effect on Unfavorable Affective Evaluation. This indicates that stronger cognitive evaluations reduce negative emotions toward the brand.
4. Consumer Animosity has a positive effect on Brand Avoidance. This means that animosity drives consumers to distance themselves from the brand.
5. Cognitive Judgment does not have a significant effect on Brand Avoidance. This indicates that rational evaluations cannot prevent consumers from avoiding the brand.
6. Unfavorable Affective Evaluation has a positive effect on Brand Avoidance. This shows that negative emotions directly lead consumers to avoid the brand.
7. Cognitive Judgment does not mediate the relationship between Consumer Animosity and Brand Avoidance. This indicates that the pathway occurs mainly through emotions rather than cognition.
8. Unfavorable Affective Evaluation mediates the relationship between Consumer Animosity and Brand Avoidance. This shows that animosity influences avoidance through negative emotional reactions.
9. Brand Affinity moderates the relationship between Consumer Animosity and Brand Avoidance. This indicates that strong brand affinity weakens the effect of animosity on avoidance..

B. Implications

1. Theoretical Implications

The findings of this research offer important theoretical implications by supporting and extending Cognitive-Affective Theory, which posits that individuals process information both rationally (cognitive) and emotionally (affective) before forming attitudes or taking action. This study confirms that in the context of socio-political conflicts, consumer animosity triggers both cognitive judgments and affective evaluations, which subsequently influence brand avoidance behavior. These results highlight the need to further explore the dual-processing nature of consumer decision-making in emotionally charged settings. Future researchers are encouraged to expand this model by incorporating additional antecedents such as media influence, cultural identity salience, moral disengagement, or social pressure, which may further clarify how external stimuli shape cognitive and emotional reactions. Furthermore, considering individual differences like consumer ethnocentrism or political ideology as moderating variables can enrich the theoretical model, offering a deeper understanding of how different consumers respond to brand-related controversies.

2. Managerial Implications

- a. The research findings show that consumer animosity has a strong influence on negative feelings and decisions to avoid certain brands, especially when those feelings are triggered by social or political issues. For brands like Starbucks, which often become the target of boycotts, it's important to manage public opinion by being open, running helpful community programs, and building good relationships with local people. They can do this by creating programs that match local values, working with trusted community members, and showing clearly that the brand stays neutral in political matters. Companies should also be ready to deal with false information, especially on social media, to avoid emotional reactions that can lead people to dislike or avoid the brand. Using tools to

monitor online conversations, responding quickly and kindly to concerns, and giving clear explanations can help reduce problems and protect the brand's reputation.

- b. The results also show that cognitive evaluations, such as perceptions of product reliability and tangible benefits, are insufficient to neutralize the effects of strong consumer animosity. Therefore, brands need to go beyond highlighting product quality and focus on emotional branding strategies, reinforcing positive brand narratives that resonate with consumer values and social identity. Building brand affinity through loyalty programs, storytelling campaigns, or localized initiatives can serve as a protective buffer to weaken the adverse impacts of animosity on brand avoidance.
- c. The study also shows that negative emotional responses (unfavorable affective evaluation) are an important link between consumer animosity and brand avoidance. This means brand managers need to actively watch and manage how their customers feel. They can do this by using tools to track public emotions on social media (like checking comments and posts), paying attention to trending topics, and identifying early signs of anger or disappointment. When negative feelings start to appear, the brand should respond quickly with clear, caring messages to explain its side or take action if needed. Having a team ready to handle negative feedback, using positive storytelling, and showing empathy can help calm down emotional reactions before they lead to boycotts or brand rejection.
- d. Additionally, the finding that brand affinity can reduce the effect of consumer animosity on brand avoidance shows how important it is for companies to build strong emotional connections with their customers. To do this, brands should focus on creating personal and meaningful experiences, such as offering loyalty programs, responding directly to customer feedback, and showing appreciation for customer support. They can also share real stories about their values, involve customers in social or environmental causes, and support local communities to make the

brand feel closer and more trustworthy. Especially in areas where political or social issues are sensitive, these efforts can help customers feel more connected to the brand and less likely to join in negative reactions or boycotts.

- e. Lastly, since the study shows that cognitive judgment does not play a strong role in mediating the effect of consumer animosity on brand avoidance, brands should understand that logical messages or facts alone are not enough in situations filled with strong emotions. To respond better, brands should combine clear information (like product quality, price, or benefits) with emotional messages that build trust and comfort. For example, they can use warm and caring tones in their advertising, highlight stories of how the brand helps people or communities, and show empathy during sensitive issues. This way, communication speaks not just to consumers' minds, but also to their feelings, making the brand more relatable and less likely to be rejected.

C. Limitations

The limitations of this study are as follows.

1. Several indicators did not meet validity requirements during the data analysis phase. Specifically, 2 indicators from the Cognitive Judgment variable were identified as invalid. As a result, only 21 out of the total 23 indicators were included in the final model testing. This limitation may have constrained the comprehensiveness of the measurement model, especially in fully capturing the Cognitive Judgment construct.
2. The coefficient of determination (R^2) for Brand Avoidance as the dependent variable is 0.779 (77.9%), indicating a strong level of explanatory power. However, the R^2 for Cognitive Judgment is only 0.173 (17.3%), suggesting that a large portion of its variance is influenced by other factors not examined in this study. Similarly, Unfavorable Affective Evaluation has an R^2 of 0.600 (60.0%), indicating a moderate explanatory level. These findings highlight the need for future research to incorporate additional variables that could

provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing cognitive and affective evaluations, as well as brand avoidance behavior.

3. The results of the Fornell-Larcker discriminant validity test indicate that one of the constructs, namely Unfavorable Affective Evaluation, shows signs of discriminant validity issues. This was observed as its square root of AVE value was lower than its correlation with another construct. This condition suggests a potential overlap in measurement, implying that the construct may not be entirely distinct from others in the model. Future studies should consider refining the measurement items or revalidating the conceptual distinctions between related constructs.

