BOYCOTTING, BUYCOTTING, AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF POLITICAL CONSUMERISM

Cindy D. Kam
William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor
Department of Political Science
Vanderbilt University
cindy.d.kam@vanderbilt.edu

Maggie A. Deichert
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Political Science
Vanderbilt University
maggie.deichert@vanderbilt.edu

March 2, 2017

BOYCOTTING, BUYCOTTING, AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF POLITICAL CONSUMERISM

Political consumerism refers to the intentional avoidance or purchase of products due to political, social, or ethical concerns. The intentional avoidance (boycotting) and the intentional purchase (buycotting) of products have begun to receive increasing attention in the political science literature. In this paper, we offer a conceptual framework for understanding and disentangling boycotting and buycotting, based on a psychological framework of avoidance and approach, respectively. Doing so provides us with further conceptual leverage for arguing for the distinctiveness of boycotting within the repertoire of political participation. We design and execute two original survey experiments to identify the differential effects of negative and positive information in inducing boycotting and buycotting, respectively. In both studies, we find that negative information is far more powerful in inducing boycotting than positive information is in inducing buycotting.

BOYCOTTING, BUYCOTTING AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF POLITICAL CONSUMERISM

"…if a shoe worker in Korea or Taiwan had gone to sleep in the shoe factory there ten years ago and wakened in a shoe factory in Indonesia or Vietnam today, [he or she would have] thought that he or she had died and gone to heaven; the conditions have improved dramatically." (Phil Knight, then-CEO of Nike, at a Nike Shareholders Meeting, Sept 1997)

"The Nike product has become synonymous with slave wages, forced overtime, and arbitrary abuse… I truly believe the American consumer doesn't want to buy products made under abusive conditions" (Phil Knight, then-CEO of Nike, National Press Club, May 1998)

What started as a low murmur in the late 1980s sparked a global boycott a decade later. In 1991, a human rights activists report documented low wages and poor working conditions at Nike-related factories, and a scattering of news articles reported on it around the world. A 1992 *Harper's Magazine* article described inhumane working conditions at a Nike-related sweatshop in Indonesia, ranging from wages far less than minimum wage, workers' inability to unionize, no overtime pay, dangerous working conditions and child labor (Ballinger 1992). News slowly began to spread about the abhorrent working conditions and abuse of workers in Nike-associated sweatshops. It was not until the mid-1990s that *The New York Times* engaged with the issue. By then, college students had organized boycotts of the brand (Araton 1997) and Michael Jordan was criticized for receiving a $20 million endorsement fee while factory workers received 45 cents-per-hour (Jones 1996). For years, Nike tried to downplay the problem. Finally, amidst mounting public pressure, and on the heels Kathie Lee Gifford's highly-publicized sweatshop scandal, in 1998, then-CEO Phil Knight publicly acknowledged the severity of the issue and vowed to institute changes at Nike. Although criticism of labor conditions at Nike-related factories still persists (though at a significantly lower volume), Nike has instituted changes to the rules governing its supply chain and its monitoring therein, and has become a leader in Corporate Social Responsibility (Epstein-Reeves 2010).

Labor scandals are certainly not limited to Nike. Many companies, including Wal-Mart and Driscoll's, have been targeted for consumer boycotts and protests due to low wages and mistreatment of employees (Bloomberg News 2005; Varner 2016). In addition, workers' rights activists have also promoted the notion of buycotting, or intentionally buying products in order to support companies that pay workers fair wages and create positive working environments. An example of this is buycotting fair trade certified products: by financially supporting companies that provide workers with a living wage, the public can help to improve the working and living conditions of workers in developing countries around the world (Halty 2016).

The Nike controversy provides just one example of many where politics and consumerism meet. In this example, and others, political preferences influence consumer behavior, and in turn, consumer behavior takes on political significance as a form of participation that can influence corporate policy. We suggest that the intentional act of buying or of refusing to buy a particular product fulfills a number of the functions of more commonly studied political acts such as voting, contacting an official, protesting, or joining an organization. Intentionally avoiding (boycotting) or intentionally purchasing (buycotting) products ranging from sneakers to fruit to coffee provides a way for individuals to express their opinions or values through everyday actions. These consumer behaviors provide an outlet for the expression of political preferences, political identity, or political values. These expressions may be motivated by the desire for self-expression of one's sense of identity or values or instrumental change to enact change in (public or corporate) policy or social gratification to prove to others who one is. These motivations are common in political participation as well (Verba et al. 1995).

Beyond these commonalities, we also argue that political consumerism is unique compared to other forms of political participation in many respects. Consumption choices occur

on the individual level, are not governed by an institutional calendar, may or may not be orchestrated by political elites, and, perhaps most obviously, are concrete acts offering observable consequences for the individual (either buying the product or not buying it). We take the investigation of political consumerism further by arguing that boycotting and buycotting should be conceptualized in distinct ways. Boycotting behavior – that is, the decision *not* to do something – is quite distinct from all of the other participatory behaviors, including buycotting, – which are all acts of engagement – that is *of doing*. Here, we develop a conceptual understanding of the motivational forces driving political consumption and consider the distinctiveness of political consumption relative to traditional forms of political participation.

Political Consumption: Disentangling Boycotting and Buycotting

The term "boycott" dates to the late 19th century and came into English parlance to describe the organized, collective shunning of Captain Charles Boycott, a land agent who was charged with evicting a set of tenants. Captain Boycott found himself the target of a collective social movement organized to protest his charge: workers refused to work for him, traders refused to trade with him (*Oxford English Dictionary* 2016). Very quickly "boycott" was picked up by the press to represent the intentional avoidance of a person or business. And, even before it had the terminology of boycotting attached, the intentional avoidance of an entity, product, or a brand for political, social or an ethical reason was not new. In the United States, boycotts have played a part in the evolving American political landscape, with notable examples including the Civil Rights Era Woolworth counter sit-ins (and subsequent boycotts), international crisis-sparked boycotts of foreign goods, and even more recently, boycotts of the 2016 Oscars. Buycotts, a term that blends "buy" with "boycott," appear in, for example, calls to "Shop Local," "Buy American," or in campaigns to support companies that abide by fair trade standards, use

sustainable resources, or support the rights of animals or particular social groups. According to the 2016 ANES Pilot Study, 32% of respondents reported having engaged in boycotting and 22% of respondents reported having engaged in buycotting within the past 12 months; these levels of political consumerism are on par with rates of displaying campaign paraphernalia (22%) and donating to campaigns (28%).

