

Why Do Consumers Take Stands? A Review of Customer Boycotts

Bin Yao Ning^{1,2}, Tat-Huei Cham^{3,4,5,6,7}, Xin-Jean Lim^{8*}, Ou Yang Bo Qiang² and Ye Ye^{2,4}

Publication Details: Received 03/12/23; Revised 12/12/23; Accepted: 16/01/24

ABSTRACT

Consumer boycotts have emerged as a powerful form of consumer activism, allowing individuals to express their discontent and advocate for change through collective purchasing decisions. This paper used a literature review approach to examine the multifaceted nature of boycotts, drawing on diverse theoretical frameworks and related empirical studies. It explores the individual, social, contextual, and emotional factors that drive boycott participation, highlighting the role of moral identity, social influence, cultural context, and media framing. Definitions of boycotts generally comprise five main components: deliberate, collective action, market-based forces, communication and pressure, and targeted action. By synthesizing key findings from the literature, this review provides a comprehensive understanding of consumer boycotts and their implications for academia, practitioners, policymakers, and other stakeholders. It also identifies research gaps and proposes future research directions to advance our knowledge, emphasizing the need for a multidisciplinary approach that integrates psychological, sociological, and economic perspectives.

Keywords: Consumer boycotts, Collective action, Consumer activism, Communication and pressure, Corporate social responsibility

INTRODUCTION

Consumer boycotts have become an effective form of market activism, whereby consumers refrain from purchasing products or services because of various environmental, political, ethical or social issues (Liao & Liu, 2022; Makarem & Jae, 2016). Historically, boycotts have been instrumental in advancing social change, from trade unions, civil rights, political identities to consumer rights (Lightfoot, 2019). Boycotts are perceived as a “weapon of the weak,” employed by a collective of individuals to effect change in powerful corporations. In recent years, boycotts have increasingly targeted corporate behavior, with consumers leveraging their collective power to hold companies accountable for their actions and demand greater transparency and responsibility (Abosag & Farah, 2014; Klein, Smith, & John, 2004; Makarem & Jae, 2016).

¹Azman Hashim International Business School, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

²Business School, Shaoguan University, China

³UCSI Graduate Business School, UCSI University, Malaysia

⁴International College, Krirk University, Thailand

⁵Universitas Multimedia Nusantara Tangerang, Indonesia

⁶Chongqing University of Arts and Sciences, China

⁷Symbiosis International (Deemed University), India

^{8*}School of Business and Economics, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia, lim.xinjean@yahoo.com

The term ‘boycott’ was coined in 1880 to characterize a movement that was organised by small businessmen against Charles Boycott, a prominent North American farmer (Friedman, 1985). Consumer boycotts are customarily defined as the deliberate act of consumers refraining from purchasing a product or service from a target business or brand in order to convey their disapproval, communicate their values, and compel the company to alter its policies or conduct (Friedman, 1985). Consumers can effectively communicate their values and priorities to respective business through collective boycotts, potentially compelling them to implement the changes that are needed (Klein et al., 2004). The rise of consumer boycotts can be attributed to several factors, including heightened awareness of corporate misconduct, the dissemination of mix information, i.e., positive and negative in social media for collective action, and the consumer expectations for businesses to act as socially responsible (Bhatia, Gupta, Vimalkumar, & Sharma, 2023; Kerr, Mortimer, Dickinson, & Waller, 2012; Woodside, Akrou, & Mrad, 2023). High-profile cases, such as boycott campaigns against Nike and Gillette as well as McDonald's and Starbucks for their perceived links to geopolitical conflicts, and boycotts of Loblaw over rising food prices, demonstrate the power of consumer activism in shaping public discourse and influencing corporate decision-making.

Nonetheless, boycotts face challenges, including the “free rider” problem, where individuals benefit from boycotts without actively participating, and the “small agent” problem, where individuals believe their actions have little impact (Lasarov, Hoffmann, & Orth, 2023; Pandey, Ahmad, & Gautam, 2021). Despite these challenges, boycotts remain an effective tool for external stakeholders, particularly the customers to exert pressure on companies and governments to address social and environmental issues. To address the complexities surrounding boycotts, requiring attention from all stakeholders and a key area of interest within the marketing industry.

This paper employs the keywords “customer” or “consumer” and “boycott” to identify 21 relevant literature sources. The TCCM approach (Ning, Omar, Ye, Ting, & Ning, 2021; Paul, Parthasarathy, & Gupta, 2017) is utilized to systematically review and analyze the existing literature on consumer boycotts in the aspects of theoretical foundations, contextual elements, key features, and the use of relevant methodological techniques.

