A Framework for Understanding Consumer Choices for Others

PEGGY J. LIU
STEVEN K. DALLAS
GAVAN J. FITZSIMONS

Although most research on consumers' choices, and resulting insights, have focused on choices that consumers make solely for themselves, consumers often make choices for others, and there is a growing literature examining such choices. Theoretically, how can this growing literature be integrated, and what gaps remain? Practically, why should marketers, consumers, and policy makers care when choices are made for others, and what should they do differently? A 2×2 framework of consumers' choices for others addresses these questions. This framework has two fundamental dimensions: the chooser's social focus (relationship vs. recipient oriented) and the chooser's consideration of consumption preferences (highlight the recipient's preferences vs. balance the recipient's preferences with the chooser's preferences). These dimensions generate four cells that represent prototypical choosing-for-others contexts: gift-giving (relationship focus, highlighting recipient's preferences), joint consumption (relationship focus, balancing recipient's and chooser's preferences), everyday favors/pick-ups (recipient focus, highlighting recipient's preferences), and caregiving (recipient focus, balancing recipient's and chooser's preferences). This framework captures most choosing-for-others situations, and each cell involves a distinct profile of motives, ultimately affecting choices. This framework integrates the choosing-for-others literature, which we hope will guide future research, and it also offers practical implications for marketers, consumers, and policy makers.

Keywords: choices for others, gift-giving, joint consumption, sharing, caregiving, relationships

Peggy J. Liu (peggy.liu@pitt.edu) is an assistant professor of business administration, Marketing and Business Economics Area, Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, 3950 Roberto Clemente Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15260. Steven K. Dallas (steven.dallas@duke.edu) is a law student, Duke University School of Law, 210 Science Drive, Durham, NC 27708, and a visiting scholar, Marketing Department, Stern School of Business, New York University, 40 West 4th Street, New York, NY 10012. Gavan J. Fitzsimons (gavan@duke.edu) is the Edward S. & Rose K. Donnell Professor of Marketing and Psychology, Marketing Department, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University, 100 Fuqua Drive, Durham, NC 27708. Please address correspondence to Peggy J. Liu. The authors acknowledge the Duke-Ipsos Research Center & Think Tank for its financial support and thank Ernest Baskin, Jim Bettman, Kelley Gullo, the Duke UC Lab Group, the Vanderbilt Marketing Department, and the University of Pittsburgh Social Psychology Group for helpful comments. Supplementary materials are included in the web appendix accompanying the online version of this article.

Editor: Linda L. Price

Associate Editor: Rebecca Walker Reczek

Advance Access publication March 8, 2019

Consumers spend their lives surrounded by others and thus often make choices not just for themselves, but also for others. For instance, consumers choose gifts for holidays and birthdays, restaurants for dates with a partner, deodorant brands for a spouse, and foods to serve their children. Yet most consumer behavior research and the resulting practical insights for marketers, consumers, and policy makers have historically neglected choices for others. Illustrating this knowledge gap from the industry perspective, marketers have voiced concerns about knowing little regarding how consumers make choices for others or what strategies might work. Indeed, one academia-industry collaborative center with a similar mission as the Marketing Science Institute but with a focus on consumer-packaged goods (the Duke-Ipsos Research Center & Think Tank) recently identified consumer choices for others as a research priority. Lately, however, consumer choices for others has also become a growing research area for the consumer research field. Therefore, in line

 • Vol. 46 • 2019
DOI: 10.1093/jcr/ucz009

with calls for conceptual articles that advance knowledge in consumer behavior and marketing (MacInnis 2011; Yadav 2010), we present a conceptual 2×2 framework that aims to provide an integrative, generative, and timely basis to advance academic and practical understanding of consumer choices for others.

This framework has four cells that we propose map well onto four prototypical choosing-for-others contexts. The four cells are important from a practical perspective because we propose that identifying which cell a chooser occupies allows for superior prediction of the factors and motives that drive choices. Marketers have spoken for years of segmenting by benefits rather than demographics or other non-benefit-based attributes (Haley 1968; Mariorty and Reibstein 1986). Our framework provides a new way of examining the benefits a consumer looks for in a particular choosing-for-others situation. There are also practical implications for improving the welfare of consumers (both choosers and recipients) in situations in which suboptimal choices are frequently made. And finally, there are substantive implications for policy makers in consumer welfare domains, such as eating and finance, in which consumers commonly make choices for others.

From an academic perspective, this framework also offers theoretical implications by integrating largely independent research streams (on gift giving, joint consumption, everyday favors/pick-ups, and caregiving situations) within a broader framework (figure 1), illustrating conceptual similarities and differences between these situations, offering ways to resolve apparent discrepancies between literatures, and providing insights into how findings in one literature may extend into other situations. Further, even *within* a research stream (e.g., gift giving), this framework identifies both prototypical cases typically studied for each context and also the less prototypical (but still occurring) mixed cases involving extensions along each framework dimension (figure 2).

This article is organized as follows. First, we define the scope of our framework and its two fundamental dimensions. We then introduce the four framework cells before discussing each cell in depth. We then lay out practical implications for each cell. We also discuss ways in which the framework is not context-bound—that is, the framework motives are not limited to a particular prototypical context and can also explain variability in choices within a context. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of theoretical implications, as many of these span across the framework cells, and an agenda for future work stemming from the framework.

TWO FUNDAMENTAL DIMENSIONS OF CHOOSING FOR OTHER CONSUMERS

First, we define the scope of our framework and outline what is beyond its scope. Specifically, what do we mean by consumer choices for others, and how do such choices fit within the broader literature on social influence and social norms?

Our framework focuses on how consumers make decisions for other consumers. For instance, how do relationship partners or friends make choices for each other, and how do consumers make choices for their children or their parents? We do not examine contexts in which consumers delegate choices to professionals (e.g., doctors, financial consultants, stylists; Steffel and Williams 2018).

Further, although contexts involving nonprofessionals making decisions for other consumers are common, we note that such contexts operate within an even broader literature on social influence and social norms. This broader literature includes a separate set of contexts in which other consumers affect consumers' own decisions for themselves via informational or normative influence (e.g., How does observing a friend's choice affect one's choice for the self? How does another person's mere presence affect one's choice for the self?) (Cialdini and Goldstein 2004). Such contexts are beyond the scope of our framework, which instead focuses on consumers making choices for other consumers.

We also note that there is a distinction between factors explaining why consumers willingly make choices for others (social norms, expectation of future economic gains, altruism, etc.) versus factors affecting which choice options are selected, conditioned on the chooser having decided to make a choice for another person. Our framework takes the starting point that the chooser has decided to make a choice for another person and delineates two fundamental dimensions that shape *which* choice options are selected in various contexts.

Our framework is grounded in two fundamental dimensions that differentiate choosing-for-others situations. The first dimension captures the chooser's social focus—whether the chooser is focused on his relationship with the recipient or on the recipient alone when choosing. When consumers adopt a relationship focus, they care strongly about the self-other link and the relational messages conveyed via their choice, as well as the relational expectations, dynamics, and implications of their choice (Cavanaugh 2016; Epp and Price 2011; Kelley and Thibaut 1978). Consumers adopting a relationship focus may still care about the other person's wants and needs, but they address those wants and needs with strong consideration of the relationship. Indeed, if the chooser ultimately selects something that addresses the other person's wants and needs, this option was thought to convey the most appropriate relational message. In contrast, consumers sometimes instead adopt a recipient focus. With a recipient focus, their primary consideration when choosing is the other person for whom they are choosing; they are much less concerned with the self-other link and the relational implications of their choice (Barasz, Kim, and John 2016;

FIGURE 1

A 2 × 2 FRAMEWORK FOR CONSUMER CHOICES FOR OTHERS

		Chooser's social focus	
		Relationship focus	**Recipient focus**
Chooser's consideration of consumption preferences	**Highlight recipient's preferences**	Prototypical context: "Gift-giving"	Prototypical context: "Everyday favors/pick-ups"
	Balance recipient's preferences with chooser's own preferences for the situation	Prototypical context: "Joint consumption"	Prototypical context: "Caregiving"

NOTE.—The four cell labels are in quotation marks to recognize that these cell labels are chosen to represent prototypical choice contexts for each combination of the conceptual dimensions. However, there can certainly be mixed cases (e.g., cases in a gift-giving context that do not fit in the relationship focus + highlight recipient's preferences cell). For those cases, our framework should be used to consider where the situation falls on each conceptual dimension. As another way to illustrate this, consider the examples in figure 2, discussed at length in the General Discussion. For example, although we suggest that prototypical gift-giving occupies the relationship focus + highlighting recipient's preferences cell, gift-giving occasions can sometimes extend into other cells. Examining these different forms of gift-giving, and the different forms of the other choice contexts, is an important direction for future research.

Laran 2010). In general, the role of the self is considerably diminished when one adopts a recipient focus.

The second fundamental dimension captures whether the chooser is primarily considering the recipient's consumption preferences or balancing them with the chooser's own preferences for the situation. For expository purposes, we often use "recipient's preferences" as shorthand for the recipient's consumption preferences. When a chooser's main consideration is the recipient's preferences, the chooser selects the option that she believes the recipient will most want or be pleased with. Choosers may sometimes be incorrect about recipients' preferences and select a less preferred option (e.g., due to perspective-taking failures). However, this framework dimension is defined by choosers' intentions regarding recipients' preferences. Thus, when the chooser's main consideration is to satisfy the recipient's preferences, our framework still considers the situation as such even if the choice does not accomplish this objective.

By contrast, sometimes choosers balance the recipient's preferences with the chooser's *own* preferences for the situation. Colloquially, the chooser considers both what the recipient wants and what the chooser wants. The chooser's wants can be either her own consumption preferences or her preferences for what the recipient should consume. For example, when selecting a restaurant, a chooser may balance the recipient's preferences (e.g., American food) against her own culinary tastes (e.g., Asian food), or she may balance the recipient's preferences (American food) against what she believes the recipient should eat (healthy food). In both cases, the chooser weighs the recipient's preferences against her own preferences for the situation. The term "balancing" does not mean equal weighting of the recipient's and chooser's preferences in either the decision-making process or outcome. Rather, we use the term to express that the chooser considers, weighs, assesses, or compares both preferences to arrive ultimately at some outcome. This balancing process may end up much closer to the recipient's preferences or the chooser's preferences (e.g., as in how work-life balance can involve varying levels of each), but we refer to it as balancing if the chooser considered both recipient and chooser preferences. Finally, we note that this second framework dimension does not include a third level consisting of highlighting the chooser's consumption preferences, as that would place zero weight on the recipient's preferences (i.e., we suggest that nearly all choosing-for-others contexts involve at least some degree of consideration of a recipient's preferences).

Generally speaking, if the chooser is relationship-focused on the first framework dimension (i.e., the social focus dimension), then the chooser's preferences for the situation that are balanced against the recipient's preferences are likely the chooser's own consumption preferences. However, if the chooser is recipient-focused on the social focus framework dimension, then the chooser's preferences that are balanced against the recipient's preferences are likely the chooser's preferences for what the recipient should consume. Indeed, it makes sense that the chooser's first dimension social focus logically indicates differences in the nature of the second dimension in the case of balancing preferences. When choosers adopt a relationship focus

FIGURE 2

EXAMPLES OF EACH CELL'S PROTOTYPE IN EVERY OTHER CELL

(a) Examples of Gift-Giving in Every Framework Cell

	Relationship focus	Recipient focus
Highlight recipient's preferences	Giving a birthday or wedding gift	Giving a "white elephant" gift
Balance recipient's preferences with chooser's own preferences for the situation	Giving a gift to a member of chooser's household (that chooser will also use)	Giving a child an educational gift

(b) Examples of Joint Consumption in Every Framework Cell

	Relationship focus	Recipient focus
Highlight recipient's preferences	Choosing a restaurant for a first date	Buying drinks at an important one-time sales meeting
Balance recipient's preferences with chooser's own preferences for the situation	Choosing a restaurant for lunch with spouse or friends	Making dinner for you and your young child

(c) Examples of Everyday Favors/Pick-Ups in Every Framework Cell

	Relationship focus	Recipient focus
Highlight recipient's preferences	Picking up beer for your spouse to repair self-other link after a fight	Picking up beer for your spouse
Balance recipient's preferences with chooser's own preferences for the situation	Picking up beer for your household	Picking up non-alcoholic beer for your alcoholic spouse

(d) Examples of Caregiving in Every Framework Cell

	Relationship focus	Recipient focus
Highlight recipient's preferences	Parent choosing a child's favorite book to read together with child	Parent choosing a fun book for child to read
Balance recipient's preferences with chooser's own preferences for the situation	Parent choosing a new young adult book to read together with child	Parent choosing an educational book for child to read

and are balancing consumption preferences (the prototypical joint consumption cell), the tension is likely between the recipient's consumption preferences and the chooser's own consumption preferences (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014; Sternberg and Dobson 1987). By contrast, when choosers adopt a recipient focus and are balancing consumption preferences (the prototypical caregiving cell), the tension is likely between the recipient's consumption preferences and what the chooser feels is the most appropriate consumption option for the recipient's long-term well-being. Accordingly, we encourage framework users to first determine whether a chooser is relationship- or recipient-focused and then whether a chooser is highlighting the recipient's preferences or balancing them with his own preferences. This is *not* meant to imply that choosers' decision processes proceed in this sequence when they make choices for others, or that such processes are necessarily deliberative and calculative.

Both dimensions are vital to capturing a chooser's main considerations when choosing for others. Thus, they define our 2×2 framework, with four cells for the combinations of chooser's social focus and consumption preference considerations. Figure 1 is a pictorial representation.

Our framework description thus far might seemingly imply that both parties (chooser and recipient) always have a set of preferences that are *specifically known* and *independent* of the other party's participation. First, regarding whether the recipient has known preferences, our framework assumes that the chooser thinks about the recipient's preferences to some degree in most choosing-for-others contexts, whether the recipient's preferences are specifically known (e.g., I know that this recipient likes chocolate) or generally inferred (e.g., I know that most people like chocolate, so the recipient also probably likes chocolate). There may be a few cases in which the recipient's preferences are neither specifically known by the chooser

nor easy to generally infer (e.g., in the new product innovation domain or when introducing a new vegetable to a young child), cases we discuss later in the gift-giving and caregiving sections. As pertains to our framework, we refer to the chooser as considering the recipient's preferences as long as the chooser thinks about what the recipient would like, regardless of whether the chooser knows (vs. infers) or is correct (vs. incorrect) about the recipient's specific preferences.

Second, regarding the independence of product preferences, we generally discuss these as separate (e.g., I like chocolate and my partner likes vanilla), as they are likely independent in many choosing-for-others situations. There may be contexts, though—particularly those involving joint activities—that involve preferences predicated on the other person's participation. For instance, a parent who rarely watches sports independently may prefer joint activities with her son involving baseball. Thus, her preference for the baseball game is dependent on the son's participation. We discuss these situations further in the joint consumption section.

Next, we discuss the four cells resulting from crossing these two fundamental dimensions. We suggest that these two dimensions parsimoniously capture considerable variance in consumer choices for others, forming four cells that provide a useful basis for reviewing and integrating research on this area.