Despite the prominence and prevalence of political consumerism, the systematic study of the determinants of boycotting and buycotting is still emerging in political science (Friedman 1999; Newman and Bartels 2011; Norris 2002; Stolle et al. 2005). Much of the existing literature on political consumerism has examined its individual-level determinants – be they demographic, attitudinal, or ideological – to catalog who engages in political consumerism.[1] Political consumers tend to have higher levels of political interest while simultaneously holding lower levels of trust in government (Bennett 2012; Dalton 2008; Kim 2012; Newman and Bartels 2011; Starr 2009). These individuals are politically conscious and aware, yet tend to engage in non-electoral political acts because they see the government as an ineffective institution (Copeland 2014; Stolle et al. 2005). Importantly, the locus for political consumerism is often the corporation, not government: individuals who engage in political consumerism see it as a personal responsibility to attempt to achieve their goals through putting pressure on private corporations (Micheletti 2003). Some evidence suggests that people who engage in political consumption are on average more likely to engage in other types of political participation, but

---

[1] Like people who engage in traditional forms of political participation, individuals who are political consumers are also more likely to be educated, white and wealthier than non-political consumers (Carfagna et al. 2014; Goul Andersen and Tobiasen 2004; Newman and Bartels 2011; Shah et al. 2007; Starr 2009). However, political consumers might be younger (Newman and Bartels 2011; but see Goul Andersen and Tobiasen 2004). Some literature suggests women are more likely to engage in political consumerism (i.e., Stolle et al. 2005; but see Newman and Bartels 2011).

there are mixed findings regarding which acts are most likely to be conducted by political consumers (de Zúñiga et al. 2013; Newman and Bartels 2011).

Much of the existing research on political consumerism uses either historical qualitative case studies of specific instances of boycotts (or buycotts) or analyzes survey data responses based upon general recollections of whether or not individuals have engaged in boycotting or buycotting in the past year, without directly assessing the specific triggering events that inspired individuals to engage in either behavior. Case studies of boycotting and buycotting have highlighted a few points of distinction across boycotting and buycotting. In his social history of boycotts and buycotts, Friedman (1999) argues that boycotting is oriented towards punishing corporations for past transgressions (and possibly aimed at coercing a change of course in the corporation's behavior), and that buycotting is oriented towards rewarding corporations for virtuous deeds (and possibly aimed at encouraging continuation of that behavior). The case studies, while fascinating, suffer from the common problem of selecting on the dependent variable: these are (often) cultural histories that trace the (in-)effectiveness of boycotts or buycotts that occurred, and thus preclude clear examination of the conditions that trigger boycotting and buycotting.

The statistical analyses of self-reported participation in boycotting or buycotting can highlight the general state of engagement in these two acts. The vast majority of these survey analyses combine boycotting and buycotting into one measure of political consumerism and then correlate political consumerism with various demographic characteristics and attitudinal factors. However, the standard questions are so vague (simply asking for whether an individual engaged in the intentional purchase or intentional avoidance of a product due to political or social

concerns in the past twelve months or four years) that they curtail analysts' ability to identify the contextual factors that transform everyday consumer decisions into political acts.

The few statistical articles that have distinguished between boycotting and buycotting have found some demographic differences between boycotters and buycotters (although some points of commonality as well) (Baek 2010; Neilson 2010; Wicks et al. 2013) and some attitudinal differences between boycotters and buycotters (Copeland 2014; Neilson 2010). For example, Copeland (2014) finds that people who are reward-oriented are more likely to engage in buycotting and Neilson (2010) finds that buycotters are more altruistic than boycotters. We build upon this more recent literature by arguing for conceptual distinctions between boycotting and buycotting, and that these acts of political consumption should be thought of as more generally acts of avoidance and acts of engagement, respectively.

Here, we develop a theoretical framework that enables us to disentangle boycotting from buycotting decisions. We argue that an approach and avoidance framework may help us understand what motivates people to engage in buycotts and boycotts, and further, how boycotting, as an act of avoidance, may be distinct from other political acts.

People evaluate most if not all of their encountered stimuli through a basic affective lens, categorizing stimuli as either good or bad (Lodge and Taber 2013; Zajonc 1984). This evaluation occurs immediately, without intention and often occurs without the evaluator's awareness (Bargh 1997; Zajonc 1998). While sometimes this automatic evaluation can be "corrected" afterwards, this automatic affective evaluation can sharply affect subsequent attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behaviors (Devine 1989; Fazio et al. 1986). One way in which these fundamental affective evaluations shape behavioral response is through evoking approach or avoidance (Elliot and Covington 2001).

Psychologists using a muscle-activation approach have shown that negative evaluations of an object are automatically linked with avoidance behaviors, and positive evaluations of an object are automatically linked with approach behaviors; that is, subjects presented with negative stimuli are automatically primed to push the stimuli away, and subjects presented with positive stimuli are automatically primed to pull the stimuli towards them. Subjects demonstrate slower responses to incongruent pairings (when asked to pull negative stimuli close to them or push positive stimuli away) (Chen and Bargh 1999). In sum, objects that are automatically negatively evaluated prompt individuals to avoid the object. Conversely, positive evaluations of objects, in a similar fashion to pleasurable stimuli, promote behavioral reactions oriented towards approach where individuals who encounter these objects are more likely to engage with the stimuli, experience curiosity and explore the stimulus object more (e.g., see Elliot 2006 for a review). Importantly, the prevalence of negativity bias suggests that the impetus to avoid negativity is more compelling than the draw to approach positivity (Baumeister et al. 2001), and avoidance motivation is over-utilized compared to approach motivation (Elliot 2006, p. 115).

As we apply this approach and avoidance paradigm to political consumerism, we see boycotting as an act of avoidance – the deliberate decision to *not do* something based on negative information about an entity, product, or brand. We see buycotting as an act of approach – the deliberate decision *to do* something based on positive information about an entity, product, or brand. We expect people who receive negative information about an entity, product or brand to experience a negative reaction to the object and subsequently avoid that product or brand. Conversely, we expect people who hear positive information about a brand or product to want to engage with it and perhaps even go out of their way to purchase that product.

Moreover, the decision to *not do* something is not merely the opposite of the decision *to do* something. Recent work by Richetin et al. (2011) raises the important point that the motivations that people have for engaging in behaviors are different from the motivations that people have for *not* engaging in behaviors. In short: doing and not doing are not simply opposites, but can be grounded in different beliefs and cognitions. Analogously, we posit that boycotting and buycotting should not be conflated as "the same" behavior (as political acts that are interchangeable or additive) – nor should they be conflated as opposite behaviors. We believe they can be profitably distinguished from each other theoretically and empirically.

Given the psychological evidence suggesting that avoidance is an automatic reaction to negative stimuli, it would make sense for boycotting to be an "easier" course of action than, say, engaging in an effortful political act to address the negative stimuli. Other forms of political participation (i.e., writing a letter, joining a rally, or voting) are all approach-oriented and require the individual to work against innate human reactions to disengage from negative stimuli.

With this framework, we contribute to the existing literature by proposing a conceptual distinction between boycotting and buycotting by looking at the motivational forces that prompt these two types of behavior. We also design two experiments that enable us to examine the conditions under which people are more or less willing to engage in boycotting and buycotting as well as probe the mechanisms underlying these motivations.