DEFINITION OF BOYCOTT

Boycotts have traditionally served as an effective means of effecting social and political change. The term “boycott” originated in the context of the Irish “Land War” in 1880, taking its name from Captain Charles Boycott, a British land agent in Ireland. Boycott rejected his tenant farmers’ requests to lower their rents and, consequently, was ostracized by the local community (Phemister, 2024). This watershed moment significantly impacted the trajectory of collective consumer action. Noteworthy instances encompass the 1955 Montgomery bus boycott, which played a crucial role in the American civil rights movement (Glennon, 1991; Phibbs, 2009), and the United Farm Workers’ grape boycott in the 1960s, which yielded substantial improvements in labor rights.

Friedman (1985, p. 97) offers a widely recognized definition of a consumer boycott, as it relates to its goal-oriented nature. He defines it as “an attempt by one or more parties to achieve some goal by urging individual consumers not to make a particular purchase in the marketplace”. The definition has served as the foundation for the majority of research within this topic. Some researchers have subsequently expanded Friedman's definition to emphasize the collective and

strategic dimensions of boycotts. For example, Garrett (1987, p. 47), describes a boycott as “the concerted but non-coercive refusal of a group of actors (agents) to enter into a marketing transaction with one or more other actors (the target company) to express their dissatisfaction with some of the target company’s policies and to compel the target company to modify those policies”. In the context of political consumerism, Micheletti (2003, p. 2) defines boycotts as “an organised, collective, market-based form of political action” , emphasising it a means of expressing political and social values through consumer choices. Similarly, Stolle, Hooghe and Micheletti (2005, p. 246) describe boycotts as “actions by which people organise themselves to use their consumption power to put pressure on corporations or governments”, underlining the grassroots and bottom-up nature of boycott movements. In light of these, it becomes evident that the core definition of boycotts generally comprises five main components, including deliberate, collective action, market-based forces, communication and pressure, and targeted action (See Table 1).

Table 1: Definitions of Boycott

Key Elements of Customer Boycott Definitions	Element Description	References
Deliberate	Boycotts are intentional and targeted actions that are motivated by particular objectives or requirements.	(Friedman, 1985; Garrett, 1987)
Collective Action	Boycotts typically entail the synchronized actions of numerous individuals or groups, which can be orchestrated through social media platforms or activist organizations.	(Micheletti, 2003; Stolle et al., 2005)
Market-Based Power	Boycotts leverage the economic power of consumers to influence corporate behavior by withholding purchases.	(Friedman, 1985; Micheletti, 2003)
Communication and Pressure	Boycotts are a form of protest that convey disapproval, advocate for ethical principles, and exert pressure on organizations to modify their procedures or guidelines.	(Garrett, 1987; Stolle et al., 2005)
Targeted Action	Boycotts are directed at specific companies, brands, or products, rather than the market as a whole.	(Friedman, 1985; Garrett, 1987)

RESEARCH AGENDA

Theory

The literature on consumer boycotts has shed light on their behavioural motivations and influences through different theories (see Table 2). Among these, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) has emerged as the predominant framework for understanding consumer boycotts. Specifically, it demonstrating the interrelationships of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control on boycott intention (Farah, 2011; Farah & Newman, 2009; Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019). However, the limitations of TPB, such as the reliance on self-report measures and the potential neglect of affective and environmental factors (James, 2010), have prompted researchers to integrate more theoretical perspectives to capture the more context-

based drivers contributing to boycotts intention. As demonstrated, James (2010) advocated the use of alternative theoretical frameworks, including mixed methods and the Behavioural Perspective Model (BPM).

In other streams, scholars have integrated TPB with other theories, such as cost-reward model (Klein et al., 2004), expectancy theory (Shin & Yoon, 2018), the spiral of silence theory (Hong & Li, 2021), and the emphasis on framing theory (Bravo & Chapa, 2024), to further investigate the rational, emotional, and social factors that shape customer boycott decisions. Additionally, the application of psychoanalytic theory (Cruz, Pires Jr, & Ross, 2013) and the Hot and Cold Cognitive System (Lasarov et al., 2023) provide insights into the temporal dynamics of boycotts and gender differences, highlighting the role of emotion and moral responsibility in consumer boycotting decision. On the other hand, the cost-reward model is used to emphasize the rational decision-making process of consumers weighing the moral satisfaction of boycotts against the personal costs (Klein et al., 2004). Meanwhile, Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Collective Action Theory shed light on how group identity and shared dissatisfaction drive participation in boycotts (Ali, 2021; Kim, Yan, Kim, Terasaki, & Furukawa, 2022). These social dynamics are further amplified by the Spiral of Silence effect, in which public opinion influences an individual's willingness to express dissent or support a boycott (Hong & Li, 2021). The boycotts have been explored through the Hot/Cold Cognitive System (Lasarov et al., 2023), which reveals an interesting shift from emotionally-driven engagement in the initial 'warming up' phase to a more rational assessment of costs and benefits in the 'cooling down' phase. This implies that persistent engagement strategies that address both rational and emotive motivations are necessary for the successful implementation of boycotts.