THE FOUR CELLS OF THE 2 × 2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The four framework cells are labeled to correspond to four major, distinct choosing-for-others literatures that can be considered prototypical contexts for each cell: gift-giving, joint consumption, everyday favors/pick-ups, and caregiving. We use these labels because they improve comprehension by representing common, prototypical, and, thus, important contexts for each cell. Moreover, considerable literature streams have emerged on each context, which facilitates a deeper understanding of the prototypical motives and outcomes in each context and thus, indirectly, within each cell.

The first cell (relationship focus + highlighting the recipient's preferences) is labeled gift-giving. We use this label because the gift-giving context prototypically involves choosers having both considerable relationship focus (Belk 1979, 1996; Camerer 1988; Lowrey, Otnes, and Ruth 2004; Otnes, Lowrey, and Kim 1993; Ruth, Otnes, and Brunel 1999; Schwartz 1967; Sherry 1983) and a desire to appeal to the recipient's preferences (Galak, Givi, and Williams 2016).

The second cell (relationship focus + balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences for the situation) is labeled joint consumption. The joint consumption label refers to shared consumption occasions involving both self and other (e.g., a shared restaurant, vacation destination, or car). We use this label because the joint consumption context prototypically involves choosers having both considerable relationship focus and a tendency to balance the recipient's preferences against the chooser's own preferences for the situation (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014; Sternberg and Dobson 1987).

The third cell (recipient focus + highlighting the recipient's preferences) is labeled everyday favors/pick-ups. This label connotes making consumption choices for a recipient who is able-minded but physically absent, mentally occupied, or not sufficiently interested in choices in the product category (e.g., picking up coffee for a busy coworker, buying toothpaste for a spouse). We use this label because everyday favors/pick-ups prototypically involve a strong recipient focus (the chooser is often making everyday choices rather than viewing the choice as a relationship-signaling opportunity) and the chooser is highlighting the recipient's preferences.

The fourth cell (recipient focus + balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences for the situation) is labeled caregiving. We use this label because caregiving situations (e.g., choosing for children or the elderly) prototypically involve both a strong recipient focus and the chooser balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences for what the recipient should consume.

These four contexts are both theoretically and empirically grounded. Theoretically, they map onto the main reasons why one consumer would choose for another. Indeed, although consumers make many choices for themselves and value the freedom to make their own choices (Botti and Iyengar 2004; Brehm 1966; Schwartz 2004), our framework reflects that one consumer may choose for another for one of four main theoretical reasons: the desire to send a relational signal to the recipient, the sharing of the choice between chooser and recipient, the recipient being occupied and thus not present to make the choice, or the recipient's difficulty in making their own appropriate choices. Occasionally, individual situations may involve multiple reasons; we suggest it is instructive in such cases to consider where the chooser falls on each framework dimension to aid in identifying the dominant choosing-for-others cell at play.

Regarding the first reason, consumers send relationship signals to each other to address social belongingness and connection needs (Baumeister and Leary 1995; Mead et al. 2011). In the choosing-for-others context, gift-giving has been, and continues to be, a key way for consumers to form, express, strengthen, and reciprocate relational bonds across ancient and modern societies and cultures alike (Bradford 2009; Mauss 1925/2000; Ruth et al. 1999; Schwartz 1967; Sherry 1983).

Regarding the second reason, multiple consumers may share in the same consumption choice (Belk 2010).

Sharing, or joint consumption, is common in families (Belk 2010; Corfman and Lehmann 1987; Davis 1976) and romantic partnerships (Etkin 2016), but also occurs outside families, as when friends attend a movie or coworkers have lunch together (Liu et al. 2013). In these contexts, more than one consumer consumes or experiences a product and, thus, joint consumption inherently involves choosing for others, if not completely then at least partially.

Regarding the third reason, making a consumption choice requires a consumer to take time and be at the appropriate location for making the choice (particularly for shopping at physical [vs. online] locations). When facing greater time or location constraints, a consumer is more likely to defer this choice to another consumer. Often, the recipient explicitly requests a specific product (a request that the chooser can modify or decline), but sometimes this can be simply "you choose for me," as in the case of a working spouse asking a stay-at-home spouse to pick up some beer, or a harried coworker asking another to pick up any sandwich for them for lunch. Indeed, research on household division of labor indicates that optimal time use is a major reason why consumers make choices for each other (Becker 1985).

Finally, for the fourth reason, some consumers have difficulty making their own choices (e.g., difficulty managing their own short-term and long-term interests). For instance, some consumers have age-related deficits associated with youth or old age (Carlson and Grossbart 1988; John and Cole 1986). Others have difficulty due to lack of expertise (Alba and Hutchinson 1987) or emotional coping ability (Botti, Orfali, and Iyengar 2009; Luce, Bettman, and Payne 1997). Choices may thus be delegated to a chooser with responsibility for caring for the recipient.

The four contexts used as prototypical labels for the framework's cells are also empirically grounded. We suggest that this framework parsimoniously captures nearly all contexts in which consumers make choices for others and that each context encapsulates a considerable breadth of situations. In particular, a pilot study completed by 102 members of an Amazon Mechanical Turk online panel illustrated the relevance of these four contexts for consumers' lives. Each participant listed five situations in which they made a choice either completely or partly for another person (the web appendix contains the full stimuli). After reading brief descriptions of each of the four choosing-for-others categories identified by our framework, each participant self-coded all five situations that they listed into one of the four categories identified by our framework or a fifth "other" category.

Two key findings emerged. First, most situations that participants listed (97.25%; 496/510 listed situations) were self-coded into one of the four choosing-for-others contexts in our framework. Second, all four contexts were well represented among the 496 situations coded as fitting into one of the four contexts: 27.42% gift-giving ($n = 136$), 26.81% joint consumption ($n = 133$), 22.78% everyday favors/pick-ups ($n = 113$), and 22.98% caregiving ($n = 114$). This pilot study thus offers a first empirical illustration that the contexts derived from our framework capture most situations in which consumers choose for others and also that each context captures a nontrivial share of such situations. Next, we discuss each cell in detail, drawing from literature on the prototypical context label used for the cell.

RELATIONSHIP FOCUS + HIGHLIGHT RECIPIENT'S PREFERENCES: THE PROTOTYPICAL GIFT-GIVING CONTEXT

The first cell is characterized by a relationship focus and highlighting the recipient's consumption preferences. A relationship focus is defined by the chooser caring about the self-other link and the relational signals and implications of the choice. Highlighting the recipient's preferences is characterized by the chooser caring strongly about what the recipient "wants" and what might most please the recipient. We suggest that gift-giving contexts represent the prototypical choice in this cell, as choosers in such contexts typically have both motives (although, as we will discuss, it can sometimes be difficult to align the motives simultaneously). Thus, to illuminate the effect of having these two motives on choices, we review literature on consumer motives and choices in this context.

The Gift-Giving Context

Gift-giving is a universal behavior that societies engage in (Belk 1979; Schwartz 1967; Sherry 1983). It commonly occurs within both families and friendships, as an exchange marking various special occasions and holidays. Examples of common gifts span the range from products or experiences nonspecific to gift-giving (e.g., a book, cookies, concert tickets) to products or experiences designed specifically to serve as gifts (e.g., a card, heart-shaped chocolates, a gift certificate for a manicure). Indeed, most products or experiences can be gifts, conditional on cultural, social, and contextual norms (Bradford 2009; Sherry 1983).

First Dimension: Relationship Focus

Gift-giving is a main way in which consumers create, maintain, strengthen, and express social bonds (Camerer 1988; Otnes et al. 1993; Ruth et al. 1999; Sherry 1983). Relational signaling is thus important in gift-giving. Gift-givers often treat the amount of money spent on a gift (Caplow 1984; Lowrey et al. 2004), the uniqueness or specificity of the gift (Goodman and Lim 2018), or the feasibility of using the gift (Rim et al. 2019) as a signal of how relationally close the recipient is to them. Further, reflecting the focus on the relationship, choosers often consider their gift's relational impact (Chan and Mogilner 2017) and whether their gift choice is appropriate for the

relationship (Goodman and Lim 2018; Lowrey et al. 2004). Additionally, within families, intergenerational gifts of assets convey meaning regarding relational closeness and status linkages between generations (Bradford 2009).

Extending beyond the typical dyadic gifting context between family members and friends, gifts are sometimes even employed to create, maintain, strengthen, and express intracommunity relational bonds (Weinberger and Wallendorf 2012). Emphasizing the importance of a relationship focus, Weinberger and Wallendorf (2012) discuss how gifts from businesses to a community are accepted by the community only if the gifts are perceived as sufficiently grounded in the moral economy (the economy of recognizing and balancing social relationships) and not just the market economy. Indeed, regarding the interplay of the moral and the market economies, store-bought gifts (as opposed to homemade ones) likely rose in acceptance in the U.S. only because marketers positioned them as being able to signal sufficient relational meaning (Weinberger 2017).

Finally, the importance of gifts as a way to manage relationships between individuals and within groups is also illustrated through the experiences of noncelebrants of dominant gift-giving holidays (e.g., Christmas). Weinberger (2015) finds that some noncelebrants of Christmas purposely engage in gift-giving at the office to maintain their relationships with coworkers and bosses and to signal cultural and social belonging.

Second Dimension: Highlight Recipient's Preferences

Satisfying the recipient's preferences is also a focal goal of the chooser in prototypical gift-giving contexts. Choosers typically aim to select what the other person will respond to most positively emotionally, at the time the gift is received (Galak et al. 2016; Yang and Urminsky 2018). While a recipient's preferences are sometimes very specifically known (as with a gift registry), a chooser may guess the recipient's preferences in other cases. The chooser may base this guess on knowledge about the recipient's past consumption, beliefs about what consumers similar to the recipient generally prefer, or beliefs about what most consumers prefer. Regardless of whether the chooser is correct or how much he knows about the recipient's specific preferences, prototypical gift-giving occasions involve the chooser aiming to select something that he *believes* will address the recipient's preferences.

Because gift-givers prototypically focus on maximizing the recipient's positive emotions upon the gift's receipt (Galak et al. 2016), givers sometimes fail to consider the complete timeline of a gift's usage and mispredict a gift's emotional impact over time. For instance, gift-givers erroneously give desirable (over feasible) gifts to recipients (Baskin et al. 2014), perhaps in part because in trying to maximize the recipient's positive emotions at the moment of gift exchange, givers underweight the multiple occasions of future usage that would increase convenience's importance for recipients. Consumers may also be inaccurate at predicting gift enjoyment over time, anticipating that a gift producing higher hedonic enjoyment at the moment of exchange will also produce greater long-term enjoyment. Indeed, Goodman, Malkoc, and Stephenson (2016) find that although material purchases that honor life events, such as a wedding or graduation, ultimately have a hedonic advantage over time, consumers inaccurately predict that experiential purchases will have a greater hedonic advantage over time due to their greater initial hedonic enjoyment. Interestingly, research identifies a strong tendency for givers to choose material over experiential gifts for distant others, but not close others (Goodman and Lim 2018). However, this tendency likely occurs not because consumers consider the positive emotional impact of material gifts over time, but rather because of considerations in the first framework dimension: consumers want to send the appropriate relational message and not behave in a socially risky way by not knowing a distant recipient's preferences (Goodman and Lim 2018). In sum, gift-giving contexts prototypically involve choosers having both a relationship-signaling motive and a motive to satisfy the recipient's preferences; we thus use literature in this context to shed light on how these chooser motives affect choices.

Making Choices Based on These Chooser Motives

When choosers have these two focal motives, they can perceive them to be aligned in some cases, enabling simultaneous pursuit of both with ease. For example, in the gifting context, consumers choosing for a distant friend may select an item from the friend's registry (satisfying the recipient's preferences) and feel that this sends an appropriate relationship signal for the distant friendship. On other occasions, however, choosers may perceive these motives to be at odds, such that the chooser ultimately prioritizes one motive. For instance, choosers choosing for a close friend may desire to signal a close relationship, making them reluctant to choose based on the recipient's explicitly specified preferences. Indeed, in the gifting context, choosers sometimes avoid explicitly requested gifts, hoping instead to surprise the recipient with a gift that conveys thoughtfulness and understanding of the recipient—a signal of closeness (Gino and Flynn 2011). Recent work shows that even when recipients provide a gift registry, close givers choose not to give from it, hoping to convey greater interpersonal knowledge and closeness by choosing unrequested gifts (Ward and Broniarczyk 2016). Our framework still refers to such choosers as having both motives, despite ultimately prioritizing one over the other. Indeed, choosers still have a goal of addressing the recipient's preferences in such cases. Yet

they aim to address such preferences as best they can while sending an appropriate relationship signal.

Thus, our framework suggests that when choosers both have a relational focus (particularly one intended to signal closeness) and are aiming to highlight a recipient's preferences, they will often try to predict recipients' preferences. Sometimes, this might entail thinking about the recipient's own prior purchases to infer the recipient's general preferences. Yet our framework's emphasis on relational considerations means that choosers may not purchase exactly what they observed the recipient previously purchase for herself because they aim to convey a higher-level, more general understanding of the recipient's preferences and thus signal a closer and deeper relationship. That is, givers may choose to express important relationship sentiments while also aiming to address recipient preferences through prediction (even if such a strategy comes at the cost of not selecting the recipient's most preferred option). A nice illustration of how the focus on relationship signaling can affect choices for close others in the gift-giving context is evident in O. Henry (1905)'s short story, "The Gift of the Magi," in which each member of a poor couple wants to signal their caring for their spouse. As a result, without consulting their spouse, each sells a beloved possession (the woman sells her hair, the man sells his gold watch) to buy a gift that they believe their spouse will greatly like (the woman buys a gold watch chain, the man buys a set of beautiful combs). Although both of them clearly also wanted to highlight the recipient's preferences and make the recipient happy (the woman had seen the combs before and admired them as perfect for her hair; the man's gold watch would have gone perfectly with the gold chain), the desire to send a strong relational signal made them avoid asking each other about their specific gifting plans, which came at the cost of successfully meeting each other's actual preferences.

This desire to predict rather than request information about others' preferences (for relationship-signaling reasons) is likely a main reason why much gift-giving research documents suboptimal gifting occasions in which givers incorrectly predict what recipients would actually prefer to receive (Baskin et al. 2014; Cavanaugh, Gino, and Fitzsimons 2015; Flynn and Adams 2009; Galak et al. 2016; Gino and Flynn 2011; Steffel, Williams, and LeBoeuf 2016a). For instance, Cavanaugh et al. (2015) found that givers mispredicted how much recipients would appreciate receiving socially responsible gifts (e.g., donations to a charity in the recipient's name).