Study 1: Experimentally Motivating Intentions to Boycott and Buycott

To test the effects of a company's values and policies on individuals' likelihood of engaging in political consumption, we designed a survey experiment where individuals were presented with a short hypothetical vignette about a local newspaper report. Our study was conducted in July 2015 through an online survey experiment using the web-based survey and

crowdsourcing platform, Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). 1,001 U.S. citizens over the age of 18 participated in exchange for a $2.00 payment. The study took about 10 minutes.

The study was described as a survey about public opinion on political attitudes and behaviors. Respondents answered demographic questions, general questions on political participation and personality traits, read a vignette about a hypothetical grocery store, and then answered a series of questions about the store. The vignette takes the form of a newspaper report. We experimentally manipulate the presence of a valence issue or no issue information (control group). Within the issue, we also manipulate whether this information is positive or negative. The full text of the vignettes appears in the Appendix.

We base our vignette upon the issue of corporate labor standards. Vast public approval of the improvement of workers' rights has affected the sales of several large corporations, including Wal-Mart, and is considered one of the more relevant considerations when deciding to shop at certain stores or boycott corporations (Ungar 2013). Both the global boycott of Nike in the 1990s and the Fair Trade buycott movement revolve around labor standards (Birch 2012). About 75% of the public consistently favors the improvement of working conditions, from raising the minimum wage to offering paid leave to parents with sick children (The New York Times/CBS News Poll 2015).

In our study, respondents received one of three descriptions of a hypothetical local grocery store. One of the vignettes focused on how the store treated its workers well. Another vignette focused on how the store treated its workers poorly. Both of these labor standards vignettes dealt with issues of wages, overtime, work breaks, and paid sick days and characterized the store as the "best" or the "worst" in town in terms of its treatment of workers. The third description, our control condition, did not provide any mention of the treatment of workers.

In all conditions, the store is described as providing "a wide selection of quality groceries and daily needs at a competitive price." We also vary the convenience of the store, to acknowledge that the willingness to engage in any participatory act may depend upon the perceived cost of doing so. As such, we randomly assign subjects to learn that the store is convenient (2 minutes away) or inconvenient (20 minutes away), in order to impose a cost to avoiding the store (especially if it is convenient) or to impose a cost to intentionally frequenting the store (especially if it is not convenient). Our expectation is that, when a store is close by, the likelihood of shopping there (given it is described as having "a wide selection of quality groceries and daily needs at a competitive price") is already quite high. Thus, positive information will have a bigger impact on encouraging shopping when the store is *inconvenient* as opposed to *convenient*. On the flip side, we expect that negative information will have a bigger impact on discouraging shopping when the store is *convenient* as opposed to *inconvenient*, since the base likelihood of shopping at the inconvenient store is already likely to be quite low. Our key dependent variable consists of respondents' self-reports of how likely they would be to shop at the store: from 0 (very unlikely) to 1 (very likely).

It is important to note the relatively covert nature of our design. Most standard questions on boycotting and buycotting ask respondents whether they have intentionally bought (or avoided buying) products based on agreement (or disagreement) with a company's values or policies. Our experimental design enables us to capture a change in the willingness to frequent a store *because of the experimentally manipulated information* without requiring subjects to consciously report that the information causes them to change their consumption choices.

Boycotting and Buycotting based on Treatment of Workers

We begin by focusing on the effect of the positive treatment of workers and the negative treatment of workers on subjects' willingness to shop at the store. The control condition, which does not mention treatment of workers, serves as the suppressed reference group. We also include covariates that tap the demographic and predispositional predictors of political consumerism as found in the current literature. Finally, we include a measure to indicate assignment to the convenient or inconvenient store. The OLS results appear in Table 1.[2]

Looking at the first column of results in Table 1, we see that both positive and negative information significantly affect the expected likelihood of shopping at the store. The positive treatment significantly increases the reported likelihood of shopping at the store by 0.16 units (on a 0-1 scale) compared to the control condition, and the negative treatment significantly decreases the reported likelihood of shopping at the store by 0.43 units (on a 0-1 scale), compared to the control condition. Consistent with the literature on negativity bias, the negative treatment has a significantly (Wald test, $p<0.001$) and substantially larger effect (in magnitude) than the positive working condition treatment. And, fascinatingly, the effect of negative information is just about three times the effect of positive information. This 3:1 ratio in the size of the effects is also consistent with the standing literature on positivity; Fredrickson's (2009) 3:1 ratio suggests that it takes three positive pieces of information to equal one negative piece of information. The remaining coefficients in the column show that there is a significant effect for location: subjects who hear that the store is only two minutes away express a significantly higher likelihood of shopping at the store, as expected.

---

[2] OLS provides us with more interpretable coefficients. Ordered probit produces results that are essentially identical in significance and direction.

The next two columns disaggregate the results based upon location of the store. Comparing across columns, we see that the effect of the positive treatment is relatively higher for the inconvenient store (as expected), and the effect of the negative treatment is relatively higher for the convenient store (as expected), although our sample size hampers our ability to crisply differentiate the effects.[2] Regardless of whether the store is far away or close by, it is worth noting that the effect of negative information is significantly greater in magnitude than the effect of positive information (Wald test, $p<0.001$ in each case).

Overall, our data reflect a general negativity bias that facilitates boycotting. Respondents seem more likely to respond to negative information about a store by boycotting, or engaging in effortless, avoidance behavior, than to respond to positive information about a store by buycotting, or engaging in effortful, costly behavior. The effect size of this negative information on the likelihood of boycotting is in many cases significantly larger than the effect of positive information on the likelihood of buycotting.

Orientations towards Reward vs. Punishment? Conflict vs. Cooperation?

Previous studies of political consumerism have suggested that these acts reflect orientations to reward others (through buycotting) or to punish others (through boycotting), or they reflect predispositions to engage in cooperation (through buycotting) versus conflict (through boycotting). In this section, we probe into these possibilities.

To understand whether boycotting and buycotting stem from these general orientations toward reward or punishment, we included a set of questions asking respondents if they thought reward or punishment would be more effective in a variety of contexts (raising children,

---

[2] In a model interacting *Close* with all other variables, the coefficient on *Close x Workers Treated Positively* is not significant (b=-0.05, s.e. = 0.05) and the coefficient on *Close x Workers Treated Negatively* is only marginally significant (b=-0.08, s.e. = 0.05, $p<0.07$, one-tailed).

supervising employees, voting in an election, and improving performance on MTurk). Because

subjects overwhelmingly supported reward over punishment, we create a dichotomous variable

to indicate those who supported reward over punishment in all four scenarios (approximately

60% of the sample) from those who did not. We interacted this variable with the positive and

negative information treatments, to determine if those who are more reward-oriented are more

likely to report a higher likelihood of frequenting the store following the positive information

and, on the flip side, if those who are more punishment-oriented report a lower likelihood of

frequenting the store. As shown in Table 2, both interactions were small and significantly

indistinguishable from zero. From this evidence, it does not appear that boycotting and

buycotting in our scenario were driven by orientations toward reward and punishment.