With the growing influence of digital platforms and online communities in amplifying consumer activism, the literature has emphasized the extensive roles of media framing, such as blogs and social media in shaping public discourse and influencing boycott participation (Bhatia et al., 2023; Kerr et al., 2012). For instance, the finding of Kerr et al. (2012) underscore the significance of digital platforms in influencing public discourse and regulatory decision-making in boycott movements. Nevertheless, the fact that their study was limited to a single case study, more studies are needed to explore the dynamics of boycotts on different digital platforms and examine the long-term impact of online activism on corporate behaviour and policy outcomes.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of boycotts depends on whether consumers believe that boycotts have the potential to bring about change (Shin & Yoon, 2018). The perceived effectiveness, coupled with ethical considerations and social implications, motivates consumers to engage in collective action to boycott brands perceived to be socially irresponsible. Using the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) model, Woodside et al., (2023) further elucidates the psychological mechanisms by which social irresponsibility triggers negative emotions and brand hatred, ultimately leading to boycott decision.

Table 2: Related Theories

Cluster	Related theories	Key article
Antecedents and Motivations for Boycott Participation	Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)	(Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Farah, 2011; Farah & Newman, 2009; Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019; James, 2010; Kim et al., 2022)
	Arousal: Cost-reward Model of Helping Behavior	(Klein, John, & Smith, 2001; Klein et al., 2004)
	Consumer Affinity Model	(Kim et al., 2022)
	Animosity Model of Consumer Purchase Behavior	(Kim et al., 2022)
	Issue-Contingent Model of Ethical Decision Making	(Bravo & Chapa, 2024)
	Psychoanalytic Theory	(Cruz et al., 2013)
	Political Consumerism	(Ali, 2021)
Boycott Behavior and Decision-Making	Social Contract Theory	(Keskin, Esen, & Bozkurt, 2024)
	Transtheoretical Model	(Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019)
	Expectancy Theory	(Shin & Yoon, 2018)
	Behavioral Perspective Model	(James, 2010)
	Cost-benefit Theory	(Makarem & Jae, 2016)
	Hot/Cool Cognition System	(Lasarov et al., 2023)
	Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) Framework	(Woodside et al., 2023)
	Spiral of Silence Theory	(Hong & Li, 2021)
	Blogger Motivations	(Kerr et al., 2012)
	Consumer Power Strategies in the Online Environment	(Kerr et al., 2012)
	Social Media Virality	(Bhatia et al., 2023)
	Emphasis Framing Theory	(Bravo & Chapa, 2024)

Context

The body of literature on consumer boycotts have been conducted in diverse geographic and socio-political contexts, as well as targeted on variety of products and brands. Geographically, most studies cover diverse regions, including Asia (Malaysia, South Korea, Japan, India), the Middle East (Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey), Europe (Germany, France, United Kingdom), and the Americas (United States, Brazil) (See Table 3). For instance, research in the Middle East, particularly Lebanon, underscores the significant role of political motivations in driving

consumer boycotts (Farah, 2011; Farah & Newman, 2009). By targeting in Malaysia context, Hamzah and Mustafa (2019) noted solidarity with Palestinians as a key motivator when discussing Malaysia—that is, a merger of political solidarity and consumer activism.

In Asia region, consumer boycotts are often driven by political, economic, cultural, ethical and religious factors. In particular, the use of harmful materials in products has been identified as a trigger for boycotts in South Korea (Shin & Yoon, 2018). Political hostility is an enabler, mainly where conflicts have occurred. There would even be socio-political tension, such as in the case of Kurdish consumers boycotting Turkish products because of political grievances (Ali, 2021). Additionally, cultural and religious insensitivity can fuel consumer activism, such as the backlash against the Tanishq advertisement in India (Bhatia et al., 2023).