Finally, these two motives—relationship focus and highlighting the recipient's preferences—can also raise particular tensions when consumers are choosing for multiple recipients. In such cases, choosers are concerned with sending the appropriate relational signals, wanting to convey both the relative relational valuation of each recipient (Belk and Coon 1993; Caplow 1984; Lowrey et al. 2004) and thoughtfulness to each recipient (Steffel and LeBoeuf 2014). Regarding relational valuation, people often view the products they give to others as a signal of relational valuation and choose products accordingly (Belk and Coon 1993; Caplow 1984; Lowrey et al. 2004). For instance, in the gifting context, consumers choose gifts either similar or differing on cost, effort, or sentiment to distinguish between recipients similar or varying in relationship type or closeness (Lowrey et al. 2004). On conveying thoughtfulness, consumers choosing for multiple others tend to choose overindividuated, unique products (e.g., gift cards to different retailers) due to a desire to convey thoughtfulness (Steffel and LeBoeuf 2014). Tying these findings to our framework, choosers are highly focused on considering the recipient's preferences and pleasing him (Galak et al. 2016; Yang and Urminsky 2018), but they also heavily factor in relational considerations, which can result in particular tensions, as evidenced by this body of research on prototypical gift-giving contexts.

Summary

These findings collectively illustrate several main points with respect to our framework. First, this body of work demonstrates that gift-giving choices are prototypically relationally oriented, with choosers often recognizing that these choices affect their relationships with recipients and thus using these choices for relationship signaling. Second, these findings suggest that choosers typically also have a goal to highlight the recipient's preferences, especially at the moment of exchange. Third, although these two motives can sometimes align easily, there are also cases in which they conflict, such as when choosing for a close friend with explicitly expressed preferences (e.g., via a gift registry) or when choosing for multiple recipients at the same time.

RELATIONSHIP FOCUS + BALANCE RECIPIENT'S PREFERENCES WITH CHOOSER'S OWN PREFERENCES: THE PROTOTYPICAL JOINT CONSUMPTION CONTEXT

The second cell is characterized by a relationship focus and balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences. A relationship focus is defined by the chooser considering the self-other link and the relational signals and implications resulting from the choice. Balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences for the situation is characterized by the chooser considering, weighting, assessing, or comparing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences, ultimately arriving at some outcome. We suggest that joint consumption contexts represent the prototypical choice in this cell, as choosers in such contexts typically

have both motives. Thus, to illuminate the effect of having these two motives on choices, we review literature on motives and choices in this context.

The Joint Consumption Context

Joint (or shared) consumption is a common type of consumption that occurs within families (Belk 2010; Corfman and Lehmann 1987; Davis 1976; Su, Fern, and Ye 2003), romantic partnerships (Etkin 2016), and even friend and coworker groups (Liu et al. 2013; Tu, Shaw, and Fishbach 2016). More than one consumer is involved in the consuming, using, or experiencing of a product and, thus, such contexts involve choosing for other consumers with or without other co-consumers' input. Examples of common joint consumption products span the range from durable material goods (e.g., a house, a car) to everyday household goods (e.g., groceries, toothpaste) to more experiential goods (e.g., a board game, a vacation, a restaurant).

First Dimension: Relationship Focus

Joint consumption contexts generally involve a strong "relationship focus," sharing this major aspect in common with gift-giving contexts based on our framework. The relationship focus in joint consumption contexts is evident in several respects. First, joint consumption choices are nearly always highly relational, given that more than one consumer shares in the chosen consumption outcome (Simpson, Griskevicius, and Rothman 2012a, 2012b). Second, choosers often realize that joint consumption choices considerably affect their relationships with co-consumers, and these relationship considerations thus often affect their choices (Belk 2010; Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014; Epp, Schau, and Price 2014; Etkin 2016; Garcia-Rada, Anik, and Ariely 2019; Nikolova, Lamberton, and Coleman 2018). For instance, in one interview with a family, Epp et al. (2014) found that family members chose to play board games together to prevent the family from falling apart. Further, other research found that the type of relationship goal affected joint food decisions (Hasford, Kidwell, and Lopez-Kidwell 2018).

Second Dimension: Balancing Recipient's Preferences with Chooser's Preferences

Despite having a strong relationship focus in both contexts, our framework proposes that a key distinction between prototypical gift-giving and prototypical joint consumption is the chooser's consideration of consumption preferences. Whereas gift-giving prototypically involves choosers highlighting the recipient's preferences (Galak et al. 2016; Yang and Urminsky 2018), joint consumption prototypically involves balancing the recipient's and the chooser's consumption preferences. Indeed, because the chooser also shares in the chosen outcome in joint consumption, the chooser's own consumption preferences are balanced against the recipient's preferences. In sum, joint consumption contexts prototypically involve choosers having both a relationship-signaling motive and a motive to balance the recipient's and the chooser's preferences; we thus use literature in this context to shed light on how these chooser motives affect choices.

Making Choices Based on These Chooser Motives

These two chooser motives align when recipients and choosers have similar preferences (i.e., the relationship is well served, and it is easy to address both recipient and chooser preferences simultaneously). When preference conflicts arise, however, there may be greater interplay between the two motives. For instance, a chooser may seek a compromise or may instead prioritize one consumer's consumption preference; which consumer's preference is prioritized may depend on the strength of the chooser's relationship focus, which can vary situationally or chronically. A stronger relationship focus would lead to prioritizing the recipient's preferences, whereas a weaker relationship focus would lead to prioritizing the chooser's preferences. (Provided that the chooser considers the self-other link and the relational signals/implications of the choice, our framework refers to the chooser as having both motives [relationship focus + balancing recipient and chooser preferences], even if the relationship focus is relatively weaker.)

Indeed, one way in which consumers address preference conflicts is to choose compromise options containing aspects that each consumer likes (e.g., in choosing a car, one spouse may have greater influence in selecting the make, whereas the other may select the color; Corfman and Lehmann 1987; Davis 1970, 1976; Menasco and Curry 1989). Another approach that consumers use is to select an option that maximizes joint utility by summing each consumer's utility from the option (Tu et al. 2016). On other occasions, choosing a jointly maximizing compromise option may not be possible for a given purchase. For instance, when consumers are choosing whether to eat at a Mexican restaurant or a Chinese restaurant, only one choice can be made (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014). In such cases, consumers may balance across multiple choices, or (given the relationship focus that also characterizes this cell), one consumer may ultimately accommodate the other's preferences to facilitate a smooth relationship (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014) or prioritize specific collective or relational goals rather than any individual preferences (Epp and Price 2011).

The prioritization of collective or relational goals over individual preferences relates to the notion that although our framework typically discusses choosers and recipients as having independent preferences that are negotiated or

balanced in joint consumption (e.g., I like Chinese food, and you like American food; I like dark chocolate, and you like white chocolate…which will we consume in joint consumption?), joint consumption can also involve preferences specific to the joint consumption situation. This is particularly likely for experiential activities rather than material goods. In our framework's terminology, although the relationship focus involved in prototypical joint consumption is commonly combined with a balancing of recipient + chooser individual preferences, the joint consumption context may lead to situations in which recipients and choosers have (either similar or different) preferences for activities to engage in together for that relationship. For instance, Etkin (2016) examined consumers' preferences for activities to engage in together jointly with their partner and found that such preferences varied by whether they perceived the relationship as having a longer or shorter future time horizon. In terms of our framework, even when choosers and recipients have preferences particular to joint activities, we suggest that choosers still often focus on balancing these preferences, as choosers and recipients may have *different* preferences for the joint activity (e.g., I like it when we play board games together, and you like it when we watch movies together).

When no compromise option is readily available and no overriding collective or relational goal is salient that leads to one preferred option, individual differences are one main predictor of whether consumers favor their own preferences or accommodate others' preferences. Consumers tend to exhibit high consistency in how they address conflicts with others (Sternberg and Dobson 1987), and this same consistency may also apply in the consumption context. For instance, people differ in whether they have an interdependent self-construal (viewing the self and others as highly connected) or an independent self-construal (viewing the self and others as unique, distinct entities) (Markus and Kitayama 1991; Singelis 1994). In the context of choosing wine for a table at a restaurant, Wu, Moore, and Fitzsimons (2019) found that consumers with an interdependent self-construal consistently balanced the preferences of self and other, whereas consumers with an independent self-construal attended to social context cues to determine to what extent they could favor their own preferences. Other research found that consumers lower in self-monitoring (who care less about self-presentation; Lennox and Wolfe 1984) are less prone to accommodating others' preferences (Yang, Chartrand, and Fitzsimons 2015).

Whereas Wu et al. (2019) and Yang et al. (2015) examined a single chooser making a joint consumption choice on behalf of both the chooser and the co-consumer(s), other research on individual differences affecting joint consumption considers greater explicit input from co-consumers. This makes sense given the potential need for accommodation or compromise in joint consumption contexts. For instance, the other consumer may express his preferences to the choosing consumer or, at the extreme, co-consumers may negotiate and jointly decide on one shared option. Overall, compromise appears to occur more often when at least one female consumer is involved in making a consumption decision. Husband-wife dyads often seek compromise, whether on a single occasion (Corfman and Lehmann 1987; Davis 1970, 1976; Menasco and Curry 1989) or over time (Su et al. 2003). Additionally, male-female and female-female dyads are both more likely to choose compromise (vs. extreme) options than male-male dyads (Nikolova and Lamberton 2016). When compromise options are unavailable, high-self-control consumers accommodate their partners' preferences to preserve a smooth relationship (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014). Attachment orientation (Ainsworth 1979) also predicts accommodation, as anxious attachment increases accommodation of a partner's preferences and avoidant attachment decreases it (Simpson, Griskevicius, and Rothman 2012a, 2012b; Tran and Simpson 2009). In the negotiations literature, higher (lower) concern for the self is linked with less (more) accommodation of others' preferences (Rahim 1983). Finally, whose preferences are accommodated may also vary over the course of a relationship, based on the type of relationship goal (formation or maintenance): for instance, in the food domain, males' healthiness/unhealthiness preferences may "win out" when relationship formation motives are active, whereas females' preferences may "win out" when relationship maintenance motives are active (Hasford et al. 2018).

Summary

These findings collectively illustrate several main points with respect to our framework. First, this body of work demonstrates that joint consumption choices are prototypically relationally oriented, and that choosers often recognize that these choices can considerably affect their relationship with the co-consumer. Second, these findings suggest that, in contrast to gift-giving contexts, the goal to address the recipient's preferences is balanced against competing interests (prototypically, the chooser's own consumption preferences). Third, compromise options are often chosen, and the extent to which choosers decide to accommodate the other person's preferences is strongly affected by individual differences.

RECIPIENT FOCUS + HIGHLIGHT RECIPIENT'S PREFERENCES: THE PROTOTYPICAL EVERYDAY FAVORS/PICK-UPS CONTEXT

The third cell is characterized by a recipient focus and highlighting the recipient's preferences. A recipient focus is defined by the chooser thinking mainly about the other person (i.e., not about the self-other link or the relational

signals and implications of the choice), and highlighting the recipient's preferences is characterized by the chooser caring strongly about what the recipient "wants" and what is most likely to please the recipient. We suggest that the everyday favors/pick-ups context represents the prototypical choice in this cell, as choosers in such contexts typically have both motives (which tend to be well aligned, with choosers being able to pursue them simultaneously). Thus, to illuminate the effect of having both of these motives on choices, we review literature on consumer motives and choices in this context.

The Everyday Favors/Pick-Ups Context

The everyday favors/pick-ups context is among the most commonly studied in the recent stream of consumer behavior and social psychology literature that compares choices for others with choices for self. Common examples of such situations include picking up coffee for a coworker, buying groceries for a spouse, or getting cough drops for a sick friend. In these examples, recipients are constrained in time or physical location or have insufficient motivation to make the choice themselves, so the main reason another consumer chooses for them is as a favor or in response to a pick-up request. We label such decisions "everyday" favors/pick-ups because such decisions typically involve low-cost, low-risk material product choices that recipients are thus willing to defer on choosing.

First Dimension: Recipient Focus

Everyday favors/pick-ups prototypically involve a strong recipient focus. Consumers do not generally view everyday favors/pick-ups contexts as ones in which it is key to think about relationship signaling and the impact of such choices on their relationships. Instead, consumers generally consider the other person (rather than the self-other link) as they make such choices. Thus, our framework indicates that a critical distinction between prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups and gift-giving is that gift-giving places emphasis on relationship signaling. Put differently, the prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups context involves a simpler set of considerations in our framework because the gift-giving context involves a relationship-signaling element that can sometimes conflict with choosing based on recipients' preferences.

Second Dimension: Highlight Recipient's Preferences

Our framework proposes that consumers in everyday favors/pick-ups contexts focus on highlighting the recipient's preferences. This proposition is consistent with several findings on the different choice processes involved when consumers choose for others (vs. themselves) in such contexts. Drawing from the regulatory focus literature (Higgins 1998), Polman (2012a) conducted studies in the everyday favors/pick-ups context and found that consumers making choices for others (vs. themselves) were more promotion focused (i.e., focused on approaching gains) than prevention focused (i.e., focused on avoiding losses) and thus less likely to suffer from choice overload. Specifically, consumers who chose for another person were more satisfied if they selected from a large (vs. small) choice set, whereas the reverse was true when consumers chose for themselves (Polman 2012a). Another finding consistent with this main focus on choosing what will please recipients' preferences comes from Polman and Vohs (2016), who showed that people find it more fun and less depleting to choose for others.

It is important to distinguish within the everyday favors/pick-ups context between cases in which choosers have highly specific, explicit information about recipients' preferences (e.g., a request to pick up "Old Spice Pure Sport Deodorant" or a "Starbucks Grande Pumpkin Spice Latte with 2% Milk and Whipped Cream") and cases in which they only have general-product requests (e.g., a request to pick up "deodorant" or "a latte"). Both kinds of cases qualify as choices for a recipient, whether the chooser's decision is to accept/reject the purchase request or to select among alternative product options (Dhar 1997). Indeed, having choice is ultimately characterized by whether a consumer exerts control over the decision: because everyday favors/pick-ups typically do not involve high-level superiors demanding acquiescence and obedience, everyday choosers in our framework have at least some control over the decision, and thus we refer to them as choosers. This relates to the distinction between the role of the buyer and the decision maker in the family decision-making model of consumer behavior (Lackman and Lanasa 1993). According to Lackman and Lanasa (1993), some consumers act more in the role of "buyers" (i.e., they physically purchase the product) and others in the role of "decision makers" (i.e., they ultimately make the decision about what to buy). For our framework, only a pure "buyer" with zero control over whether to follow through on a purchase request (e.g., someone hired as a professional shopper who must obey an exact purchase request) falls outside of the framework's designation as a consumer making a choice for others. In sum, everyday favors/pick-ups contexts prototypically involve choosers having a recipient focus and seeking to highlight the recipient's preferences; we thus use literature in this context to shed light on how these chooser motives affect choices.

Making Choices Based on These Chooser Motives

These two focal motives are well aligned, and consumers can pursue them simultaneously with ease. What kinds of choices do consumers make, given these motives? For this cell, it is important to distinguish between cases involving recipients who have made highly specific, explicit requests

and those involving general requests. For the former, our framework predicts that in deciding whether to follow through on highly specific purchase requests, consumers in this cell are much more likely to decide to accept the request without modification than those in other cells. For instance, both the gift-giving cell and the caregiving cell may also involve highly specific, explicit purchase requests from recipients. Yet the chooser's decision about whether to comply exactly with the request may systematically vary based on our framework dimensions. If the motives are those characterizing the gift-giving cell and the recipient requests a mini chocolate cupcake from the local bakery, the relationship-signaling motive may increase the likelihood that the chooser decides to buy a full-size cupcake and also some accompanying pastries. If the motives are those characterizing the caregiving cell and the recipient requests a mini chocolate cupcake, the balancing of recipient and chooser preferences may increase the likelihood that the chooser rejects the request and instead buys a fruit cup. If the motives are those characterizing the everyday favors/pick-ups cell, though, and the recipient requests a mini chocolate cupcake, the chooser may decide to follow through exactly on the request without modifying it. Again, we emphasize that as long as the chooser retains decision-making control over whether to comply with a request or not, then we still refer to this as a choice covered under our framework.