To speak to the suggestion that boycotting and buycotting derive from orientations

towards conflict, we also included two different measures of conflict orientation. The first

comprises the two items from the Agreeableness scale of the *Ten-Item Personality Inventory*

(Gosling et al. 2003), recoded to range from 0 (most agreeable) to 1 (most disagreeable). We

include an interaction with the positive and negative information treatments, to determine if

those who are more disagreeable are more likely to respond to negative information and if those

who are more agreeable are more likely to respond to positive information. In this case, as

shown in the second column of results in Table 2, the interaction between disagreeableness and

positive information is not statistically distinguishable from zero, and the interaction between

disagreeableness and negative information, though significant, actually runs the wrong way (the

effect of the negative information treatment declines the more disagreeable someone is). Our

second measure of conflict orientation is based on Mutz's (2015) five-item Conflict

Approach/Avoidance Subscale ($\alpha = 0.89$) to tap willingness to approach conflict. We interacted

13

it with the positive and negative information treatments, as shown in the third column of results in Table 2. Here, both interactions were indistinguishable from zero. Moreover, the interaction between conflict interaction and negative information was signed in the wrong direction, suggesting that, if anything, conflict orientation attenuates the link between negative information and a willingness to engage in boycotting.

Overall, our results suggest that boycotting and buycotting are not simply political expressions of predispositions towards either reward/punishment or towards conflict. What, then, might help us understand propensities to engage in boycotting or buycotting?

Boycotts for Boycotters

In this section, we examine whether people are predisposed to be avoiders versus engagers by looking at how participants' past political behavior affects their likelihood of engaging in political consumption in our scenario. Early in the pre-stimulus questionnaire, respondents were asked a number of questions about their behaviors in the past 12 months, including focal questions concerning past boycotting or buycotting. Within our sample, 52% of respondents said that they had boycotted in the past 12 months ("NOT bought a certain product or service because you disagree with the company's social or political values") and about 46% of the sample indicated that they had buycotted in the past 12 months ("bought a certain product because you like the company's social and political values"). About 40% of respondents had done neither and 38% had done both. We use two separate dummy variables to capture the distinct past behavior of boycotting and buycotting in this next round of analyses.

Interacting each of the past behavior variables with each of the two working conditions treatments enables us to address whether a moderating relationship exists conditional on past political consumption behavior in general, indiscriminate across the type of behavior, or whether

the moderating effect is specific to the type of political consumption behavior. That is, are some

people predisposed to be avoiders? Are some predisposed to be approachers?

The OLS results in Table 3 first show that, in the absence of issue information, the

decision to shop at the hypothetical store is not politicized. The tiny and insignificant

coefficients for *Past Boycott* (b=0.03, s.e. = 0.04) and *Past Buycott* (b=0.03, s.e. = 0.04) tell us

that in the control condition, as expected, whether an individual boycotted or buycotted in the

past twelve months is irrelevant to the likelihood of shopping at the hypothetical store. We also

see that introducing the negative information has a substantial effect on reducing the likelihood

of shopping at the store among those who have boycotted in the past. Among those who have

not boycotted in the past twelve months, the negative information reduces the likelihood of

shopping at the store by 0.30 units (on a 0-1 scale). Among those who *have* boycotted in the past

twelve months, the effect of negative information is even more pronounced: the increase in effect

size is statistically significant and substantial, reducing the likelihood of shopping at the store by

0.52 units (-0.30+ -0.22 = -0.52). We also see that buycotting behavior does not have the same

resonance. Those who have buycotted in the past are no more likely to respond to the positive

information about the store than those who have not buycotted in the past (b=-0.01, s.e. = 0.06).

Could these effects simply reflect the greater likelihood of the politically active to

respond to negative information? The difference in receptivity across past boycotters and past

buycotters provides initial indication that this is not the case, since past buycotters do not react to

negative (or positive information), but past boycotters react (only to) negative information. To

investigate this question further, we create an index of past participation[3] and interact the index

---

[3] We combine the following nine political acts into an additive scale, ranging from 0 (no acts) to
1 (all 9), with $\alpha = 0.77$, mean = 0.26, and s.d. = 0.24. The acts are: being a member of social,
political organization; signing a paper petition; signing an online petition; joining a protest;

with each of the treatments. We then include these three variables in the model, and the results

appear in the second column of results in Table 3. There, we see that there are no significant

effects attributable to past participation, either alone or when interacted with the treatments.

Moreover, the key interactive effect for *Past Boycott x Workers Treated Negatively* is untouched.

These results reinforce the distinctiveness of boycotting relative to buycotting and to

other political acts. Those who are most likely to respond to the negative information in our

treatment with a reduced likelihood to frequent the store are those who have engaged in

boycotting in the past – not those who have engaged in more traditional forms of political

activism in the past nor those who have engaged in buycotting in the past.

Study 2: The Psychological Motivations for Political Consumption

The results from Study 1 suggest that positive and negative information about a store's

treatment of workers alters people's willingness to shop at the store. But why? What are the

underlying motivations that induce political consumerism? We designed Study 2 to provide

some insight into the motivations for boycotting and buycotting.

As in Study 1, Study 2 respondents received a description of a hypothetical local grocery

store. Respondents were randomly assigned to one of seven conditions. In the control condition,

respondents read a vignette about the store that made no mention of treatment of workers. The

remaining six conditions include a 2 (positive versus negative treatment of workers, similar to

Study 1) x 3 (motivational frame) factorial design. For the motivational frame factor, we

designed three conditions. The first is a stripped condition that contains no explicit motivational

frame. The second and third conditions highlight two of the most common reasons that people

---

contacting a government official online; writing a letter to public official; expressing political
views on the Internet, attending a meeting to talk about social/political concerns; and donating
money to a political or social organization.

give for engaging in political consumption from the National Civic Engagement Survey II, Fall 2002: instrumental change and self-expression. The instrumental frame focuses on how political consumption can help shape a store's policies by either encouraging the store to maintain policies (in the positive information vignettes) or encouraging the store to change its policies (in the negative information vignettes). The self-expression frame focuses on how political consumption is a means to show support (in the positive information vignettes) or disapproval (in the negative information vignettes) of a store's treatment of workers. The full text of the vignettes appears in the Appendix.

Study 2 was fielded in October 2016 as part of the Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project (CCAP). The online sample includes 1,000 U.S. citizens over the age of 18 who are part of YouGov's standing panel. Respondents answered demographic questions, general questions on political participation and past political consumerism, read the vignette about a hypothetical grocery store, and then answered a series of questions about the store.