In respect to product and brand contexts, this review noted a diversify focus from multinational corporations like Nestle to domestic brands like Tanishq, which have experiencing backlash due to perceived cultural insensitivity. This diversity brings out the range of issues that potentially set off consumer boycotts and its potential impact on country's economy growth. Boycotts can go beyond specific brands and extend to entire product categories, as in the case of Turkish products in Iraqi Kurdistan (Ali, 2021). In other instances, they include daily consumer goods in response to economic sanctions (Kim et al., 2022).

In contrast, studies from the Western context, boycott motivations are often underpinned by ethical and moral considerations. In United States, studies further indicate the influence of moral intensity and sociopolitical stances on boycott intentions, resulted from the case of Ben & Jerry's stance on gun control (Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Hong & Li, 2021). The above observations are complemented by research in other regions, such as India (Bhatia et al., 2023; Pandey et al., 2021) and Turkey (Keskin et al., 2024; Ulker-Demirel, Yuruk-Kayapinar, & Kayapinar, 2021), where social media dynamics and corporate social irresponsibility are shown to be critical drivers of boycotts. Several studies were conducted in Europe and the UK (Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Woodside et al., 2023) to illustrate the impacts of corporate unethical action such as work violations, the use harmful ingredients on consumer boycotts.

Table 3: Geographic focus

Geographic Focus	Sources
Malaysia	(Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019)
Lebanon	(Farah, 2011; Farah & Newman, 2009)
Republic of Korea	(Shin & Yoon, 2018)
Brazil	(Cruz et al., 2013)
United States	(Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Hong & Li, 2021; Klein et al., 2001; Lasarov et al., 2023; Woodside et al., 2023)
Lucknow, India	(Bhatia et al., 2023; Pandey et al., 2021)
Iraqi Kurdistan	(Ali, 2021)
Istanbul, Turkey	(Keskin et al., 2024; Ulker-Demirel et al., 2021)
South Korea and Japan	(Kim et al., 2022)
Germany	(Lasarov et al., 2023)
France, UK	(Woodside et al., 2023)

Characteristics

Antecedents and Motivations for Customer Boycotts

The literature identifies a variety of antecedents and motivations for customer boycotts, welling from individual, social, and contextual factors. First, individual determinants such as the perceived egregiousness of a company's acts (Klein et al., 2004; Lasarov et al., 2023), the desire for "clean hands" (Klein et al., 2004), the need for self-enhancement (Klein et al., 2004), and attitudes, beliefs, and perceived behavioral control (Farah, 2011; Farah & Newman, 2009) play a significant role in triggering boycott behavior. Consumers are also motivated by ethical concerns, such as those related to labor violations, animal cruelty, or environmental damage (Bhatia et al., 2023; Woodside et al., 2023). Additionally, political and social issues, like a company's stance on controversial topics or involvement in political conflicts, can spark boycotts as a form of political consumerism (Ali, 2021; Hong & Li, 2021).

Second, social factors, such as social pressure and the influence of social media, can also amplify boycott intentions and behaviors (Pandey et al., 2021). The perceived participation of others and the credibility of boycott messages can significantly influence individual decisions to join a boycott (Shin & Yoon, 2018).

Third, contextual factors such as cultural context can influence consumer animosity and affinity towards brands (Kim et al., 2022). Company's social responsibility practices and impression management tactics (Keskin et al., 2024), political animosity and economic sanctions (Ali, 2021) are also the underlying reasons that trigger boycotts intention among the consumers (Ali, 2021). Furthermore, other vital motivators for boycotts are emotional- related factors, including consumer animosity, brand hate, and moral outrage are also significant drivers of boycotts (Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Kim et al., 2022; Woodside et al., 2023). The effect of these emotions can be moderated by media framing as well as the perceived egregiousness of the company's actions, all of which magnify boycott intentions and participation.

Moderating Factors

While the aforementioned antecedents provide a foundation for understanding boycott motivations, several moderating factors are found to influence the intensity and duration of boycott participation. These include consumer affinity towards the brand, (Kim et al., 2022), the perceived personal costs and benefits of participating in the boycott (Klein et al., 2001; Klein et al., 2004; Lasarov et al., 2023), the cultural context (Kim et al., 2022), and individual differences in moral awareness and values (Bravo & Chapa, 2024). These moderating factors can either amplify or dampen the effects of the antecedents, leading to variations in boycott participation and outcomes.