What happens when choosers lack explicit information about recipients' preferences? Indeed, while recipients may often request a particular product category (e.g., beer, coffee, snacks), recipients may leave out specific details, such as the brand, size, or flavor, leaving the chooser to make such decisions on their behalf. Whereas the gift-giving cell is characterized by trying to signal thoughtfulness and relational connection in the absence (or, in some cases, even in the presence) of such preference information, the everyday favors/pick-ups cell is instead mainly characterized by trying to identify choice options that recipients will like and not reject. Given this goal, one heuristic that choosers may use is to consider a recipient's observable habitual behaviors as a reliable predictor of their preferences. For instance, if a chooser has observed that a recipient typically purchases skim milk, a chooser will also purchase that for the recipient.

Without observing recipients' habits, another heuristic that a chooser is likely to use is to seek choice options that maximize the chances that others will like what is selected for them. Multiple research findings appear consistent with this notion. Chang et al. (2012) found that consumers choosing for others tend to select compromise options, as they feel more confident that others will like such options. Laran (2010) and Lu, Liu, and Fang (2016) found that consumers choosing for adult others tend to select more indulgent and hedonic products for others than for themselves. Lu, Xie, and Xu (2013) also found that consumers were more likely to select desirable options over feasible options for adult others than for themselves. One potential interpretation of the findings by Laran (2010), Lu et al. (2013), and Lu et al. (2016) is that people believe indulgent/hedonic/desirable options are more widely liked and involve lower preference uncertainty. Finally, Choi et al. (2006) found that consumers tend to choose a greater variety of products when choosing for others (vs. self), possibly to ensure that recipients will like at least some of the products in the assortment.

Lastly, choosers' likelihood of actively soliciting detail about a recipient's explicit preferences is likely much higher in the everyday favors/pick-ups cell than in the gift-giving cell. In the gift-giving cell, the dual concerns of relational signaling and wanting to choose something that a recipient will enjoy mean that choosers often want to predict close recipients' preferences and avoid explicitly asking for their preferences. In contrast, our framework posits that a relational-signaling concern is weak in the everyday favors/pick-ups cell and, therefore, choosers may often request explicit information on what close others prefer if they have routes to request such information.

Summary

These findings collectively illustrate several main points with respect to our framework. First, everyday favors/pick-ups choices are prototypically recipient-oriented, in comparison to the strong relationship orientation of prototypical gift-giving choices, and involve a strong motive to highlight the recipient's preferences. Second, it is important to differentiate within this cell between situations in which choosers have highly specific, explicit information about recipients' preferences versus situations in which choosers lack such specific information about recipients' preferences. In the case of the former, choosers are likely to follow this preference information closely; in the case of the latter, choosers may use various decision rules or information about recipients' prior purchase and consumption behaviors to predict recipients' most preferred option.

RECIPIENT FOCUS + BALANCE RECIPIENT'S PREFERENCES WITH CHOOSER'S OWN PREFERENCES: THE PROTOTYPICAL CAREGIVING CONTEXT

The fourth cell is characterized by a recipient focus and balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences. Again, a recipient focus is defined by the chooser thinking mainly about the other person (not the self-other link or the choice's relational signals and implications), and balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences is characterized by the chooser considering, weighting, assessing, or comparing both individuals' preferences, arriving at some outcome. The fact that the chooser has a recipient focus means that the

chooser's own preferences, which she is balancing against the recipient's consumption preferences, are more likely to relate to the recipient's consumption well-being (rather than, say, the chooser's own consumption well-being).

We suggest that caregiving contexts represent the prototypical choice in this cell, as choosers in such contexts typically have both motives (which tend to be well aligned, with choosers able to pursue them simultaneously). Thus, to better understand the effect of having both of these motives on choices, we review literature on consumer motives and choices in the prototypical caregiving context.

The Caregiving Context

Caregiving choices commonly occur when choosers believe that others' decision-making deficits interfere with their ability to make informed, appropriate choices for themselves. Such deficits can be related to youth or old age (Barnhart and Peñaloza 2013; Carlson and Grossbart 1988; Epp and Velagaleti 2014; John and Cole 1986), expertise (Alba and Hutchinson 1987), or emotional coping (Arora and McHorney 2000; Botti et al. 2009; Steffel, Williams, and Perrmann-Graham 2016b). Caregiving contexts can thus span a wide range of product categories, depending on the reason for low ability. For instance, parents and other adults may make choices for young children in both more trivial everyday product domains (e.g., food choices) and weightier domains (e.g., school decisions, medical decisions), whereas caregiving choices for fellow adults may occur more in product categories involving high expertise (e.g., technology products, financial products) and/or emotional stress (e.g., medical decisions).

First Dimension: Recipient Focus

Caregiving contexts prototypically involve a strong recipient focus. Consumers generally do not view caregiving contexts as ones in which it is key to think about relationship signaling and the impact of such choices on their relationships. Instead, as with everyday favors/pick-ups, consumers generally consider the other person (rather than the self-other link) as they make caregiving choices.

Second Dimension: Balancing Recipient's Preferences with Chooser's Preferences

Our framework proposes that the other defining characteristic of prototypical caregiving contexts is that choosers aim to balance the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences (in this case, the chooser's own preferences for what the recipient should receive). Our framework thus illustrates that while prototypical caregiving and prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups share a recipient focus, the critical conceptual distinction is that the caregiving context involves a more complex set of considerations. Rather than just considering which option is most likely to please the recipient, choosers also consider their own preferences for the recipient. Consistent with cultural and social norms, choosers' own preferences for the recipient often consist of what is safe and responsible, but such preferences can also include the chooser's goals for the recipient. In sum, caregiving prototypically involves choosers having a recipient focus and balancing the recipient's preferences with the chooser's own preferences for the situation; we thus use literature in this context to shed light on how these chooser motives affect choices.

Making Choices Based on These Chooser Motives

A recipient focus is generally compatible with balancing recipient and chooser preferences, enabling choosers to pursue both simultaneously. With these motives, consumers typically make safer, more responsible choices that account for the recipient's welfare. For example, in the caregiving context of parents making choices for their children, research shows that parents feel responsible for making appropriate choices for children to help them develop the ability to make well-informed consumption decisions (Carlson and Grossbart 1988; John and Cole 1986). In the food domain, parents exposed (vs. not exposed) to a menu with calorie information ordered lower-calorie meals for their children (Tandon et al. 2010). As another example, Bhattacharjee, Berger, and Menon (2014) found that parents uncertain about their parental identity—an identity that involves many caregiving choices—react positively to identity-defining, responsibility-focused messages when choosing products for their children (e.g., "If you are a responsible parent, this is the only sunscreen for you and your kids!"). Further supporting this point, Mukhopadhyay and Yeung (2010) found that parents—especially those who believe self-control is a limited resource that can be increased—are highly likely to make healthy choices for their children. Moreover, while our framework's focus remains on nonprofessional choosers, research has shown that people acting in a parental role and those acting in a medical professional role both preferred to choose active treatments to reduce risk for children (i.e., what could be considered a more responsible decision) rather than passive treatments that contained greater risk due to inactivity (Zikmund-Fisher et al. 2006), further illustrating the importance of responsibility.

As with the joint consumption cell, the caregiving cell does not involve a complete disregard of the other person's preferences. Rather, the chooser will often consider the recipient's preferences but exercise veto power when the chooser feels that the preferred option is irresponsible or that there is a more appropriate option. For instance, as Dix (1991) notes, the parent-child relationship is commonly characterized by parents responding to the child in ways beyond pleasing the child, including balancing comfort

with discipline, protection, and stimulation, and parenting itself is generally characterized by "long-term, child-focused motives" (14). Indeed, regarding stimulation, some caregiving situations for young children may involve choosers aiming to expand a recipient's taste exposure where the recipient has not yet developed any specific preferences (e.g., introducing a new vegetable). In such cases, the balancing of chooser and recipient preferences may appear as the chooser prioritizing his own preferences for the situation, as the recipient lacks specific preferences (however, we suggest that the chooser may still weigh his own preferences against the young child's known specific preferences for other previously tried options and, thus, a sense of the child's general preferences).

Research on the caregiving context of family members and friends making choices for the elderly also illustrates how having a recipient focus and balancing recipient and chooser preferences affects choices. The assemblage of individuals who assist the elderly with consumption activities has been referred to as the "elderly consumption ensemble" (Barnhart and Peñaloza 2013). In this role, consumers make choices for recipients for a wide variety of everyday basic consumption activities, including shopping, money management, and meal preparation (Matthews and Rosner 1988). As with choices for young children, choices for the elderly also reflect the chooser's concern with responsibility and the long-term well-being of the recipient, because the underlying reasons for why consumers choose for the elderly involve declines in cognitive and physical abilities. This responsibility emphasis is illustrated, for example, by adult children who balance their parents' desire for independence with assistance and monitoring of their health and changing needs for consumption activity help (Matthews and Rosner 1988).

Although choosing for children and choosing for the elderly are both characterized by a responsibility focus, the context of choosing for the elderly better illustrates that a recipient focus combined with balancing recipient and chooser preferences can lead to tension. The tension may be greater when choosing for the elderly (vs. for young children) because elderly recipients may resent the implication that they have an elderly identity if this does not match their own self-views, such that they resist the imposition of the chooser's preferences (Barnhart and Peñaloza 2013; Tepper 1994). Indeed, although caregiving is universally viewed as appropriate for young children, the norm for adult children to make caregiving choices for elderly parents is fluid across cultures and history (Barnhart and Peñaloza 2013). For instance, in traditional collectivist cultures such as China, adult children often make caregiving choices for elderly parents—and this is more accepted by elderly recipients—whereas this is less common in individualist cultures such as the U.S. (Li and Buechel 2007). Such norms can change, however: China's one-child policy has disrupted traditional family structures, making it more difficult for adult children to sustain decision-making for their parents (Li and Buechel 2007), and the advent of Medicare in the U.S. has potentially contributed to a view of the elderly as necessitating caregiving help (Barnhart and Peñaloza 2013).

Finally, research on family members and friends making choices for fellow non-elderly adult consumers with expertise-related deficits (Alba and Hutchinson 1987) or emotional coping deficits (Arora and McHorney 2000; Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005; Botti et al. 2009; Steffel et al. 2016b) further illustrates how a recipient focus and balancing recipient and chooser preferences affects choices. For instance, family and friends may intervene to make choices for adults regarding their access to certain harmful consumption goods (e.g., drugs and alcohol; Velleman et al. 1993) or to make choices for grieving adults who may have trouble coping with their emotions at difficult periods in life (Damianakis and Marziali 2012). Although many factors can influence choosers' decisions, including social and cultural norms, choosers are usually motivated to select the safest, most responsible option for the recipient. For instance, in the financial decision-making context, people often make decisions for others (e.g., people lacking financial literacy commonly defer such decisions to a spouse; Ward and Lynch 2019). Supporting classification of financial decisions within the prototypical caregiving cell, Pronin, Olivola, and Kennedy (2008, study 4) found that people were more likely to delay a financial reward now for a greater one in the future when choosing for others or for their future selves than when choosing for their present selves.

Summary

These findings collectively illustrate several main points with respect to our framework. First, this body of work demonstrates that caregiving choices are prototypically recipient oriented, as choosers typically focus on how these choices affect the recipient, not how they affect the chooser-recipient relationship. Second, these findings suggest that the goal to address the recipient's preferences is balanced against the chooser's preferences, which generally consist of the chooser's own preferences for what the recipient ought to consume. Third, the chooser's preferences for what the recipient ought to consume are typically characterized by a strong responsibility focus.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS

As we have laid out, consumers typically have particular framework motives (and thus predictable choices) based on which prototypical context is at play. We thus consider practical implications of our framework for three main stakeholders—marketers, consumers, and policy makers—

in each prototypical context. Table 1 summarizes the main goals of each stakeholder in each prototypical context and delineates practical implications of our framework based on these stakeholder goals.

As table 1 indicates, marketers have goals for choosers to select their products and for their products to be well received by recipients; choosing consumers have goals as laid out by our framework; and policy makers have goals for the joint consumption and caregiving contexts, but less so for the gift-giving and everyday favors/pick-ups contexts. Given these goals, our framework offers practical implications for each stakeholder.

Two relevant questions when delineating these practical implications are (i) whether/how each stakeholder can identify a given context, in order to leverage an understanding of the motives most likely to be active in that context, and (ii) whether a particular situation is indeed a prototypical case for our framework, such that the motives identified in our framework characterize choices in that situation.

The first question is especially relevant for marketers, but also for policy makers. Whereas choosing consumers can identify the choosing-for-others context based on access to their own motives and knowledge about the occasion for which they are choosing, marketers who want to address the wants and needs of consumers in a particular prototypical context and policy makers who want to promote particular outcomes need to be able to identify the context. The ease of identifying each context varies. First, the gift-giving context can be identified through several routes: by times of the year (e.g., Valentine's Day, Administrative Professionals Day, Christmas, Hanukkah), by product aisles (e.g., birthday greeting cards aisle), by online department categories (e.g., "gifts for her"), or by online searches (e.g., the term "gift"). Second, the joint consumption context can also be identified in several ways. Many experiential purchases can be identified as joint consumption situations based on the number of people booked (e.g., vacation packages, dinner reservations). Some material goods can also be identified as joint consumption products, as they are designed for sharing (e.g., board games; Caprariello and Reis 2013). Additionally, many larger-ticket purchases relevant to both marketers and policy makers (e.g., cars, multibedroom houses) are often shared within households, and thus can also be identified as joint consumption products, particularly when multiple individuals arrive at the purchase occasion. Further, in certain joint consumption marketing contexts (e.g., sales of cars, houses, vacations), salespeople involved in interpersonal interactions with customers may detect preference conflicts. Third, the everyday favors/pick-ups context is likely the most difficult for a marketer (or policy maker) to detect and differentiate from other situations. Although one defining characteristic of this context is that it typically involves smaller-ticket items, these situations are often difficult for outsiders to differentiate from choosing-for-self situations. Indeed, the common research paradigm used to study this context compares choices for others with choices for the self (Barasz et al. 2016; Laran 2010; Liu and Baskin 2017; Polman 2012a, 2012b; Polman and Emich 2011; Polman and Vohs 2016), illustrating this challenge. Thus, the corresponding practical implications for everyday favors/pick-ups (in table 1c) focus instead on shifting consumers into making more everyday favors/pick-ups choices from a marketer perspective and on encouraging better choices both for the self and for others indiscriminately from a policy perspective. Fourth, and finally, the caregiving context can be identified via certain product categories with high levels of caregiving choices (e.g., many young children's products, or products targeting elderly consumer health services). Other product categories also generally involve some levels of caregiving choice (e.g., medical decisions for family members with diminished abilities to make their own informed choices).