As in Study 1, our key dependent variable consists of respondents' self-reports of how likely they would be to shop at the store: from 0 (very unlikely) to 1 (very likely). In addition, we also include measures of self-reports of other acts of political participation, including posting a link to the article online, joining a rally in support or opposition of the store, and contacting government in support or opposition of the store.

We begin by focusing on the overall effects of receiving positive information versus receiving negative information (aggregating across the motivational frames), with the control condition serving as the suppressed baseline. The first column of results in Table 4 shows that both general positive information and general negative information significantly affect the expected likelihood of shopping at the grocery store. Positive information significantly increases

the reported likelihood of shopping at the grocery store by 0.07 units (on a 0 to 1 scale)

compared to the control condition, and negative information significantly decreases the reported

likelihood of shopping at the store by 0.39 units (on a 0 to 1 scale), compared to the subjects in

the control condition. In addition, the results from this study again are consistent with a strong

negativity bias. The negative information treatments have a significantly (Wald Test, $p<0.000$)

and substantially larger effect (in magnitude) than the positive information treatments. Thus, the

results from receiving general negative and positive information further substantiates the results

from Study 1.

The next column in Table 4 includes the effects of using different motivational frames of

political consumption to detect the psychological motivations behind the expected likelihood of

patronizing the store. Each of the frames is coded 1 for the respective frame and 0 otherwise.

Thus, the dummy variables indicate the effect of the given frame over and above any general

positive (or negative) information. The results indicate that the positive information treatment

without any specific motive is more powerful than the positive instrumental frame and the

positive self-expression frame – as both of the positive frames undercut the effect of the general

positive information. These undermining results are consistent with those of Kam et al. (2008)

who find that directed appeals to the self and to public policy can actually detract from people's

willingness to participate. The results also suggest that the negative information treatment exerts

a significant effect on the reported likelihood of shopping, and the frames neither undercut nor

accentuate the effect of negative information. Looking only at the positive and negative

information dummies, we again find that the effect of negative information is just about three

times the effect of positive information. Overall, the data from Study 2 substantiate the results

from Study 1 in that both positive and negative information affect reported likelihood of

shopping a store, and negative information exerts a far more powerful effect in suppressing action than positive information has on encouraging action. In the next section, we probe a potential rationale for this distinction.

Avoidance, not Approach

The first possibility is that negative information may simply be more powerful in changing behavioral intentions compared to positive information. If this is the case, then we should see negative information having a larger effect than positive information on altering political consumerism as well as other participatory acts related to the vignette. The second possibility is that negative information may be more powerful than positive information in inducing avoidance behavior - a relatively costless activity that essentially requires non-action of the participant - but not in inducing approach-oriented behavior (i.e., more costly participatory acts such as rallying against the store or writing a letter protesting the store).

In order to parse out the driving factor behind the larger effect size of the negative information on the likelihood of boycotting, we incorporate dependent variables that measure more traditional forms of political participation. In addition to their likelihood of shopping at the store, each participant reported their likelihood of engaging in three effortful forms of political participation related to the store: posting a link about the store, writing a letter to a congressperson about the store, or attending a rally related to the store.[4] The response options ranged from very unlikely to very likely. We combine responses to the three acts into an additive index ($\alpha = 0.80$), ranging from 0 (least likely) to 1 (most likely). Subjects in the control condition were least likely to say they would act (M=0.24, s.e. = 0.03), and subjects in the

---

[4] We sorted participants into questions about rallying and writing to a congressperson based upon their exposure to positive versus negative information. Participants who received the control condition were sorted with those who received positive information about the store.

negative and positive control conditions reported higher scores (M_{neg}=0.33, s.e. = 0.02; M_{pos}=0.37, s.e. = 0.02).

We repeat our OLS regressions to estimate the effect of negative versus positive information on the likelihood of engaging in other participatory acts. These results appear in the third and fourth columns of Table 4. We see that negative and positive information have essentially the same effect in inducing active participation, compared to the control condition. Moreover, there is no statistical difference in the magnitude of the effect of positive information versus negative information (Wald test, $p \sim 0.46$). The basic results are essentially unchanged when we include dummies for the motivational frames.

Our results are consistent with the notion that there is something particularly distinct about boycotting as opposed to other forms of political engagement. Both positive and negative information motivate other forms of political engagement to a similar degree, but negative information is far more powerful in inducing avoidance of the store than positive information is in inducing approach. Thus, the results suggest that, as a general matter, negativity is not necessarily more motivating than positivity, and rather, there may be something uniquely distinctive about boycotting in that it is a *refusal* to act.

Conclusions

Although boycotts have had a long history in the United States, technological advances have made it possible for information– especially negative information – to be transmitted quickly, easily, and on a massive scale. As information about a company can now quickly go viral, it becomes even more important to understand how, when, and why political considerations inform consumer decisions. The existing work on political consumerism hinges largely upon selected qualitative case studies or on survey data that relies on combined retrospective self-

reports on whether or not an individual has engaged in boycotting or buycotting in the past twelve months. While the case studies provide contours of boycotts (and buycotts) that have already emerged, they have trouble identifying the missing cases – those cases where a boycott or buycott did not emerge. And while the survey analyses can allow researchers to sketch out the stable individual-level factors such as demographics and political attitudes that are correlated with self-reported boycotting or buycotting, their very generality precludes an investigation of the contextual factors that trigger boycotting or buycotting. Moreover, many of the existing works combine boycotting and buycotting into an additive measure of political consumerism, thus confounding what, to us, seem to be conceptually different acts.

Here, we have introduced a theoretical distinction between boycotting and buycotting grounded in an approach/avoidance framework. This approach/avoidance framework also provides us with leverage for the distinctiveness of boycotting – as an intentional act of avoidance – compared with other pro-active political acts such as rallying, writing a letter, or posting a link. In two different studies, our results suggest that the effect of the negative information is stronger in encouraging avoidance compared with the effect of the positive information on encouraging approach. In both Study 1 and Study 2, we uncovered effect sizes on the order of a 3:1 ratio – that negative information is about three times as powerful as positive information in inducing behavior. This 3:1 ratio exactly mirrors the 3:1 ratio associated with the literature on positivity (Fredrickson 2009).

We also examined potential sources of heterogeneity in propensity to react to negative versus positive information. Orientations towards reward vs. punishment and conflict orientations did not significantly moderate the treatment effects. In testing whether past political participation moderated the treatment effects, we found that past boycotters are significantly

more likely to react to negative information with a decreased likelihood of frequenting the store, but past buycotting and past effortful participation did not significantly moderate the treatments. These patterns suggest that negative information resonates with people who have engaged in a negative act in the past compared with those who have engaged in a positive act (buycotting) or effortful participatory act.