Outcomes and Consequences of Customer Boycotts

The outcomes and consequences of customer boycotts are far-reaching, impacting both the targeted companies and the broader marketplace. For examples, the act of reducing purchase by the existing consumers may result in financial loss for a company (Kim et al., 2022), damage brand equity, affect consumer trust, and provoke dramatical change in company policy or practice (Keskin et al., 2024; Klein et al., 2004). In certain scenario, boycott can have wide social and political impacts, as it raises awareness on the issues that need to shape the policy decisions. For instance, boycotts of companies that support Israel's occupation of Palestine are

moderately effective in awareness-raising and, especially in the short term, at expressing solidarity with Palestinians (Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019). Additionally, boycotts can foster solidarity and collective action among participants, enhance their identification with the cause (Klein et al., 2001; Klein et al., 2004). Despite this fact, direct measurement of the outcomes of boycotts and their long-term effects is a challenge in many studies, underlining the importance of further research.

Table 4: Key variables related to the literatures

Characteristic	Key Variables	Citations
Antecedents and Motivations	Perceived egregiousness, ethical concerns, political and social issues, consumer animosity, social influence	(Ali, 2021; Bhatia et al., 2023; Hong & Li, 2021; Klein et al., 2001; Klein et al., 2004; Lasarov et al., 2023; Pandey et al., 2021; Shin & Yoon, 2018; Woodside et al., 2023)
Moderating Factors	Consumer affinity, perceived costs and benefits, cultural context, individual differences (moral awareness, values)	(Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Kim et al., 2022; Klein et al., 2004; Lasarov et al., 2023)
Outcomes and Consequences	Financial losses, brand image, corporate behavior, social and political impact	(Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019; Keskin et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2022; Klein et al., 2004)

Method

As demonstrated in Table 5, the methodological techniques utilized in the consumer boycott literature mainly concentrate on quantitative research (Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019; Kim et al., 2022; Pandey et al., 2021; Ulker-Demirel et al., 2021; Woodside et al., 2023), i.e., survey method. This prominent focus on quantitative research facilitates the discovery of extensive patterns and relationships among variables, thereby contributing to a comprehensive understanding of boycott behavior. Nonetheless, the dependence on cross-sectional design may restrict insights into the nature of boycotts, as they record consumer sentiments at a particular juncture rather than monitoring their development over time.

To address this limitation, some studies have adopted longitudinal survey designs (Lasarov et al., 2023) and experimental approaches (Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Hong & Li, 2021; Klein et al., 2004) to examine the causal relationships between variables and the temporal dynamics of boycott participation. Additionally, the incorporation of mixed-methods (Farah, 2011) and qualitative approaches (Kerr et al., 2012; Makarem & Jae, 2016) provides a deeper understanding of the nuanced motivations and experiences of boycott participants. The emergence of machine learning techniques in analyzing social media data (Bhatia et al., 2023) further expands the methodological toolkit, enabling the exploration of large-scale datasets and uncovering hidden patterns in consumer behavior. However, the limited use of mixed-methods designs and the application of machine learning suggest potential avenues for future research to enhance our comprehension of the complex and evolving phenomenon of consumer boycotts.

Table 5: Research method from relevant literatures

Method	Research Design	Data Collection	Citations
Quantitative	Survey, Cross-sectional	Online survey	(Hamzah & Mustafa, 2019)
		Convenience sampling from post-graduate students at universities in Lucknow, India.	(Pandey et al., 2021)
		Online survey using an online market research panel	(Kim et al., 2022)
		Survey administered to a randomized systematic sample of 500 Muslim and Christian consumers.	(Farah & Newman, 2009)
		Survey (Face-to-face)	(Ulker-Demirel et al., 2021)
	Survey, Longitudinal Survey, Experimental	Survey data from national samples	(Woodside et al., 2023)
		Online survey	(Keskin et al., 2024)
		Online surveys	(Lasarov et al., 2023)
		Online Survey	(Bravo & Chapa, 2024)
		Surveys, product choice experiment	(Klein et al., 2004)
Mixed-methods Qualitative	Survey, Cross-sectional	Online surveys or experimental tasks	(Hong & Li, 2021)
	Content Analysis	Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires	(Farah, 2011)
		Content analysis of weblogs (blogs)	(Kerr et al., 2012)
Machine Learning	Social Media Analysis	Twitter API	(Makarem & Jae, 2016)
		Twitter API	(Bhatia et al., 2023)

Managerial Implication

The articles on customer boycotts yield crucial insights for managers and organizations attempting to navigate the domain of consumer activism. One of the key lessons is the significance of proactively addressing consumer concerns and aligning business practices with the values and expectations of target markets (Klein et al., 2004; Shin & Yoon, 2018). By understanding the antecedents and motivations behind boycotts, such as perceived egregiousness of company actions, ethical concerns, and political issues, managers can take imperative steps to mitigate the risk of boycotts and maintain positive relationships with its consumers (Bhatia et al., 2023; Woodside et al., 2023).