The second main question is whether a particular situation is indeed a prototypical case for our framework. For example, is a particular occasion of gift-giving indeed a prototypical case in that it involves relationship focus and highlighting the recipient's preferences? If yes, then the practical implications of our framework (e.g., table 1a for gift-giving) can be used to guide actions in this situation. We suggest that most occasions of gift-giving are indeed governed by these framework motives and, likewise, that most occasions in the other three prototypical contexts are governed by their respective framework motives. Thus, for practical use, identifying the contextual label should allow accurate prediction of choice motives in most cases. However, as we discuss next, our framework is grounded in theory-based motives and is not context-bound, such that for the most accurate use or for mixed cases in which more than one context label could apply (e.g., gift-giving for young children), framework users should identify where the chooser falls on the two framework dimensions to determine the corresponding implications.

EXPLORING HYBRID CHOOSING-FOR-OTHERS CONTEXTS

We have mainly discussed the four choosing-for-others contexts as distinct and discrete, such that their prototypes are used to label each framework cell. Treating the contexts as distinct and discrete was supported by the pilot study (which suggested that consumers find it easy to sort the choosing-for-others situations in their lives into these categories) and facilitates practical use, as these labels increase the ease of initially mapping most choosing-for-others situations and thus of delineating practical implications likely to apply in most situations. However, we

TABLE 1

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FRAMEWORK FOR DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholder	Goals	Practical implications
a) Practical implications for gift-giving		
Marketers	Marketers want consumers to choose their products for standard gift-giving occasions, such as holidays, and for nonstandard gift-giving occasions. Marketers also want their products to be liked by recipients.	Marketers should be aware that a relationship focus can interfere with consumers' likelihood of choosing a product most preferred by recipients. Marketers selling products known to satisfy recipients' preferences but that do not typically provide a relational-signaling opportunity (e.g., all-purpose gift cards, gift registries, practical gifts like a frying pan) may also address relational goals. For instance, marketers can provide ways for choosers to add personalization for relational signaling (e.g., adding a photo of giver and recipient to the gift card, adding personalization for registry options). Marketers can also show how practical products can become a part of a recipient's daily routine and serve as a relational reminder with each use. Marketers may consider offering bundled products, including both a product that appeals to the chooser's relational-signaling motives and a product promoting longer-term recipient satisfaction. Such bundles may allow firms to make an initial sale to the chooser and also promote future recipient engagement with the firm. Marketers may consider promoting "companionizing," wherein a chooser selects the same product for self and recipient (Polman and Maglio 2017). Companionizing may address relational motives, signaling that a chooser feels sufficiently close to a recipient to choose the same product for the self, while also promoting longer-term recipient satisfaction, assuming that also choosing for the self mitigates some common errors in choosers' predictions about recipients' preferences.
Consumers	Consumers want to choose products that signal their desired relationship and that are liked by recipients.	Consumers should be aware that a relationship focus (especially a desire to send a close relationship signal) can interfere with choosing a product most preferred by recipients. Consumers aiming to send a close relationship signal may pair a requested product, which they know will highlight the recipient's preferences, together with a personal touch, which can send a close relationship signal (e.g., a card with a thoughtful note or a picture of the recipient and the giver). Consumers aiming to send a close relationship signal may gauge the recipient's preferences indirectly to convey high interpersonal knowledge (e.g., via examining the recipient's social media accounts [e.g., Pinterest, Instagram], examining shared accounts [e.g., Netflix or Amazon family account], or asking intermediaries close to the recipient).
Policy makers	Addressing consumer-consumer gift-giving is not a major policy maker aim, as consumers focusing on the relationship and the recipient's preferences are unlikely to use their own consumption preferences to interfere with the recipient's welfare.	While policy makers generally have few gift-giving goals, some aim to encourage socially responsible gifting (e.g., charitable gift-giving in a recipient's name). These policy makers should be aware that relational closeness affects charitable gift-giving, such that givers underestimate (overestimate) how appreciative close (distant) recipients will be of charitable gift-giving (Cavanaugh et al. 2015). Policy makers may thus counteract givers' underestimation of the attractiveness of such gifts for close recipients by informing potential givers that even close recipients like such gifts or by offering greater policy encouragement (e.g., deeper tax discounts). They may also leverage givers' overestimation of the attractiveness of such gifts for distant recipients by pairing charitable gift-giving suggestions with references to distant relationships.
b) Practical implications for joint consumption		
Marketers	Marketers want consumers to choose their products for use not only by the chooser but also by multiple users. Marketers also want all users in the occasion to be satisfied.	Marketers may consider promoting options with aspects appealing to co-consumers with divergent preferences. This is actionable when three prerequisites are met: (i) marketers have information about the unique preferences of different consumer segments or can forecast them accurately, (ii) marketers can identify occasions involving co-consumers from differing consumer segments, and (iii) marketers can supply an option customized to these divergent preferences. Many marketing situations do not meet all three prerequisites; some that do are vacation planning with a travel agent or financial planning with a financial advisor. In such cases, rather than offer a product or bundle that is completely internally consistent in appealing strongly to one consumer segment, marketers may craft targeted compromise products or bundles containing divergent aspects valued by each consumer segment. Marketers may address relational connection concerns, especially when unable to provide compromise options appealing to co-consumers with

TABLE 1 (*CONTINUED*)

Stakeholder	Goals	Practical implications
		divergent preferences. As co-consumer preference conflict may lead to forgoing choice, to dissatisfaction (Cahn 1992), and to negative consequences for the brand (Brick and Fitzsimons 2017), marketers might try to preempt these outcomes by emphasizing the relational benefits of sharing consumption experiences (especially hedonic ones, such as family board games, vacations, bowling; Boothby, Clark, and Bargh 2014; Caprariello and Reis 2013; Garcia-Rada et al. 2019; Raghunathan and Corfman 2006; Ratner and Hamilton 2015) or by marketing their brand as a brand for the entire family. Our framework suggests that marketing appeals focusing on the relational connections facilitated by such products may foster more satisfaction than appeals focusing on specific concrete or physical attributes of such products.
Consumers	Consumers want to choose products that are appropriate for their relationship goals and that balance self and recipient consumption preferences.	Consumers may face tension between their own consumption preferences and the preferences of the co-consuming recipient. Because how choosers resolve such preference conflicts is likely influenced by their relational goals, consumers may learn about (and reevaluate) their relationships by observing how such conflicts have been resolved in the past and currently (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014; Hasford et al. 2018). Because consumers can derive relational benefits (Epp et al. 2014; Min, Liu, and Kim 2018) and pleasure from co-consuming with others, particularly for hedonic experiences (Boothby et al. 2014; Caprariello and Reis 2013; Garcia-Rada et al. 2019; Raghunathan and Corfman 2006; Ratner and Hamilton 2015), consumers should recognize that joint consumption in itself may have sufficient positive relational and emotional benefits to make it worthwhile not to have one's individual consumption preferences addressed on each occasion.
Policy makers	Policy makers want to encourage choices addressing both chooser and recipient preferences. Policy makers have goals in this cell because consumers focused on the relationship and balancing self and other's preferences often make large-ticket purchases and may overly prioritize their own preferences.	Policy makers aimed at helping consumers make responsible financial decisions should be aware of motives affecting prototypical joint consumption and design information sources for consumers that account for these motives. For instance, the Financial Literacy and Education Commission overseen by the U.S. Department of the Treasury established a national financial education website (MyMoney.gov), which provides consumers with tips and tools for handling money (U.S. Department of the Treasury 2019). Although the website offers some useful advice ("When planning a big purchase, take time to comparison shop and check prices at a few different stores, by phone or online") (Financial Literacy and Education Commission 2019), the suggestions are targeted at individual consumers making choices for themselves. There is little acknowledgment that a co-consumer's preferences may affect these decisions. Similarly, information that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau provide to prospective home buyers largely overlooks that co-consumers' preferences often factor into decisions, such as what mortgage and insurance to select (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau 2019; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 2019). Policy makers may improve these information sources by acknowledging that multiple preferences may be involved, providing tools or strategies for resolving preference conflicts, and suggesting options that balance divergent preferences without compromising relationships (e.g., insurance options with a moderate coverage level for a moderate cost).
c) Practical implications for everyday favors/pick-ups		
Marketers	Marketers want recipients to request their products and for consumers to choose their products for both themselves and recipients.	Marketers should be aware that distinguishing between consumers making choices for themselves or for others for everyday favors/pick-ups may be difficult. Thus, trying to identify and target choosers already in the process of making such choices for others may be difficult. Marketers may instead target potential recipients by making it easy to delegate product choices (e.g., enabling sharing shopping histories and preferences with designated choosers). Marketers may try to actively prompt everyday favors/pick-ups for low-cost, low-risk material product categories. For instance, messages such as "While picking up coffee for yourself, grab a cup for your coworker as well! The house blend is our most popular cup!" may be effective because they both prompt such situations and also indicate which option is likely to please most recipients. Indulgent or hedonic products or variety packs may be ripe for such appeals (Choi et al. 2006; Laran 2010; Lu et al. 2016). Additionally, because having a recipient focus and highlighting a recipient's preferences is often more fun than choosing for the self (Polman and Vohs 2016), marketers

TABLE 1 (*CONTINUED*)

Stakeholder	Goals	Practical implications
		may also mention the affective benefits of making small purchases for recipients.
Consumers	Consumers want to choose products that are liked by recipients.	Consumers closely follow explicit and specific preference information from recipients, even for close relationships (unlike in gift-giving). Recipients may consider making their requests explicit and specific to ensure receiving their preferred options (e.g., specifying their preferred size and brand of coffee for the occasion). Otherwise, recipients should be aware of common strategies choosers will use to predict their preferences (e.g., selecting an indulgent/hedonic option [Laran 2010; Lu et al. 2016], selecting a desirable but less feasible option [Lu et al. 2013], selecting what they have observed the recipient previously consume).
Policy makers	Addressing everyday favors/pick-ups is not a major policy maker aim, as consumers focusing on the recipient and highlighting the recipient's preferences are unlikely to use their own preferences to interfere with the recipient's welfare (and often make small-ticket purchases).	While policy makers generally have few goals relevant to everyday favors/pick-ups, consumers in these situations tend to choose more indulgent and hedonic products for recipients than for themselves (Laran 2010; Lu et al. 2016). In the food domain, this is problematic from a public health perspective, as excess consumption of indulgent foods is linked with obesity and other medical consequences (Mozaffarian et al. 2011). Because choosers aim to select recipients' most preferred options, recent trends toward most consumers wanting to eat healthier (Nielsen 2015) suggest that policy makers may disseminate this knowledge. With this knowledge, consumers may choose healthier options both for themselves (via social influence) and for recipients when performing everyday favors/pick-ups.
d) Practical implications for caregiving		
Marketers	Marketers want recipients to request their products and for choosers to view their products as a responsible choice.	For products potentially appealing to recipients (e.g., cereal for children), marketers may create appeals addressing both recipients' consumption preferences and choosers' decision criteria (e.g., choosing responsible, justifiable options). For instance, the Kix cereal ad slogan "Kid Tested, Mother Approved" illustrates such an appeal. For products unappealing to recipients (e.g., children likely find sunscreen and cough medicine unappealing), marketers may direct their appeals towards the chooser. For instance, the sunscreen message "If you are a responsible parent, this is the only sunscreen for you and your kids!" illustrates such an appeal (Bhattacharjee et al. 2014). Marketers may use appeals that activate a caregiving identity and highlight a product's long-term benefits. Although consumers are often myopic, choosers' motivation to select the most responsible option in these situations should increase willingness to take a long-range view. Thus, pairing caregiving identity activation with ads for products and services with high upfront costs but potential longer-term savings (e.g., energy efficient appliances, maximum coverage insurance plans) may be successful. Because a recipient focus—not a relationship focus—characterizes these situations, marketing appeals emphasizing social connection opportunities for choosers and recipients may resonate less than appeals focusing on the recipient's welfare.
Consumers	Consumers want to choose products that are liked by recipients while meeting the chooser's preferences for the recipient (e.g., options that support the recipient's long-term welfare).	Consumers may face tension between their own preferences for the recipient and the recipient's preferences. For instance, consumers may select healthier options for young children recipients than recipients prefer (Mukhopadhyay and Yeung 2010; Tandon et al. 2010). Although choosing healthier options for recipients has some clear benefits, externally restricting children's access to desirable foods can backfire by leading to greater selection and intake of such foods later in life (Fisher and Birch 1999). More generally, external restrictions imposed in prototypical caregiving may provoke reactance in recipients (Barnhart and Peñaloza 2013; Brehm 1966). One potential solution suggested by some research in the food domain is for choosers to select combinations of both healthy and unhealthy components that include much higher proportions of the healthy component (Liu et al. 2015), as such combinations may not feel as restrictive to recipients and thus provoke less resistance.
Policy makers	Policy makers want consumers to make choices good for the recipient's welfare. Policy makers have goals in this cell because consumers focusing on the recipient and balancing the recipient's preferences with	Consumers are most likely to make responsible choices with long-term benefits for recipients in this cell. Given that policy makers aim to encourage greater consumption of such options, they may consider ways to "move" consumers making choices for others into this cell. One possibility is to use appeals to activate choosers' caregiving identities. For instance, public service announcements (PSAs) stating, "Parents' greatest responsibility is looking out for their children; make wise choices," may activate parents' caregiving

TABLE 1 (*CONTINUED*)

Stakeholder	Goals	Practical implications
	their own for the situation often involve vulnerable recipients.	identity and increase selection of responsible, healthy products in choosing-for-others contexts (Bhattacharjee et al. 2014). It may be especially beneficial to do so during times when the motives characterizing prototypical caregiving are inactive (e.g., prototypical gift-giving occasions, such as Christmas, when parents may instead be overly focused on pleasing their children). Outside of parent-child relationships, PSAs that emphasize the need to "have each other's back" and "look out for each other" may also shift consumers to adopt motives characteristic of prototypical caregiving (Marquis 2017; NYC Metropolitan Transportation Authority 2018). As the population ages (U.S. Census Bureau 2018), more consumers may be tasked with making caregiving choices for elderly recipients. Policy makers ought to be aware that elderly recipients may resent or reject caregiving choices, especially if they feel that such choices violate their images of themselves, and may offer guidance for how consumers can balance recipient preferences with their own. For instance, Medicare provides information for nursing home residents, their relatives, and their caregivers (Medicare 2019). Although the website offers useful information about residents' rights and protections, it does not offer guidance for how consumers making caregiving choices can balance such rights and protections with their own preferences for the recipient. Policy makers may improve these information sources by providing tools or strategies.

emphasize that the framework motives are not limited to a particular prototypical context and can also explain variability in choices within a context. Figure 2 illustrates several ways in which the framework is not context-bound.

First, figure 2 shows that a given pair of framework motives is not limited to one prototypical context. For instance, although we proposed that a relationship focus and highlighting the recipient's preferences most commonly characterize choices in the prototypical gift-giving context, these motives could also occasionally characterize choices in the other three contexts, such as in an everyday favors/pick-ups situation of going grocery shopping and picking up your spouse's favorite beer to repair your relationship after a fight.