In a separate study, we replicated the basic results of the first and designed an extension to probe the specific reasons that might encourage people to engage in buycotts or boycotts. We find that neither instrumental nor self-expression psychological frames increase the reported likelihood of boycotting beyond that of just receiving negative information about the store. However, both the instrumental and self-expression frames undercut the effect of positive information on buycotting. Finally, we examined whether the effect of the negative information could be generalized to any behaviors reflecting political engagement or whether there was something specific about boycotting (or avoidance). We found that both negative information and positive information significantly increased willingness to engage in acts that require individuals to put forward energy and commitment (attending a rally, writing a letter, or posting a link). For these acts, there was no significant difference in the power of positive and negative information. This evidence suggests that there may be something distinctive about boycotting: the intentional act of avoidance.

We think our results provide evidence arguing for the fruitful conceptual distinguishing of boycotting from buycotting, and they suggest that there may be something distinctive about the act of boycotting that sets it apart from other political acts. While we find these results to be fascinating, we fully acknowledge that many questions remain unanswered. Our framing conditions suggest that reminders of self-expression and instrumental policy change do not

enhance (and could even detract from) generalized negative and positive information. More work on this front is certainly needed.

More broadly, we note that there is an irony to considering boycotting as a political act, as it is an act that is by definition the *avoidance* of acting. In the political arena, scholars of democratic politics worry that a failure to act will mean that people will be ignored (i.e., Verba et al. 1995). But there might be something particularly compelling about boycotting's power as it relates to corporations, entities that are presumably driven by bottom-line financial considerations. The irony is that a big enough boycott (or the threat of a big enough boycott) – that is, the large-scale *refusal* to act – might be even more consequential in pressuring corporate change given its direct ties to bottom-line financials, than effortful political acts imbued with voice.

References

Araton, Harvey. 1997. "Sports of the Times: Athletes toe the Nike line, but students apply pressure." *The New York Times.* Nov 22, 1997.

Baek, Young Min. 2010. "To Buy or Not to Buy: Who Are Political Consumers? What Do They Think and How Do They Participate?" *Political Studies* 58 (5): 1065–86. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2010.00832.

Ballinger, Jeffrey. 1992. "The New Free-Trade Heel: Nike's profits jump on the backs of Asian workers." *Harper's Magazine,* August, 285, no. 1707: 46-47.

Bargh, John A. 1997. "The Automaticity of Everyday Life." In *Advances in Social Cognition, Vol.10*, edited by R. S. Wyer, 1–61. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baumeister, Roy F., Ellen Bratslavsky, Catrin Finkenauer, and Kathleen D. Vohs. 2001. "Bad Is Stronger than Good." *Review of General Psychology* 5 (4): 323–70. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.323.

Bennett, W. Lance. 2012. "The Personalization of Politics Political Identity, Social Media, and Changing Patterns of Participation." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644 (1): 20–39. doi:10.1177/0002716212451428.

Birch, Simon. 2012. "How Activism Forced Nike to Change Its Ethical Game." *The Guardian*, July 6, 2012. http://www.theguardian.com/environment/green-living-blog/2012/jul/06/activism-nike.

Bloomberg News. 2005. "Unions Boycott Wal-Mart." *The New York Times.* August 11, 2005. http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/11/business/unions-boycott-walmart.html?_r=0

Carfagna, Lindsey B., Emilie A. Dubois, Connor Fitzmaurice, Monique Y. Ouimette, Juliet B. Schor, Margaret Willis, and Thomas Laidley. 2014. "An Emerging Eco-Habitus: The Reconfiguration of High Cultural Capital Practices among Ethical Consumers." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 14(2): 158-78. doi:10.1177/1469540514526227.

Chen, Mark, and John A. Bargh. 1999. "Consequences of Automatic Evaluation: Immediate Behavioral Predispositions to Approach or Avoid the Stimulus." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 25 (2): 215–24. doi:10.1177/0146167299025002007.

Copeland, Lauren. 2014. "Conceptualizing Political Consumerism: How Citizenship Norms Differentiate Boycotting from Buycotting." *Political Studies* 62 (S1): 172–86. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.12067.

Dalton, Russell J. 2008. "Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation." *Political Studies* 56: 76–98.

de Zúñiga, Homero Gil, Lauren Copeland, and Bruce Bimber. 2013. "Political Consumerism: Civic Engagement and the Social Media Connection." *New Media & Society* 17(3): 319-336 doi:10.1177/1461444813487960.

Devine, Patricia G. 1989. "Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56 (1): 5–18. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5.

Elliot, Andrew J. 2006. "The Hierarchical Model of Approach-Avoidance Motivation." *Motivation and Emotion* 30 (2): 111–16. doi:10.1007/s11031-006-9028-7.

Elliot, Andrew J., and Martin V. Covington. 2001. "Approach and Avoidance Motivation." *Educational Psychology Review* 13 (2): 73–92. doi:10.1023/A:1009009018235.

Epstein-Reeves, James. 2010. "The Parents of CSR: Nike and Kathie Lee Gifford." *Forbes*. June 8, 2010. https://www.forbes.com/sites/csr/2010/06/08/the-parents-of-csr-nike-and-kathie-lee-gifford/#6e56d591f416

Fazio, Russell H., David M. Sanbonmatsu, M. C. Powell, and Frank R. Kardes. 1986. "On the Automatic Activation of Attitudes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50 (2): 229–38.

Fredrickson, Barbara. 2009. *Positivity*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.

Friedman, Monroe. 1999. *Consumer Boycotts: Effecting Change Through the Marketplace and the Media*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gosling, Samuel D., Peter J. Rentfrow, and William B. Swann, Jr. 2003. "A Very Brief Measure of the Big Five Personality Domains." *Journal of Research in Personality* 37: 504-28.

Goul Andersen, Jorgen, and Mette Tobiasen. 2004. "Who Are These Political Consumers Anyway? Survey Evidence from Denmark." In *Politics, Products and Markets: Exploring Political Consumerism Past and Present*, edited by Michele Micheletti, Andreas Follesdal, and Dietlind Stolle. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Halty, Santiago. 2016. "How Fair Trade Improves Product Quality and Worker Livelihoods: Behind the Scenes of Soccer Ball Manufacturing." *Huffington Post*, May 13, 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/santiago-halty/how-fair-trade-improves-q_b_9935184.html.

Jones, Del. 1996. "Critics tie sweatshop sneakers to 'Air' Jordan." *USA Today*. June 6, 1996, Pg. 1B.

Kam, Cindy D., Elizabeth Zechmeister, and Jennifer R. Wilking. 2008. "From the Gap to the Chasm: Gender and Participation Among Non-Hispanic Whites and Mexican-

Americans." *Political Research Quarterly* 61(2): 228-238.

Kim, Young Mie. 2012. "The Shifting Sands of Citizenship Toward a Model of the Citizenry in Life Politics." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644 (1): 147–58. doi:10.1177/0002716212456008.

Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Micheletti, Michele. 2003. *Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mutz, Diana C. 2015. *In-Your-Face Politics: The Consequences of Uncivil Media*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Neilson, Lisa A. 2010. "Boycott or Buycott? Understanding Political Consumerism." *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* 9 (3): 214–27. doi:10.1002/cb.313.