Effective communication and reputation management strategies emerge as crucial tools to address boycotts' issues or seeking effective ways to prevent it (Bravo & Chapa, 2024; Keskin et al., 2024). Managers should be prepared to respond quickly and transparently to consumer concerns, addressing the specific issues raised and demonstrating a commitment to ethical and socially responsible practices (Farah & Newman, 2009). Engaging in dialogue with consumers,

stakeholders, and activists can help to build trust and foster understanding, potentially mitigating the impact of boycotts (Ali, 2021; Kim et al., 2022).

The role of cultural sensitivity and adaptability in managing boycott risks is another important implication for managers operating in diverse markets (Kim et al., 2022; Pandey et al., 2021). Understanding the cultural, political, and social contexts in which boycotts occur can help companies tailor their strategies and messaging to the specific needs and expectations of different consumer segments (Ali, 2021; Bhatia et al., 2023). Developing a deep understanding of local market dynamics and building strong relationships with local partners and stakeholders can help to navigate the complexities of consumer activism in different cultural settings (Farah & Newman, 2009; Kim et al., 2022).

The growing influence of social media in accelerating boycott communication and mobilization presents both challenges and opportunities for managers (Bhatia et al., 2023; Makarem & Jae, 2016). On one hand, the rapid spread of information and the ability of consumers to organize and express their discontent online can amplify the impact of boycotts and damage brand reputation (Bhatia et al., 2023). Yet, if social media is used appropriately, it can be a valuable channel for companies to engage with consumers, monitor sentiment, and proactively address concerns (Makarem & Jae, 2016). Developing a strong online presence, actively listening to consumer feedback, and effectively managing digital communications can help companies to mitigate the risks associated with online boycott campaigns (Kerr et al., 2012; Makarem & Jae, 2016).

Finally, the potential for boycotts to have broader social and political impacts highlights the need for managers to consider the wider implications of their actions and to engage in corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives that align with the values and expectations of their stakeholders (Keskin et al., 2024; Klein et al., 2004). By contributing to positive social change, addressing important issues, and demonstrating a consistent commitment to ethical and sustainable practices, companies can build goodwill and resilience in the face of consumer activism (Farah & Newman, 2009; Woodside et al., 2023).

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS ON COSTOMER BOYCOTT

Building upon the existing literature, several avenues for future research on consumer boycotts emerge. First, to delve deeper into the individual factors influencing boycott participation, researchers could investigate the relationship between moral identity, perceived egregiousness, and boycott intentions (Klein et al., 2004; Lasarov et al., 2023). This could involve examining how different aspects of moral identity, such as internalization and symbolization, influence consumers' responses to corporate transgressions. Additionally, exploring the role of personality-related factors, such as self-enhancement in boycott behavior could shed light on the psychological mechanisms that drive individuals to participate in collective action (Klein et al., 2001; Klein et al., 2004). The propositions are shown as followed:

Proposition 1a: The perceived egregiousness of a company's actions will positively influence consumers' moral outrage, increasing boycott intentions and participation.

Proposition 1b: Consumers' moral identity will moderate the relationship between perceived ethical violations and boycott intentions.

Proposition 1c: Self-enhancement is a significant factor influencing consumer boycott participation.

Second, to understand the social factors of boycotts, future research could examine the role of social media platforms in facilitating communication, mobilization, and the spread of boycott messages. Investigating the message sources, such as influencers, celebrities, or organizations, on clarify the viral issues could the credibility of the messages (Shin & Yoon, 2018).

Proposition 2a: Social norms and perceived social support will positively influence an individual's intention to participate in a boycott campaign and the duration of their participation.

Proposition 2b: The credibility of boycott messages and their source will significantly impact consumers' perceptions of boycott effectiveness and their willingness to participate.

Third, to explore the contextual factors shaping boycott behavior, researchers could conduct cross-cultural studies to examine how cultural values and norms influence consumer responses to corporate actions and boycotts (Kim et al., 2022). Additionally, investigating the impact of media framing on boycott participation could reveal how different narratives and portrayals of corporate misconduct shape public opinion and consumer activism (Kerr et al., 2012). The severity of economic sanctions and their correlation with consumer animosity and subsequent boycott intentions towards products from the sanctioned country is another area ripe for exploration (Kim et al., 2022). Furthermore, understanding the impact of company social irresponsibility, particularly during crises, on consumer boycott intentions can inform effective crisis management strategies (Keskin et al., 2024).