Second, figure 2 shows how the framework's motives can explain variability in choices within a context. For instance, although we proposed that a relationship focus and highlighting the recipient's preferences most commonly characterize choices in the prototypical gift-giving context (and this is indeed true on common gifting occasions, such as giving a birthday or wedding gift), other factors can occasionally shift gift-giving situations to different positions along the framework dimensions. For example, if participating in a "white elephant" gift exchange (also known as "Yankee Swap" or "Dirty Santa"), in which partygoers each bring a wrapped gift to a party and then play a game taking turns either selecting a wrapped gift or stealing an already-unwrapped gift from another partygoer, then a relationship focus is not likely and the chooser may instead focus on the average recipient's preferences, ultimately choosing something impersonal that should meet most people's preferences. Or, if gift-giving is for a household member and the chooser plans to use the gift too (e.g., buying a new coffeemaker for a spouse), then while the relationship focus is retained, the chooser may shift on the second dimension from highlighting the recipient's preferences to balancing them with the chooser's own preferences for the situation, ultimately choosing a compromise gift involving attributes liked by both the chooser and the recipient.

Finally, figure 2 illustrates that mixed cases can arise. For example, parents purchase gifts for their children on holidays and birthdays, such that both a gift-giving context and a caregiving context could characterize this situation. In all mixed situations, framework users should think about where a given chooser falls on each framework dimension. For instance, is the parent thinking more about how this choice will shape his relationship with the child, or solely about the child? If the former, then our framework suggests that the motives in the gift-giving cell may best characterize this mixed situation. Our framework thus predicts that the parent will mainly consider the child's preferences, rather than balancing them against his own preferences for the child. If the latter, then our framework suggests that the motives in the caregiving cell may better characterize this mixed situation. Our framework thus predicts that the parent will balance the child's preferences against his own preferences for the child (e.g., choosing a gift that facilitates learning, even if less preferred by the child).

In sum, although the framework cells are labeled with the names of prototypical contexts, the framework motives are not constrained to operate only in a given context and can also help explain variation in choices within a context. Additionally, mixed cases can emerge when one considers where the chooser is on each framework dimension to predict choices. Indeed, mixed cases may also offer practical

intervention opportunities for marketers and policy makers, who may strategically utilize certain messages based on which prototypical choosing-for-others context they want to nudge consumers toward (e.g., policy makers may want to encourage more prototypical caregiving).

MOVING FORWARD: THEORETICAL INSIGHTS AND FORWARD-LOOKING RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

In sum, we have proposed a conceptual framework for choosing for others with two fundamental dimensions. These two dimensions generate four cells, labeled with names representing prototypical contexts in each cell. These four contexts are grounded both theoretically (mapping onto main reasons why consumers have others make choices for them) and empirically (a pilot study illustrated that these contexts capture most naturally occurring choosing-for-others situations), and heretofore largely separate literatures have examined each.

Theoretical Contributions

Our framework offers both practical contributions (as discussed earlier) and theoretical contributions. In terms of theoretical contributions, our framework provides a conceptual basis for organizing streams of heretofore separate literatures on choosing for others. Our framework arrays these literatures along two fundamental dimensions (see the web appendix for a table containing examples of research articles on each of the four choosing-for-others contexts). Indeed, because *separate* literatures have examined the common topic of choosing for others, multiple articles sometimes examine the same conceptual outcome, but in different choosing-for-others contexts involving different motives and norms, reaching different conclusions. Our framework offers opportunities to integrate these findings, resolve apparent discrepancies, and develop a richer understanding of boundary conditions.

One example is Laran (2010) and Tandon et al. (2010), who both examined the outcome of healthy versus indulgent food choice. Whereas Laran (2010) concluded that consumers were more likely to choose indulgences for others than for themselves, Tandon et al. (2010) found that providing calorie information had no effect on parents' food choices for themselves, but it led parents to make lower-calorie food choices for their children. Our framework offers one potential explanation: whereas Laran (2010) examined choices for adults who can make their own well-informed choices (i.e., characteristic of prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups contexts), Tandon et al. (2010) examined choices for children who cannot make their own well-informed choices (i.e., characteristic of prototypical caregiving contexts). Our framework proposes that the prototypical situations in both contexts involve a recipient focus, but the key conceptual difference is whether the chooser is highlighting the recipient's preferences or balancing these against the chooser's own preferences for the recipient. Given that there are strong cultural and social norms for caregiving decision makers' own preferences for the recipient to consist of what is safe and responsible, choosers in such contexts likely shift to weigh health and calorie information to a greater extent.

Another example is Dzhogleva and Lamberton (2014) and Mukhopadhyay and Yeung (2010), who both examined the conceptual outcome of high- versus low-self-control choice. Dzhogleva and Lamberton (2014) found that high-self-control consumers acceded to low-self-control partners' preferences, whereas Mukhopadhyay and Yeung (2010) found that parents did not accede, choosing high-self-control options for their children. Our framework offers one way to reconcile these findings: the social focus of participants was likely different, with a relationship focus active in the former and a recipient focus active in the latter. Specifically, participants in the former were likely focused on maintaining a smooth relationship, whereas participants in the latter were likely focused on promoting the recipient's self-control development.

As a third example, various articles have examined the extent to which the recipient's explicit preferences affect choices. For instance, Ward and Broniarczyk (2016) and Gino and Flynn (2011) found that consumers hesitate to choose explicitly requested gifts for recipients. In contrast, Davis (1976) found that wives buying alcohol and shaving cream for their husbands "purchased only those brands that husbands requested" (243). Our framework explains these divergent findings by implicating the social focus of the chooser. In the former case, choosers likely have a relationship focus as is common in prototypical gift-giving, such that they aim to signal the closeness of their relationship with the recipient by demonstrating their knowledge of the recipient. By contrast, in the latter case, choosers likely have a recipient focus as is common in prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups, such that they simply select the recipient's explicitly preferred option.

Given the significant and growing interest in consumer choices for others among both practitioners and academics, we are confident that as more research is conducted in different choosing-for-others contexts, additional occasions of apparent inconsistencies may arise. Such inconsistencies can be useful in two respects. If explainable through our framework, they help bolster the framework's explanatory power; if they are not easily explained with our framework, they may reveal gaps in our framework that require further explanation and investigation.

An Agenda for Future Research

Besides resolving inconsistencies between different literatures, this framework also offers a forward-looking research agenda that ultimately aims to build a broader

understanding of choices for others across multiple contexts. Next, we discuss four main aims that we suggest are most pressing and potentially fruitful for future research, and we offer illustrative—but nonexhaustive—examples of how this framework can help consumer researchers generate hypotheses toward these four main aims: (1) understanding how research conducted in one choosing-for-others context extends to other choosing-for-others contexts, (2) understanding how research conducted on choices for the self extends to different choosing-for-others contexts, (3) understanding how the increasingly digital landscape in which consumer choice takes place will affect consumer choices for others, and (4) understanding how additional dimensions relevant to choosing for others will affect consumer choices for others.

Aim 1: Extending Findings to Different Choosing-for-Others Contexts. First, literature on choices for others is growing, but most research is conducted in different literatures that have largely been separate (as illustrated in the web appendix table). This leaves substantial opportunity for understanding when findings uncovered in one context either generalize to or differ in predictable ways when applied to other choosing-for-others contexts, with the ultimate goal to understand the entire choosing-for-others landscape. This framework offers an integrated perspective on choices for others, providing a structured way to develop hypotheses for how findings originally conducted in one context will stay the same or differ when extended to other contexts. Specifically, researchers can consider how a finding's underlying mechanism maps onto the two framework dimensions and whether shifting to a different prototypical choosing-for-others context involves a change to this mechanism.

As an illustration, consider comparisons between the gift-giving context and the everyday favors/pick-ups context. Much research on gift-giving shows that choosers select products signaling a close relationship over more preferred products (e.g., choosing unique over popular products, unrequested over requested products, experiential over material products; Goodman and Lim 2018; Steffel and LeBoeuf 2014; Steffel et al. 2016a; Ward and Broniarczyk 2016). Because prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups differ from prototypical gift-giving in involving a recipient focus instead of a relationship focus, these gift-giving findings likely do not extend to everyday favors/pick-ups contexts. By contrast, other research mainly in the everyday favors/pick-ups context implicates a mechanism centered on highlighting a recipient's consumption preferences rather than on a relationship-signaling mechanism (e.g., choosing quality over quantity products; preferring larger over smaller consideration sets; Liu and Baskin 2017; Polman 2012a). Because the everyday favors/pick-ups context and the gift-giving context both involve highlighting a recipient's consumption preferences, these findings likely do extend to the gift-giving context.

As another illustration, consider comparisons between the joint consumption context and the caregiving context. Much research on joint consumption shows that individual differences in choosers' willingness to prioritize relational considerations affect their likelihood of choosing products preferred by recipients versus choosers (Dzhogleva and Lamberton 2014; Wu et al. 2019). Because prototypical caregiving differs from prototypical joint consumption in involving a recipient focus instead of a relationship focus, these individual differences—specifically, those that influence the extent to which relational considerations are prioritized—likely do not similarly affect the selfishness of choices in the caregiving context. By contrast, other research conducted in the joint consumption context is centered on how to balance self and other's consumption preferences without focusing on a relational-signaling mechanism (e.g., research examining different routes to compromise and the effect of product ads favoring one person's preferences on the balance between self and other's preferences; Corfman and Lehmann 1987; Menasco and Curry 1989). Because the joint consumption context and the caregiving context both involve balancing self and other's consumption preferences, these findings are more likely to extend from the joint consumption context to the caregiving context.

Overall then, aim 1 is to increase understanding of how research on one choosing-for-others context extends to others. Relatedly, limited work examines the outcomes or success of choices for others, such as satisfaction from consuming a choice made by another person, or the relational outcomes. Although some exists (Botti and McGill 2006; Chan and Mogilner 2017), more can be done, especially on whether these outcomes vary based on choosers' relationship or recipient focus and whether choosers highlight or balance preferences.

Aim 2: Extending Findings on Choosing-for-Self to Choosing-for-Others Contexts. A second priority is to examine how findings on choosing for the self change when extended to choosing-for-others contexts. Our framework's identification of two key dimensions—social focus and consideration of consumption preferences—affecting choices for others can help generate hypotheses by encouraging researchers to consider how the motives involved in choices for the self relate to each dimension of our framework.

In relation to the first framework dimension, prototypical choices for the self involve self-focused attention, not socially focused attention (on either a recipient or a relationship). In relation to the second framework dimension, prototypical choices for the self involve highlighting the chooser's consumption preferences. Given this mapping, we can consider what happens with (i) a conceptual shift on the first dimension from self-focus to relationship focus

or to recipient focus, (ii) a conceptual shift on the second dimension from highlighting the chooser's consumption preferences to highlighting the recipient's consumption preferences or to balancing chooser and recipient preferences, and (iii) jointly integrating these two conceptual shifts to predict choice outcomes.

What kinds of changes occur with a conceptual shift from self-focus to either relationship focus or recipient focus? A shift from self-focus to relationship focus involves choosers having greater interest in relational signaling and the relational impact of one's choices. This heightened interest in relational signaling and impact may manifest in choice outcomes in multiple ways, such as greater interest in the ability to personalize products and lower interest in generic products. A shift from self-focus to recipient focus involves an increase in social distance, a form of psychological distance (Liberman and Trope 2014). This increased psychological distance may likewise manifest in various decision processes and choice outcomes, some of which may be predicted from Construal Level Theory (Liberman and Trope 2014; Liberman, Trope, and Wakslak 2007). For instance, choosers focused on the self (vs. distant others) may place greater weight on concrete (vs. abstract) features and prefer feasible (vs. desirable) options (Lu et al. 2013).

What kinds of changes occur with a conceptual shift from highlighting the self's consumption preferences to either highlighting a recipient's consumption preferences or balancing self and recipient preferences? A shift from highlighting the self's preferences to highlighting a recipient's preferences involves greater preference uncertainty. This heightened preference uncertainty may manifest in decision processes and choice outcomes in multiple ways, such as increased time spent choosing; engaging in more information search; seeking recommendations, guidance, or expertise; and greater interest in options involving lower preference uncertainty (e.g., high quality options; Liu and Baskin 2017; Liu et al. 2018). A shift from highlighting the self's preferences to balancing self and recipient preferences involves greater potential for preference conflict. This heightened preference conflict may likewise manifest in various decision processes and choice outcomes, such as heightened choice difficulty and greater interest in compromise choice options containing either moderate attribute levels or a mix of extreme attribute levels.

Given these kinds of conceptual shifts along both dimensions, what happens when jointly integrating these two shifts? We suggest that researchers ought to combine these kinds of considerations, considering the shift involved for the first dimension (the chooser's focus) and the shift involved for the second dimension (whose consumption preferences the chooser factors in). As an example, let us consider shifting from the starting point of choosing for the self. This choice involves both self-focus and highlighting the self's preferences. If shifting to a relationship focus and to highlighting a recipient's preferences (characteristic of prototypical gift-giving), we may observe outcomes such as greater interest in options with relational-signaling capability (e.g., personalized products) and also greater interest in options with low preference uncertainty (e.g., high-quality products). If we instead shift from choosing for the self to a recipient focus and to highlighting the recipient's preferences (characteristic of prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups), we may still observe greater interest in options with low preference uncertainty (e.g., high-quality products) but rather than greater interest in options with relational-signaling capability, we may observe interest in options reflecting greater psychological distance (e.g., products strong on desirability over feasibility).

For some effects of choosing for self versus other, both dimension shifts may drive the effect, whereas for other effects, one dimension shift may drive the effect. Our framework helps to lay out what dimension shifts researchers should examine; for effects ultimately driven by one dimension, the other dimension shift represents an alternative explanation to be addressed. For instance, Polman, Effron, and Thomas (2018) take an analogous approach when considering self versus other discrepancies, showing that consumers believe the purchasing power of their own money is greater than that of others' money, and finding that differences in psychological distance underlie this effect (but not differences in beliefs about product preferences).

Overall then, aim 2 is to understand how extending from choosing for the self to different choosing-for-others contexts affects choices. We suggest that this aim can be pursued by considering how choices for the self map onto our framework's theoretical constructs.

Aim 3: Understanding How the Digital Landscape Affects Choices for Others. Third, as the digital landscape increasingly affects consumer choices and thus warrants much additional study (Lamberton and Stephen 2016; Weingarden 2018), we posit that the digital landscape in general presents two particularly relevant changes for consumer choices for others: (1) it reduces the time costs associated with physically traveling to a location to purchase products, and (2) it makes it easier for recipients to specify exactly what products they prefer to receive. These changes have several possible implications in light of our framework. The first change may alter the frequency of prototypical everyday favors/pick-ups choices for others, as consumers can increasingly make such choices for themselves online. This first change may have little impact on the frequency of the other three kinds of choices for others, though. The second change is perhaps more interesting, as it deals directly with our second framework dimension. For the gift-giving domain, the rise of gift registries already points to this trend; however, as some recent work suggests (Ward and Broniarczyk 2016), the

relationship focus that characterizes the gift-giving cell may interfere with the success of gift registries. For the everyday favors/pick-ups cell, being able to specify preferences by viewing products online first (e.g., showrooming) may change the role of choosers in such contexts. Specifically, rather than a recipient giving the chooser a general product category and the chooser selecting the brand, size, and so on, the digital landscape may mitigate the chooser's active role in such selections. Finally, for the joint consumption and caregiving cells, in which choosers typically balance recipient and chooser preferences for the situation, the rise of the digital landscape may increase the difficulty of such choices to the extent that recipients develop and articulate stronger preferences, which may conflict with choosers' own preferences for the situation. Future research could investigate these intriguing possibilities raised by our framework.