Newman, Benjamin J., and Brandon L. Bartels. 2011. "Politics at the Checkout Line: Explaining Political Consumerism in the United States." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (4): 803–17.

Norris, Pippa. 2002. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2016. "*boycott, v*." March 2016. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/22329?rskey=M1TcdE&result=2.

Richetin, Juliette, Mark Conner, and Marco Perugini. 2011. "Not Doing Is Not the Opposite of Doing: Implications for Attitudinal Models of Behavioral Prediction." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 37 (1): 40–54. doi:10.1177/0146167210390522.

Shah, Dhavan V., Douglas M. McLeod, Eunkyung Kim, Sun Young Lee, Melissa R. Gotlieb, Shirley S. Ho, and Hilde Breivik. 2007. "Political Consumerism: How Communication and Consumption Orientations Drive 'Lifestyle Politics.'" *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 611 (1): 217–35. doi:10.1177/0002716206298714.

Starr, Martha. 2009. "The Social Economics of Ethical Consumption: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence." *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 38 (6): 916–25.

Stolle, Dietlind, Marc Hooghe, and Michele Micheletti. 2005. "Politics in the Supermarket: Political Consumerism as a Form of Political Participation." *International Political Science Review* 26 (3): 245–69. doi:10.1177/0192512105053784.

The New York Times/CBS News Poll. 2015. "Americans' Views on Income Inequality and

Workers' Rights - The New York Times." *The New York Times*, June 3, 2015.
http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/06/03/business/income-inequality-workers-
rights-international-trade-poll.html?_r=0.

Ungar, Rick. 2013. "Walmart Pays Workers Poorly and Sinks While Costco Pays Workers Well
and Sails-Proof That You Get What You Pay For." *Forbes*, April 17, 2013.
http://www.forbes.com/sites/rickungar/2013/04/17/walmart-pays-workers-poorly-and-
sinks-while-costco-pays-workers-well-and-sails-proof-that-you-get-what-you-pay-
for/#5c81a11dbc3d.

Varner, Natasha. 2016. "The Workers Who Pick Your Summer Berries Are Asking You Not to
Buy Them." *Public Radio International*, July 20,. https://www.pri.org/stories/2016-07-
18/workers-who-pick-your-summer-berries-are-asking-you-not-buy-them.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic
Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wicks, Jan LeBlanc, Shauna A. Morimoto, Angie Maxwell, Stephanie Ricker Schulte, and
Robert H. Wicks. 2013. "Youth Political Consumerism and the 2012 Presidential
Election: What Influences Youth Boycotting and Buycotting?" *American Behavioral
Scientist*, 58(5):715-32. doi:10.1177/0002764213515993.

Zajonc, Robert B. 1984. "On the Primacy of Affect." *American Psychologist* 39 (2): 117–23.
doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.vanderbilt.edu/10.1037/0003-066X.39.2.117.

———. 1998. "Emotion." In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by Daniel T. Gilbert,
Susan T. Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey, 4th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Table 1. Boycotting and Buycotting based on the Treatment of Workers

	All Locations	Inconvenient Location	Convenient Location
Workers Treated Positively	0.16***	0.18***	0.13***
	0.03	0.04	0.04
Workers Treated Negatively	-0.43***	-0.40***	-0.48***
	0.03	0.04	0.04
Convenient Location	0.14***		
	0.02		
Female	0.00	-0.01	0.01
	0.02	0.03	0.03
Black	0.07*	0.06	0.07
	0.04	0.06	0.05
Asian	0.04	-0.02	0.10**
	0.04	0.06	0.05
Hispanic	-0.03	-0.06	-0.02
	0.04	0.06	0.06
Education	-0.11**	-0.14**	-0.07
	0.05	0.07	0.08
Age: 18-29	-0.10	0.01	-0.21*
	0.09	0.13	0.12
Age: 30-39	-0.11	-0.03	-0.19
	0.09	0.13	0.12
Age: 40-49	-0.07	-0.01	-0.13
	0.09	0.14	0.12
Age: 50-64	-0.18**	-0.11	-0.25**
	0.09	0.14	0.12
Income	0.05	0.12	-0.02
	0.04	0.06	0.06
Republican	0.05	0.02	0.08
	0.04	0.05	0.05
Democrat	0.05	0.05	0.05
	0.03	0.05	0.04
Intercept	0.74	0.64	0.97
	0.10	0.14	0.13
Adjusted R^2	0.51	0.48	0.50
N	599	307	292

Dependent variable (shopping intention) is coded from 0 (very unlikely) to 1 (very likely).
OLS coefficients with standard errors below.
*$p<0.10$; **$p<0.05$; ***$p<0.01$

Table 2. Tests of Treatment Moderation by Orientations towards Reward, Disagreeableness, or Conflict

	Reward Orientation	Disagree-ableness	Conflict Orientation
Workers Treated Positively	0.12***	0.17***	0.12**
	0.04	0.04	0.05
Workers Treated Negatively	-0.44***	-0.53***	-0.50***
	0.04	0.04	0.05
Orientation x Workers Treated Positively	0.05	-0.04	0.09
	0.05	0.12	0.11
Orientation x Workers Treated Negatively	0.02	0.30***	0.16
	0.05	0.11	0.11
Orientation	0.04	-0.04	-0.08
	0.04	0.08	0.08
Convenient Location	0.15***	0.14***	0.14***
	0.02	0.02	0.02
Female	0.00	0.01	0.00
	0.02	0.02	0.02
Black	0.07*	0.06	0.07*
	0.04	0.04	0.04
Asian	0.05	0.03	0.04
	0.04	0.04	0.04
Hispanic	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
	0.04	0.04	0.04
Education	-0.12**	-0.10**	-0.11**
	0.05	0.05	0.05
Age: 18-29	-0.09	-0.12	-0.10
	0.09	0.09	0.09
Age: 30-39	-0.10	-0.12	-0.11
	0.09	0.09	0.09
Age: 40-49	-0.06	-0.08	-0.07
	0.09	0.09	0.09
Age: 50-64	-0.18*	-0.18**	-0.18**
	0.09	0.09	0.09
Income	0.04	0.05	0.05
	0.04	0.04	0.04
Republican	0.06	0.06	0.05
	0.04	0.04	0.04
Democrat	0.05	0.05*	0.04
	0.03	0.03	0.03
Intercept	0.71	0.75	0.78
	0.10	0.10	0.10
Adjusted R^2	0.52	0.52	0.51
N	599	599	599

Dependent variable (shopping intention) is coded from 0 (very unlikely) to 1 (very likely).

OLS coefficients with standard errors below.