Proposition 3a: Cultural context plays a significant role in shaping consumer responses to corporate actions, including boycotts.

Proposition 3b: Media attention will positively influence public awareness and participation in the boycott campaign.

Proposition 3c: The severity of economic sanctions imposed on a country will positively correlate with consumer animosity and boycott intentions.

Proposition 3d: Company social irresponsibility during crises will significantly increase customer boycott intentions.

Finally, to understand the emotional underpinnings of boycotts, future research could examine the role of specific emotions, such as anger, disgust, and moral outrage, in driving boycott intentions and behaviors. Investigating how these emotions interact with cognitive factors, such as perceived effectiveness and social norms, could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the complex psychological processes involved in consumer boycotts (Makarem & Jae, 2016; Woodside et al., 2023).

Proposition 4a: Emotions play a significant role in driving boycott participation.

Proposition 4b: Negative emotions towards a brand mediate the relationship between perceived social irresponsibility and consumer responses, including boycotts.

CONCLUSION

The exploration of customer boycotts through the lens of the TCCM framework has illuminated the multifaceted nature of this phenomenon, revealing a complex interplay of individual motivations, social dynamics, contextual factors, and emotional responses. The literature underscores that boycotts are not merely isolated acts of consumer dissatisfaction but rather a powerful form of collective action deeply embedded in social, political, and ethical contexts. The use of various theoretical foundations in customer boycott research have offer a more nuanced understanding of the cognitive, emotional, and social processes that drive boycott participation.

The contextual analysis of customer boycotts reveals a diverse array of geographic, cultural, and socio-political factors that shape boycott motivations and behaviors across the globe. From the political solidarity driving boycotts in the Middle East and Malaysia to the ethical considerations and sociopolitical stances influencing consumer activism in the United States and Europe, the literature highlights the importance of understanding the specific contexts in which boycotts occur. Furthermore, the growing influence of social media and online platforms in amplifying boycott communication and mobilization presents both challenges and opportunities for businesses and activists alike.

The synthesis of key characteristics of customer boycotts, including antecedents, motivations, moderating factors, and consequences, provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the reasons that trigger consumers intentions to participate in boycott campaign. The literature identifies a range of individual, social, and contextual factors that motivate boycott participation, such as perceived egregiousness of company actions, consumer animosity, instrumental and expressive motivations, and social pressure. Additionally, moderating factors, such as consumer affinity, demographic variables, and cultural context, influence the intensity and duration of boycott engagement. The consequences of boycotts extend beyond the financial impact on targeted companies, encompassing reputational damage, changes in corporate policies and practices, and potential unintended effects.

However, the literature also reveals several gaps and limitations in our understanding of consumer boycotts. The over-reliance on cross-sectional surveys and the limited use of mixed methods designs call for more nuanced and comprehensive research approaches. Future studies could explore the long-term effects of boycotts, the role of social media in amplifying boycotts, and the effectiveness of different strategies to counter consumer boycotts.

Reference

- Abosag, I., & Farah, F. M. (2014). The influence of religiously motivated consumer boycotts on brand image, loyalty and product judgment. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(11/12), 2262–2283. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-12-2013-0737>
- Ali, B. J. (2021). Impact of consumer animosity, boycott participation, boycott motivation, and product judgment on purchase readiness or aversion of Kurdish consumers in Iraq. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 55(2), 504–523. (68). <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12350>