Furthermore, technological innovation has enabled marketers to explore new opportunities using the principles of our framework. We can illustrate some examples by considering technological innovations introduced by the largest internet companies as of 2018. One such company is Netflix, which allows multiple users to share the same account and also allows adults to set parental controls. The allowance for multiple users to share the same account offers the ability for different users on the same account to more easily learn others' unique preferences, which is particularly useful for the gift-giving context (as choosers would like to signal relational closeness by not explicitly asking for recipients' preferences), and also to more easily identify shared preferences, which is particularly useful for the joint consumption context. The option to set parental controls offers greater ability for parents to balance their consumption preferences with those of their children in the caregiving context. These innovations thus set the stage to test questions about how online account sharing affects consumer welfare, including in terms of the ease and quality of consumers' choices for others. As a second example, Pinterest allows consumers to curate images from the web in many categories, the most common involving consumer products (e.g., food and drink; home and garden decor and design; apparel and accessories; Hall and Zarro 2012) and to make this curation publicly viewable or privately shared with select individuals. Instagram similarly allows users to publicly or privately share their photographs, often of consumer products (Hu, Manikonda, and Kambhampati 2014). Observing these product images may allow viewers to learn both about others' specific product preferences (e.g., a specific dress in a particular brand, color) and to infer more general product preferences (e.g., preppy business casual), which is particularly useful when consumers in the gift-giving context aim to avoid explicitly asking for recipients' preferences. These innovations thus set the stage to test questions about how signaling preferences online in different ways (e.g., public vs. private, product-focused vs. style-focused, curated vs. scattered) affects consumer welfare, including in terms of the ease and quality of consumers' choices for others. As a third example, companies such as Venmo and PayPal offer the ability to quickly transfer money to friends and family, making it easier for recipients to pay choosers back for purchases and to split the cost of purchases. The rise of these easy money transfers thus offers the opportunity to test questions about how who is paying for a purchase may affect choices for others. For instance, if the chooser (vs. recipient) pays for a purchase in the joint consumption or caregiving contexts, does that affect the balance between chooser and recipient preferences? If multiple consumers split the cost of a gift, how does that affect relational signaling with the recipient?

As researchers gain access to data from these companies via partnering, information-sharing agreements, or web scraping, they can test some of the ideas from our framework. From a practical perspective, they may test whether these technologies are currently utilized to facilitate the frequency of and to improve the quality of choices for others and, if not, they may test ways of encouraging such uses to promote consumer utility and beneficial firm outcomes. Additionally, besides testing practical questions, the rise of the digital landscape also provides opportunities for testing theoretical questions. For instance, some researchers have tested the digital innovation of posting identity-relevant products on social media, to provide both theoretical insights on identity signaling and practical insights for marketers (Grewal, Stephen, and Coleman 2019). In sum, aim 3 is to utilize our framework to study how general digital landscape changes and specific technological innovations affect choices for others.

Aim 4: Understanding How Additional Dimensions Affect Choices for Others. A fourth priority is to consider other meaningful ways of distinguishing consumer choices for others. We focused on two fundamental dimensions that relate directly to key chooser motives and also capture considerable variance in such choices, forming four cells for reviewing and integrating research on consumer choices for others. However, there are other alternative dimensions that could affect—and thus be used to categorize—these choices. As we illustrate next with two examples, our framework's dimensions can offer ways to generate hypotheses regarding systematic effects of shifting along alternative dimensions on choice outcomes.

One alternative dimension that may delineate choices for others is the degree of control that recipients have over resulting choice outcomes. For instance, in some situations, recipients can reject or change the choices made for them (e.g., by returning or exchanging products selected for them, by refusing to go to a selected restaurant for joint consumption). Choosers are unlikely to want their choices to be rejected or changed by recipients. Such rejection can be generally frustrating, suggesting that a chooser is not a

good chooser in this domain and thus has wasted her time. Rejection can also cause embarrassment by signaling that the chooser is not close enough to the recipient to care about or understand the recipient's preferences. Thus, in light of our framework, one possibility is that choosers will be especially attuned to the degree of control that recipients have over choice outcomes when choosers adopt a relationship focus (vs. a recipient focus) on the first framework dimension. That is, the impact of thinking about the recipient's degree of control will be greater on choosers in the prototypical gift-giving and joint consumption cells. Additionally, another possibility is that when choosers perceive that recipients have a high degree of control over resulting choice outcomes, they will be more reluctant to balance the recipient's preferences with their own and more inclined to highlight the recipient's preferences alone (i.e., shifting on the second dimension of our framework). For example, a parent aware that her adult child can (vs. cannot) overturn her selection of a healthy, but not particularly tasty, dish due to the child's financial independence might make a choice more analogous to an everyday favors/pickups choice than a prototypical caregiving choice.

Another alternative dimension that may delineate choices for others is whether the outcome of the choice will affect the recipient only or both the recipient and the chooser. For instance, experiences may be consumed separately (vs. jointly), products may be owned by the recipient (vs. jointly), or purchases may be funded by the chooser (vs. both the chooser and the recipient vs. the recipient alone). One possibility is that as the outcome of the choice has higher impact on both the recipient and the chooser (vs. the recipient alone), choosers will feel especially justified to exert their own preferences for the situation. Using our framework's terminology, choosers may be more likely to balance the recipient's preferences against the chooser's own preferences for the situation, rather than highlighting the recipient's preferences (i.e., shifting on the second dimension of our framework). For example, if a chooser is picking up deodorant for a spouse and is deciding on the brand, the chooser may be more likely to incorporate her own preferences for a thrifty brand rather than just highlighting her spouse recipient's preferences if she is funding the purchase from her own separate account (vs. the joint account and especially vs. the recipient's separate account).[1]

1 However, in caregiving cases in which choosers pay for recipients' medical care (vs. recipients paying for themselves), choosers may be especially concerned with appearing to have choice motives that are free of impure conflicts of interest. For instance, in elder care situations involving medical decisions, choosers who will pay (as opposed to the recipient paying) may be especially concerned about wanting to avoid the appearance that they are trying to save money at the expense of the recipient's welfare.

In sum, aim 4 is to consider other meaningful ways of distinguishing consumer choices for others, an aim that we suggest can also be facilitated by considering our framework's dimensions, as they are fundamental ways of characterizing consumer choices for others and relate directly to key chooser motives. Although we offered the recipient's degree of control over the choice outcome and whether the choice outcome will affect the recipient only or both the chooser and the recipient as two illustrative examples of meaningful ways to distinguish choices for others, these are by no means exhaustive.

Concluding Remarks

We often make consumption choices for other consumers or have other consumers make consumption choices for us. Although such choices are typically studied in distinct contexts—gift-giving, joint consumption, everyday favors/pick-ups, and caregiving—we have argued that being able to organize consumer choices for others within the present framework can shed light on how these contexts differ prototypically, how they are similar, and how oft-understudied mixed cases can be resolved. We hope that this framework will be of practical use to marketers, consumers, and policy makers, while also helping researchers develop novel hypotheses about consumer choices for others, especially toward the four main highlighted aims. If so, ultimately, we can better understand the full range of consumer decision making for others and how ongoing changes to the consumption and marketing landscapes may affect such choices.

DATA COLLECTION INFORMATION

The pilot study was administered on Amazon Mechanical Turk in fall 2017 by the first author and analyzed by the first author. The remainder of the article is a conceptual framework and does not contain any other data collection.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, Mary S. (1979), "Infant–Mother Attachment," *American Psychologist*, 34 (10), 932–7.

Alba, Joseph W. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (1987), "Dimensions of Consumer Expertise," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (4), 411–54.

Arora, Neeraj K. and Colleen A. McHorney (2000), "Patient Preferences for Medical Decision Making: Who Really Wants to Participate?" *Medical Care*, 38 (3), 335–41.

Baker, Stacey Menzel, James W. Gentry, and Terri L. Rittenburg (2005), "Building Understanding of the Domain of Consumer Vulnerability," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25 (2), 128–39.

Barasz, Kate, Tami Kim, and Leslie K. John (2016), "The Role of (Dis) Similarity in (Mis) Predicting Others' Preferences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (4), 597–607.

Barnhart, Michelle and Lisa Peñaloza (2013), "Who Are You Calling Old? Negotiating Old Age Identity in the Elderly Consumption Ensemble," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (6), 1133–53.

Baskin, Ernest, Cheryl J. Wakslak, Yaacov Trope, and Nathan Novemsky (2014), "Why Feasibility Matters More to Gift Receivers than to Givers: A Construal-Level Approach to Gift Giving," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (1), 169–82.

Baumeister, Roy F. and Mark R. Leary (1995), "The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, 117 (3), 497–529.

Becker, Gary S. (1985), "Human Capital, Effort, and the Sexual Division of Labor," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3 (1, Part 2), S33–58.

Belk, Russell W. (1979), "Gift-Giving Behavior," in *Research in Marketing*, Vol. 2, ed. Jagdish Sheth, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 95–126.

—— (1996), "The Perfect Gift," in *Gift Giving: A Research Anthology*, ed. Cele Otnes and Richard F. Beltramini, Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 59–84.

——(2010), "Sharing," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (5), 715–34.

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 (3), 393–417.

Bhattacharjee, Amit, Jonah Berger, and Geeta Menon (2014), "When Identity Marketing Backfires: Consumer Agency in Identity Expression," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (2), 294–309.

Boothby, Erica J., Margaret S. Clark, and John A. Bargh (2014), "Shared Experiences Are Amplified," *Psychological Science*, 25 (12), 2209–16.

Botti, Simona and Sheena S. Iyengar (2004), "The Psychological Pleasure and Pain of Choosing: When People Prefer Choosing at the Cost of Subsequent Outcome Satisfaction," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87 (3), 312–26.

Botti, Simona and Ann L. McGill (2006), "When Choosing Is Not Deciding: The Effect of Perceived Responsibility on Satisfaction," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (2), 211–9.

Botti, Simona, Kristina Orfali, and Sheena S. Iyengar (2009), "Tragic Choices: Autonomy and Emotional Responses to Medical Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (3), 337–52.

Bradford, Tonya Williams (2009), "Intergenerationally Gifted Asset Dispositions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (1), 93–111.

Brehm, Jack W. (1966), *A Theory of Psychological Reactance*, Oxford, UK: Academic Press.

Brick, Danielle J. and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2017), "Oppositional Brand Choice: Using Brands to Respond to Relationship Frustration," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 27 (2), 257–63.

Cahn, Dudley D. (1992), *Conflict in Intimate Relationships*, New York: Guilford.

Camerer, Colin (1988), "Gifts as Economic Signals and Social Symbols," *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (Supplement), S180–214.

Caplow, Theodore (1984), "Rule Enforcement without Visible Means: Christmas Gift Giving in Middletown," *American Journal of Sociology*, 89 (6), 1306–23.

Caprariello, Peter A. and Harry T. Reis (2013), "To Do, to Have, or to Share? Valuing Experiences over Material Possessions Depends on the Involvement of Others," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104 (2), 199–215.

Carlson, Les and Sanford Grossbart (1988), "Parental Style and Consumer Socialization of Children," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (1), 77–94.

Cavanaugh, Lisa A. (2016), "Consumer Behavior in Close Relationships," *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 10 (1), 101–6.

Cavanaugh, Lisa A., Francesca Gino, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2015), "When Doing Good Is Bad in Gift Giving: Mis-Predicting Appreciation of Socially Responsible Gifts," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 131 (1), 178–89.

Chan, Cindy and Cassie Mogilner (2017), "Experiential Gifts Foster Stronger Social Relationships than Material Gifts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (6), 913–31.

Chang, Chung-Chau, Shih-Chieh Chuang, Yin-Hui Cheng, and Tien-Ying Huang (2012), "The Compromise Effect in Choosing for Others," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 25 (2), 109–22.

Choi, Jinhee, B. Kyu Kim, Incheol Choi, and Youjae Yi (2006), "Variety-Seeking Tendency in Choice for Others: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Causes," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (4), 590–5.

Cialdini, Robert B. and Noah J. Goldstein (2004), "Social Influence: Compliance and Conformity," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591–621.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (2019), "Buying a House: Tools and Resources for Homebuyers," https://www.consumerfinance.gov/owning-a-home/.

Corfman, Kim P. and Donald R. Lehmann (1987), "Models of Cooperative Group Decision-Making and Relative Influence: An Experimental Investigation of Family Purchase Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (1), 1–13.

Damianakis, Thecla and Elsa Marziali (2012), "Older Adults' Response to the Loss of a Spouse: The Function of Spirituality in Understanding the Grieving Process," *Aging & Mental Health*, 16 (1), 57–66.

Davis, Harry L. (1970), "Dimensions of Marital Roles in Consumer Decision Making," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 7 (2), 168–77.

—— (1976), "Decision Making within the Household," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2 (4), 241–60.

Dhar, Ravi (1997), "Consumer Preference for a No-Choice Option," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (2), 215–31.

Dix, Theodore (1991), "The Affective Organization of Parenting: Adaptive and Maladaptative Processes," *Psychological Bulletin*, 110 (1), 3–25.

Dzhogleva, Hristina and Cait Poynor Lamberton (2014), "Should Birds of a Feather Flock Together? Understanding Self-Control Decisions in Dyads," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (2), 361–80.

Epp, Amber M. and Linda L. Price (2011), "Designing Solutions Around Customer Network Identity Goals," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (2), 36–54.

Epp, Amber M., Hope Jensen Schau, and Linda L. Price (2014), "The Role of Brands and Mediating Technologies in

Assembling Long-Distance Family Practices," *Journal of Marketing*, 78 (3), 81–101.

Epp, Amber M. and Sunaina R. Velagaleti (2014), "Outsourcing Parenthood? How Families Manage Care Assemblages Using Paid Commercial Services," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (4), 911–35.

Etkin, Jordan (2016), "Choosing Variety for Joint Consumption," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 1019–33.

Financial Literacy and Education Commission (2019), "Spend," https://www.mymoney.gov/spend/Pages/spend.aspx.

Fisher, Jennifer Orlet and Leann Lipps Birch (1999), "Restricting Access to Palatable Foods Affects Children's Behavioral Response, Food Selection, and Intake," *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 69 (6), 1264–72.

Flynn, Francis J. and Gabrielle S. Adams (2009), "Money Can't Buy Love: Asymmetric Beliefs about Gift Price and Feelings of Appreciation," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45 (2), 404–9.