*$p<0.10$; **$p<0.05$; ***$p<0.01$

Table 3. Tests of Treatment Moderation by Past Behavior

	Past Political Consumerism	Adding Past Participation
Workers Treated Positively	0.14***	0.12***
	0.04	0.04
Workers Treated Negatively	-0.30***	-0.30***
	0.04	0.04
Past Boycott x Workers Treated Positively	0.04	0.03
	0.06	0.06
Past Boycott x Workers Treated Negatively	-0.22***	-0.22***
	0.06	0.06
Past Buycott x Workers Treated Positively	-0.01	-0.04
	0.06	0.06
Past Buycott x Workers Treated Negatively	-0.02	-0.03
	0.06	0.06
Past Boycott	0.03	0.05
	0.04	0.04
Past Buycott	0.03	0.04
	0.04	0.04
Past Participation x Workers Treated Positively		0.16
		0.12
Past Participation x Workers Treated Negatively		0.02
		0.11
Past Participation		-0.08
		0.08
Convenient Location	0.14	0.14
	0.02	0.02
Female	0.01	0.01
	0.02	0.02
Black	0.06	0.06
	0.04	0.04
Asian	0.05	0.05
	0.04	0.04
Hispanic	-0.02	-0.02
	0.04	0.04
Education	-0.09	-0.09
	0.05	0.05
Age: 18-29	-0.11	-0.10
	0.09	0.09
Age: 30-39	-0.12	-0.11
	0.09	0.09
Age: 40-49	-0.08	-0.07
	0.09	0.09
Age: 50-64	-0.19	-0.17
	0.09	0.09
Income	0.05	0.05
	0.04	0.04
Republican	0.04	0.04
	0.04	0.04
Democrat	0.05	0.04
	0.03	0.03
Intercept	0.71	0.72
	0.10	0.10
Adjusted R^2	0.53	0.53
N	599	599

Dependent variable (shopping intention) is coded from 0 (very unlikely) to 1 (very likely).

OLS coefficients with standard errors below.

*$p<0.10$; **$p<0.05$; ***$p<0.01$

Table 4. Tests of Motivational Frames on Political Consumption and Participation

	DV: Shopping Intention Basic Model	DV: Shopping Intention With Frames	DV: Participation Intention Basic Model	DV: Participation Intention With Frames
Workers Treated Positively	0.07*	0.12***	0.13***	0.14***
	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04
Workers Treated Negatively	-0.38***	-0.40***	0.11***	0.08**
	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.04
Positive: Instrumental		-0.07**		-0.02
		0.03		0.05
Positive: Expressive		-0.11**		-0.04
		0.04		0.05
Negative: Instrumental		0.03		0.03
		0.06		0.04
Negative: Expressive		0.02		0.05
		0.06		0.04
Female	0.03	0.03	0.07***	0.07***
	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02
Black	0.02	0.02	0.12***	0.12***
	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04
Hispanic	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04
	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
Education	-0.10	-0.09	-0.05	-0.05
	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04
Age 18-29	-0.00	0.00	0.09**	0.09**
	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Age 30-39	0.03	0.02	0.13***	0.12***
	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Age 40-49	-0.03	-0.03	0.13***	0.13***
	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Age 50-64	0.01	0.01	0.10***	0.10***
	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03
Income	-0.01	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00
	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04
Income Refused	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04
	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Republican	-0.00	-0.00	-0.06*	-0.06*
	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03
Democrat	-0.03	-0.03	0.06*	0.06*
	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Intercept	0.81	0.81	0.13	0.13
	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05
R^2	0.38	0.39	0.16	0.16
N	940	940	939	939

Dependent variable is coded from 0 (very unlikely) to 1 (very likely).
OLS coefficients with standard errors below. Weighted analysis.
*$p<0.10$; **$p<0.05$; ***$p<0.01$

Experimental Treatments for MTurk Study, Fall 2015

Control: No Worker Treatment information	Workers Treated Positively	Workers Treated Negatively
Store located 2 minutes away	Store located 2 minutes away	Store located 2 minutes away
Store located 20 minutes away	Store located 20 minutes away	Store located 20 minutes away

Control Group:
Imagine that in the past week a local newspaper wrote an article about one of your local grocery stores. The article notes that this store provides a wide selection of quality groceries and daily needs at a competitive price.

For Control Vignettes:
How likely would you be to shop at this store if it were located [2/20] minutes from your home, given what you have read about the store's practices?
Very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, somewhat likely, very likely

Treatment of Workers Vignettes [positive/negative]
Now we would like you to read a report about a hypothetical situation.

Imagine that in the past week a local newspaper has published an [article/exposé] about one of your local grocery stores and its [supportive/abusive] working conditions for employees. The store consistently pays its workers [above/below] the minimum wage and requires employees to [take/work during] their scheduled breaks and [pays double for work outside their shifts/outside their shifts without pay]. It also employs workers on a [full-time basis to provide/part-time basis to avoid providing] benefits like paid sick days. The newspaper ranks the store as the [best/worst] store in the area in terms of working conditions for employees.

For Treatment of Workers Vignettes:
Suppose this store provides a wide selection of quality groceries and daily needs at a competitive price. Given what you have read about the store's actions, how likely would you be to shop at this store if it were located [2/20] minutes from your home?
Very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, somewhat likely, very likely

Experimental Treatments for CCAP Study, Fall 2016

Control: No Worker Treatment information	Workers Treated Positively	Workers Treated Negatively
	No frame	No frame
	Instrumental frame	Instrumental frame
	Self-expression frame	Self-expression frame

Control Vignette:
Imagine that in the past week a local newspaper has published an article about one of your local grocery stores. The store is located 10 minutes from your home and provides a wide selection of quality groceries and daily needs at a competitive price.

Treatment of Workers Vignettes [positive/negative]
Imagine that in the past week a local newspaper has published an [article/ exposé] about one of your local grocery stores. The store is located 10 minutes from your home and provides a wide selection of quality groceries and daily needs at a competitive price. The [article/ exposé] spotlights the store's [supportive/abusive] working conditions for employees. The store consistently pays its workers [above/below] the minimum wage and requires employees to [take/work during] their scheduled breaks and [pays double for work outside their shifts/ and outside their shifts without pay]. It also employs workers on a [full-/part-]time basis to [provide/avoid providing] benefits like paid sick days. The newspaper ranks the store as the [best/worst] store in the area in terms of working conditions for employees.

Additional Text for Instrumental Frame **[positive/negative]**
Some people say that [shopping at/boycotting] a store is an effective way of [encouraging a store to maintain/pressuring a store to change] its policies. By [shopping/refusing to shop] at this local grocery store, you can [encourage/pressure] the store to [continue its fair/change its poor] treatment of workers.

Additional Text for Self-Expression Frame **[positive/negative]**
Some people say that [shopping at/boycotting] a store is an effective way of expressing your values and beliefs about political and ethical issues. By [shopping/refusing to shop] at this local grocery store, you can show your [support of fair/disapproval of the poor] treatment of workers.