- Bhatia, R., Gupta, A., Vimalkumar, M., & Sharma, D. (2023). Factors affecting Consumer Brand Sabotage virality: A study of an Indian brand #boycott. *Information Systems and E-Business Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10257-023-00628-0>
- Bravo, O. S.-A. C., & Chapa, S. (2024). Testing the effects of moral intensity news frames on consumer boycott intention. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 41(2), 226–238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-06-2022-5413>
- Cruz, B. D. P. A., Pires Jr, R. J. M., & Ross, S. D. (2013). Gender Difference in the Perception of Guilt in Consumer Boycott. *Review of Business Management*. <https://doi.org/10.7819/rbgn.v15i49.1357>
- Farah, M. F. (2011). The Arab Consumer Boycott of American Products: Motives and Intentions. In Ö. Sandıkçı & G. Rice (Eds.), *Handbook of Islamic Marketing*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857936028.00030>
- Farah, M. F., & Newman, A. J. (2009). Exploring consumer boycott intelligence using a socio-cognitive approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(4), 347–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.03.019>
- Friedman, M. (1985). Consumer Boycotts in the United States, 1970–1980: Contemporary Events in Historical Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 19(1), 96–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.1985.tb00346.x>
- Garrett, D. E. (1987). The Effectiveness of Marketing Policy Boycotts: Environmental Opposition to Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298705100204>
- Glennon, R. J. (1991). The Role of Law in the Civil Rights Movement: The Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955–1957. *Law and History Review*, 9(1), 59–112. <https://doi.org/10.2307/743660>
- Hamzah, H., & Mustafa, H. (2019). Exploring consumer boycott intelligence towards Israel-related companies in Malaysia: An integration of the theory of planned behaviour with transtheoretical stages of change. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 10(1), 208–226. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-06-2017-0070>
- Hong, C., & Li, C. (2021). Will Consumers Silence Themselves When Brands Speak up about Sociopolitical Issues? Applying the Spiral of Silence Theory to Consumer Boycott and Buycott Behaviors. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 33(2), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495142.2020.1865234>
- James, V. K. (2010). A socio-cultural approach to exploring consumer boycott intelligence: A commentary essay. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(4), 363–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.04.015>
- Kerr, G., Mortimer, K., Dickinson, S., & Waller, D. S. (2012). Buy, boycott or blog: Exploring online consumer power to share, discuss and distribute controversial advertising messages. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(3/4), 387–405. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561211202521>
- Keskin, H., Esen, E., & Bozkurt, S. (2024). Company social irresponsibility and customer boycott intention in times of crisis. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00300-7>
- Kim, C., Yan, X., Kim, J., Terasaki, S., & Furukawa, H. (2022). Effect of consumer animosity on boycott campaigns in a cross-cultural context: Does consumer affinity matter? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 69, 103123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103123>

- Klein, J. G., John, A., & Smith, N. C. (2001). *EXPLORING MOTIVATIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN A CONSUMER BOYCOTT*. London Business School. 2024-05-31.
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C., & John, A. (2004). Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(3), 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.3.92.34770>
- Lasarov, W., Hoffmann, S., & Orth, U. (2023). Vanishing Boycott Impetus: Why and How Consumer Participation in a Boycott Decreases Over Time. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 182(4), 1129–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04997-9>
- Liao, Z., & Liu, Y. (2022). Why Firm's Reactive Eco-innovation May Lead to Consumers' Boycott. *British Journal of Management*, 33(2), 1110–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12483>
- Lightfoot, E. B. (2019). Consumer Activism for Social Change. *Social Work*, 64(4), 301–309. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swz035>
- Makarem, S. C., & Jae, H. (2016). Consumer Boycott Behavior: An Exploratory Analysis of Twitter Feeds. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 50(1), 193–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12080>
- Micheletti, M. (2003). *Political Virtue and Shopping*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403973764>
- Ning, B., Omar, R., Ye, Y., Ting, H., & Ning, M. (2021). The Role of Zhong-Yong Thinking in Business and Management Research: A Review and Future Research Agenda. *Asia Pacific Business Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2021.1857956>
- Pandey, S. P., Ahmad, Y., & Gautam, A. (2021). Consumer Motivations for Boycott. *Pacific Business Review*, 14(6), 51–63.
- Paul, J., Parthasarathy, S., & Gupta, P. (2017). Exporting challenges of SMEs: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of World Business*, 52(3), 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2017.01.003>
- Phemister, A. (2024). A Free Market of Morals: Boycotting, Liberalism, and Property. *Global Perspectives*, 5(1), 116152. <https://doi.org/10.1525/gp.2024.116152>
- Phibbs, C. (2009). *The Montgomery Bus Boycott: A History and Reference Guide* (1st ed.). ABC-CLIO, LLC. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798400687297>
- Shin, S., & Yoon, S. (2018). Consumer motivation for the decision to boycott: The social dilemma. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42(4), 439–447. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12444>
- Stolle, D., Hooghe, M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the Supermarket: Political Consumerism as a Form of Political Participation. *International Political Science Review*, 26(3), 245–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512105053784>
- Ulker-Demirel, E., Yuruk-Kayapinar, P., & Kayapinar, O. (2021). The role of consumer ethnocentrism on boycott behaviour: What if a domestic business behaves egregiously? *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de l'Administration*, 38(4), 354–368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.1600>
- Woodside, A. G., Akrou, H., & Mrad, M. (2023). Consumer hate and boycott communications of socially irresponsible fashion brands: Applying complexity theory in psychology and marketing research. *Psychology & Marketing*, 40(10), 1986–2015. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21890>