Galak, Jeff, Julian Givi and Elanor F. Williams (2016), "Why Certain Gifts Are Great to Give but Not to Get: A Framework for Understanding Errors in Gift Giving," *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25 (6), 380–5.

Garcia-Rada, Ximena, Lalin Anik, and Dan Ariely (2019), "Consuming Together (versus Separately) Makes the Heart Grow Fonder," *Marketing Letters*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-019-09479-7.

Gino, Francesca and Francis J. Flynn (2011), "Give Them What They Want: The Benefits of Explicitness in Gift Exchange," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47 (5), 915–22.

Goodman, Joseph K. and Sarah Lim (2018), "When Consumers Prefer to Give Material Gifts instead of Experiences: The Role of Social Distance," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45 (2), 365–82.

Goodman, Joseph K., Selin A. Malkoc, and Brittney L. Stephenson (2016), "Celebrate or Commemorate? A Material Purchase Advantage When Honoring Special Life Events," *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 1 (4), 497–508.

Grewal, Lauren, Andrew T. Stephen, and Nicole Verrochi Coleman (2019), "When Posting about Products in Social Media Backfires: The Negative Effects of Consumer Identity Signaling on Product Interest," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56 (2), 197–210.

Haley, Russell I. (1968), "Benefit Segmentation: A Decision-Oriented Research Tool," *Journal of Marketing*, 32 (3), 30–5.

Hall, Catherine and Michael Zarro (2012), "Social Curation on the Website Pinterest.com," *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 49 (1), 1–9.

Hasford, Jonathan, Blair Kidwell, and Virginie Lopez-Kidwell (2018), "Happy Wife, Happy Life: Food Choices in Romantic Relationships," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (6), 1238–56.

Higgins, E. Tory (1998), "Promotion and Prevention: Regulatory Focus as a Motivational Principle," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 30, ed. Mark P. Zanna, New York: Academic Press, 1–46.

Hu, Yuheng, Lydia Manikonda, and Subbarao Kambhampati (2014), "What We Instagram: A First Analysis of Instagram Photo Content and User Types," in *Proceedings of the Eighth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, Ann Arbor, MI: AAAI Press, 595–8.

John, Deborah Roedder and Catherine A. Cole (1986), "Age Differences in Information Processing: Understanding Deficits in Young and Elderly Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (3), 297–315.

Kelley, Harold H. and John W. Thibaut (1978), *Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence*, New York: Wiley.

Lackman, Conway and John M. Lanasa (1993), "Family Decision-Making Theory: An Overview and Assessment," *Psychology & Marketing*, 10 (2), 81–93.

Lamberton, Cait and Andrew T. Stephen (2016), "A Thematic Exploration of Digital, Social Media, and Mobile Marketing: Research Evolution from 2000 to 2015 and an Agenda for Future Inquiry," *Journal of Marketing*, 80 (6), 146–72.

Laran, Juliano (2010), "Goal Management in Sequential Choices: Consumer Choices for Others Are More Indulgent than Personal Choices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (2), 304–14.

Lennox, Richard D. and Raymond N. Wolfe (1984), "Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46 (6), 1349–64.

Li, Yushi and Annie Buechel (2007), "Study of American and Chinese Family Members' Evaluations on Institutionalized Care for Their Older Parents: Potential Development in the Future," *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 30 (2), 176–98.

Liberman, Nira and Yaacov Trope (2014), "Traversing Psychological Distance," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18 (7), 364–9.

Liberman, Nira, Yaacov Trope, and Cheryl Wakslak (2007), "Construal Level Theory and Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 17 (2), 113–7.

Liu, Peggy J. and Ernest Baskin (2017), "The Quality versus Quantity Tradeoff: A Dual-Risk Account for How Choices for Self versus Others Differ," in *NA—Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 45, ed. Ayelet Gneezy, Vladas Griskevicius, and Patti Williams, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 112–6.

Liu, Peggy J., Troy H. Campbell, Gavan J. Fitzsimons, and Gráinne M. Fitzsimons (2013), "Matching Choices to Avoid Offending Stigmatized Group Members," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122 (2), 291–304.

Liu, Peggy J., Kelly L. Haws, Cait Lamberton, Troy H. Campbell, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2015), "Vice-Virtue Bundles," *Management Science*, 61 (1), 204–28.

Liu, Yi, Evan Polman, Yongfang Liu, and Jiangli Jiao (2018), "Choosing for Others and Its Relation to Information Search," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 147 (1), 65–75.

Lowrey, Tina M., Cele C. Otnes, and Julie A. Ruth (2004), "Social Influences on Dyadic Giving over Time: A Taxonomy from the Giver's Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (4), 547–58.

Lu, Jingyi, Zhengyan Liu, and Zhe Fang (2016), "Hedonic Products for You, Utilitarian Products for Me," *Judgment and Decision Making*, 11 (4), 332–41.

Lu, Jingyi, Xiaofei Xie, and Jingzhe Xu (2013), "Desirability or Feasibility: Self–Other Decision-Making Differences," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39 (2), 144–55.

Luce, Mary Frances, James R. Bettman, and John W. Payne (1997), "Choice Processing in Emotionally Difficult Decisions," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23 (2), 384–405.

MacInnis, Deborah J. (2011), "A Framework for Conceptual Contributions in Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (4), 136–54.

Mariorty, Rowland T. and David J. Reibstein (1986), "Benefit Segmentation in Industrial Markets," *Journal of Business Research*, 14 (6), 463–86.

Markus, Hazel R. and Shinobu Kitayama (1991), "Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation," *Psychological Review*, 98 (2), 224–53.

Marquis, Erin (2017), "'We Look Out for Each Other Here,'" July 17, https://www.citylab.com/life/2017/07/minock-park-detroit-essay-belt-publishing/533283/.

Matthews, Sarah H. and Tena Tarler Rosner (1988), "Shared Filial Responsibility: The Family as the Primary Caregiver," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50 (1), 185–95.

Mauss, Marcel (1925/2000), *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, New York: W.W. Norton.

Mead, Nicole L., Roy F. Baumeister, Tyler F. Stillman, Catherine D. Rawn, and Kathleen D. Vohs (2011), "Social Exclusion Causes People to Spend and Consume Strategically in the Service of Affiliation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (5), 902–19.

Medicare (2019), "Information for Nursing Home Residents, Family Members, and Care Givers," https://www.medicare.gov/NursingHomeCompare/Resources/infoforresidents.html.

Menasco, Michael B. and David J. Curry (1989), "Utility and Choice: An Empirical Study of Wife/Husband Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (1), 87–97.

Min, Kate E., Peggy J. Liu, and Soo Kim (2018), "Sharing Extraordinary Experiences Fosters Feelings of Closeness," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44 (1), 107–21.

Mozaffarian, Dariush, Tao Hao, Eric B. Rimm, Walter C. Willett, and Frank B. Hu (2011), "Changes in Diet and Lifestyle and Long-Term Weight Gain in Women and Men," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 364 (25), 2392–404.

Mukhopadhyay, Anirban and Catherine Yeung (2010), "Building Character: Effects of Lay Theories of Self-Control on the Selection of Products for Children," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47 (2), 240–50.

Nielsen (2015), "We Are What We Eat: Healthy Eating Trends Around the World," https://www.nielsen.com/content/dam/nielsenglobal/eu/nielseninsights/pdfs/Nielsen%20Global%20Health%20and%20Wellness%20Report%20-%20January%202015.pdf.

Nikolova, Hristina and Cait Lamberton (2016), "Men and the Middle: Gender Differences in Dyadic Compromise Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 355–71.

Nikolova, Hristina, Cait Lamberton, and Nicole Verrochi Coleman (2018), "Stranger Danger: When and Why Consumer Dyads Behave Less Ethically than Individuals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45 (1), 90–108.

NYC Metropolitan Transportation Authority (2018), "New Yorkers Keep New York Safe," http://www.mta.info/mta-security.

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 (2), 229–44.

Polman, Evan (2012a), "Effects of Self–Other Decision Making on Regulatory Focus and Choice Overload," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102 (5), 980–93.

—— (2012b), "Self–Other Decision Making and Loss Aversion," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 119 (2), 141–50.

Polman, Evan, Daniel A. Effron, and Meredith R. Thomas (2018), "Other People's Money: Money's Perceived Purchasing Power Is Smaller for Others than for the Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45 (1), 109–25.

Polman, Evan and Kyle J. Emich (2011), "Decisions for Others Are More Creative than Decisions for the Self," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37 (4), 492–501.

Polman, Evan and Sam J. Maglio (2017), "Mere Gifting: Liking a Gift More Because It Is Shared," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43 (11), 1582–94.

Polman, Evan and Kathleen D. Vohs (2016), "Decision Fatigue, Choosing for Others, and Self-Construal," *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7 (5), 471–8.

Pronin, Emily, Christopher Y. Olivola, and Kathleen A. Kennedy (2008), "Doing unto Future Selves as You Would Do unto Others: Psychological Distance and Decision Making," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34 (2), 224–36.

Raghunathan, Rajagopal and Kim Corfman (2006), "Is Happiness Shared Doubled and Sadness Shared Halved? Social Influence on Enjoyment of Hedonic Experiences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43 (3), 386–94.

Rahim, M. Afzalur (1983), "A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict," *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (2), 368–76.

Ratner, Rebecca K. and Rebecca W. Hamilton (2015), "Inhibited from Bowling Alone," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (2), 266–83.

Rim, SoYon, Kate E. Min, Peggy J. Liu, Tanya L. Chartrand, and Yaacov Trope (2019), "The Gift of Psychological Closeness: How Feasible versus Desirable Gifts Reduce Psychological Distance to the Giver," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45 (3), 360–71.

Ruth, Julie A., Cele C. Otnes, and Frédéric F. Brunel (1999), "Gift Receipt and the Reformulation of Interpersonal Relationships," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (4), 385–402.

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

—— (2004), *The Paradox of Choice: Why More Is Less*, New York: HarperCollins.

Sherry, John F., Jr. (1983), "Gift Giving in Anthropological Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (2), 157–68.

Simpson, Jeffry A., Vladas Griskevicius, and Alexander J. Rothman (2012a), "Bringing Relationships into Consumer Decision-Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22 (3), 329–31.

—— (2012b), "Consumer Decisions in Relationships," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22 (3), 304–14.

Singelis, Theodore M. (1994), "The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (5), 580–91.

Steffel, Mary and Robyn A. LeBoeuf (2014), "Overindividuation in Gift Giving: Shopping for Multiple Recipients Leads Givers to Choose Unique but Less Preferred Gifts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (6), 1167–80.

Steffel, Mary and Elanor F. Williams (2018), "Delegating Decisions: Recruiting Others to Make Choices We Might Regret," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (5), 1015–32.

Steffel, Mary, Elanor F. Williams, and Robyn A. LeBoeuf (2016a), "Overly Specific Gift Giving: Givers Choose Personalized but Less-Versatile and Less-Preferred Gifts," in *NA—Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 43, ed. Kristin

Diehl and Carolyn Yoon, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 229–33.

Steffel, Mary, Elanor F. Williams, and Jaclyn Perrmann-Graham (2016b), "Passing the Buck: Delegating Choices to Others to Avoid Responsibility and Blame," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 135 (1), 32–44.

Sternberg, Robert J. and Diane M. Dobson (1987), "Resolving Interpersonal Conflicts: An Analysis of Stylistic Consistency," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (4), 794–812.

Su, Chenting, Edward F. Fern, and Keying Ye (2003), "A Temporal Dynamic Model of Spousal Family Purchase-Decision Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (3), 268–81.

Tandon, Pooja S., Jeffrey Wright, Chuan Zhou, Cara Beth Rogers, and Dimitri A. Christakis (2010), "Nutrition Menu Labeling May Lead to Lower-Calorie Restaurant Meal Choices for Children," *Pediatrics*, 125 (2), 244–8.

Tepper, Kelly (1994), "The Role of Labeling Processes in Elderly Consumers' Responses to Age Segmentation Cues," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (4), 503–19.

Tran, SiSi and Jeffry A. Simpson (2009), "Prorelationship Maintenance Behaviors: The Joint Roles of Attachment and Commitment," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97 (4), 685–98.

Tu, Yanping, Alex Shaw, and Ayelet Fishbach (2016), "The Friendly Taking Effect: How Interpersonal Closeness Leads to Seemingly Selfish yet Jointly Maximizing Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (5), 669–87.

U.S. Census Bureau (2018), "Older People Projected to Outnumber Children for First Time in U.S. History," https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2018/cb18-41-population-projections.html.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2019), "Buying a Home," https://www.hud.gov/topics/buying_a_home.

U.S. Department of the Treasury (2019), "Financial Literacy and Education Commission," https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/consumer-policy/financial-literacy-and-education-commission.

Velleman, Richard, Gerald Bennett, Tony Miller, Jim Orford, Kate Rigby, and Anne Tod (1993), "The Families of Problem Drug Users: A Study of 50 Close Relatives," *Addiction*, 88 (9), 1281–9.

Ward, Adrian F. and John G. Lynch, Jr. (2019), "On a Need-to-Know Basis: How the Distribution of Responsibility between Couples Shapes Financial Literacy and Financial Outcomes," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45 (5), 1013–36.

Ward, Morgan K. and Susan M. Broniarczyk (2016), "Ask and You Shall (Not) Receive: Close Friends Prioritize Relational Signaling over Recipient Preferences in Their Gift Choices," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53 (6), 1001–18.

Weinberger, Michelle F. (2015), "Dominant Consumption Rituals and Intragroup Boundary Work: How Non-Celebrants Manage Conflicting Relational and Identity Goals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (3), 378–400.

—— (2017), "Gifts: Intertwining Market and Moral Economies and the Rise of Store Bought Gifts," *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 20 (3), 245–57.

Weinberger, Michelle F. and Melanie Wallendorf (2012), "Intracommunity Gifting at the Intersection of Contemporary Moral and Market Economies," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (1), 74–92.

Weingarden, Matt (2018), "Call for Papers | Journal of Marketing Special Issue: New Technologies and Marketing," https://www.ama.org/2018/11/01/call-for-papers-journal-of-marketing-special-issue-new-technologies-and-marketing/.

Wu, Eugenia C., Sarah G. Moore, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2019), "Wine for the Table: Self-Construal, Group Size and Choice for Self and Others," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46(3), 508–27.

Yadav, Manjit S. (2010), "The Decline of Conceptual Articles and Implications for Knowledge Development," *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (1), 1–19.

Yang, Adelle X. and Oleg Urminsky (2018), "The Smile-Seeking Hypothesis: How Immediate Affective Reactions Motivate and Reward Gift Giving," *Psychological Science*, 29 (8), 1221–33.

Yang, Linyun W., Tanya L. Chartrand, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2015), "The Influence of Gender and Self-Monitoring on the Products Consumers Choose for Joint Consumption," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 32 (4), 398–407.

Zikmund-Fisher, Brian J., Sarr Brianna, Angela Fagerlin, and Peter A. Ubel (2006), "A Matter of Perspective: Choosing for Others Differs from Choosing for Yourself," *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 21 (6), 618–22.