Bridging Who They Are with Who They Thought They'd Be: The Effects of Gen Zers' Subjective Well-Being on Their Boycott Responses to Online and Offline Unethical Situations

Annamaria Tuan, Marco Visentin, and Giandomenico Di Domenico

Annamaria Tuan isSenior Assistant Professor of Marketing, Department of Management, Alma Mater Studiorum – University of Bologna, Italy (email: annamaria.tuan@unibo.it). Marco Visentin is Associate Professor of Marketing, Department of Management, Alma Mater Studiorum – University of Bologna, Italy (email: marco.visentin@unibo.it). Giandomenico Di Domenico is Lecturer in Marketing and Strategy, Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, UK (email: DiDomenicoG@cardiff.ac.uk).

Abstract

This research investigates the role of subjective well-being in Gen Zers' response to unethical situations that are encountered online versus offline. It empirically supports a model that incorporates moral reasoning effects and the aftermath of learning about the situation in either a first-person or third-person perspective. The findings suggest that Gen Zers are eager to show their values and participate in boycotts when facing an unethical situation. Subjective well-being plays an important role in activating versus inhibiting boycott behaviors as a response to unethical situations encountered both online and offline. Counterintuitively, Gen Zers are less likely to show support for a boycott when scoring high on well-being, since they are not willing to signal their commitment to gain social legitimacy. In fact, when coping with unethical situations, they are eager to display their true values and to enact the boycott rather than merely show support for it.

Keywords: subjective well-being, moral reasoning, Generation Z, boycotting, anticonsumption

According to a McKinsey study, 75% of Gen Z consumers (hereinafter referred to "Gen Zers," those born between 1997 and 2012) will boycott companies that discriminate against race and gender across advertisement campaigns. Furthermore, a recent survey on Tinder reported that users between 18 and 24 years of age are 66% more likely than Millennials to mention issues such as climate change, social justice, and gun control in their bios (Luttrell and McGrath 2021). Likewise, academic research suggests that Gen Zers are increasingly paying attention to social and environmental issues in their consumption behavior, forcing brands to think about the causes they are willing to support. This generation is active in fighting for systemic and transformative societal change; one path to accomplish this is to speak out and stand up for their values when

faced with the egregious behaviors of companies, brands, or groups (Klein, Smith, and John 2004; Luttrell and McGrath 2021; Palacio-Florencio et al. 2021; Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021). Young adult consumers hold particularly sophisticated skills and critical attitudes toward the marketplace and are quick to use boycotts to challenge the status quo (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Palan, Gentina, and Muratore 2010; Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021).

Research has usually analyzed the impact of negative affective states (e.g., dislike, hate; Pinto and Brandão 2020; Zarantonello et al. 2016) on boycotting behavior. Nevertheless, the role of positive affective states, such as subjective well-being, has largely avoided scrutiny (with the notable exception of Kuanr et al. [2021]). Furthermore, scholars have widely investigated the cultural and ideological determinants of boycotting, and how these behaviors affect subjective well-being (for a review, see Klein, Smith, and John [2004]), but there is scarce evidence on how subjective well-being leads consumers (and especially Gen Zers) to boycott (e.g., Kuanr et al. 2021; Makri et al. 2020). Thus, this article considers subjective well-being as a determinant of boycotting behavior, as it represents a factor that likely activates individuals' internal resources to respond actively to an issue (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2018; Pajunen 2021).

When consumers' ideological beliefs are at odds with a situation or with a company's values, people encounter a moral dilemma, wherein they need to choose between the "individual benefit of consumption and the wish of a collective to refrain from consumption so that all received the shared benefits of a successful boycott" (Klein, Smith, and John 2004, p. 93). The literature, in fact, generally agrees that boycott behaviors are the result of perceiving a moral outrage from a third party (Kuanr et al. 2021; Shim et al. 2021). Consistently, the current research relies on moral reasoning theory to analyze Gen Zers' boycotting, as this generation seems to be

particularly responsive to companies that display questionable behaviors (Gutfreund 2016; Luttrell and McGrath 2021). Four domains of moral reasoning stand out when analyzing Gen Z boycott behaviors. First, Ethical Idealism (Palacios-Florencio et al. 2021) captures the willingness of Gen Zers to take actions against companies that violate their ethical code. Second, Individual Self-Congruence (Xie, Bagozzi, and Meland 2015) accounts for the importance that young consumers assign to the congruence between what they say and what they do. Third, Self-Expression (Saenger, Thomas, and Johnson 2013) measures the intrinsic rewards of boycotting participation beyond the collective gains that a boycott can bring. Finally, as Gen Zers actively fight for systemic and transformational social change (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Luttrell and McGrath 2021), ethical dilemmas may galvanize their willingness to Make a Difference (Klein, Smith, and John 2004).

Finally, the literature suggests that young people tend to fluidly switch between different online and offline behaviors (Francis and Hoefel 2018; Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Wang, Mo, and Wang 2022). Likewise, an unethical situation experienced in person versus learned of from others may elicit different salient evaluations and, by extension, different behaviors (Kristofferson, White, and Peloza 2014; Lu, Xie, and Xu 2013; Prensky 2001).

Thus, the present study strives to illuminate the determinants of boycotting behaviors by advancing a model in which Gen Zers' inclination to boycott stems from (1) their subjective well-being, (2) their individual moral reasoning, and (3) the characteristics of the unethical situation (i.e., online vs. offline as well as first-person vs. third-person experience).

Theoretical Framework

Boycott Behaviors and Gen Zers

Among the generational cohorts, Gen Zers are most likely to embrace boycotts not only by signing petitions online (Graj 2020) but also by playing an active role in changing the status quo

(Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021). Being digital natives, Gen Zers are well informed and constantly exposed to global events. This wide exposure has made them socially aware and cultivated values such as respect for others, sincerity, and honesty (Azimi, Andonova, and Schewe 2021). In this sense, hashtag activism is popular among this generation, as it is a way to present their beliefs and speak up for social injustice (Luttrell and McGrath 2021). However, Gen Zers like to bridge their online and offline identities—and that extends to activism. Their strong desire to contribute to ethical, social, and environmental issues (Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021) is reflected in their everyday consumption behaviors, through which they signal their identity (Djafarova and Foots 2022; Francis and Hoefel 2018).

Consequently, Gen Zers are likely to take actions "against consumption" (Lee, Fernandez, and Hyman 2009). Anticonsumption phenomena include consumer activism (Kozinets and Handelman 2004); a reduction in consumption driven by ethical/moral or sustainability reasons (Shaw and Newholm 2002); individual, group, or organizational boycotting; societal- or national-level trade sanctions (Yuksel, Thai, and Lee 2020); and product category and brand avoidance (Lee, Motion, and Conroy 2009). Despite their different iterations, these behaviors all involve a common goal of intentionally reducing or rejecting some aspects of the consumption process (Zavestoski 2002). As a form of consumer protest in response to brand misconduct (Yuksel 2013), boycotts are particularly problematic for brands because they can compel consumers to abandon their relationship with the brand (Yuksel, Thai, and Lee 2020).

Together with brand avoidance, boycotts represent acts of brand subversion, in which consumers try to undermine the success of the brand's marketing activities (Wilson, Darke, and Sengupta 2021). Though they appear to be similar, brand avoidance and boycotting present subtle differences. Brand avoidance refers to the deliberate and long-lasting (Lee, Motion, and Conroy

2009) avoidance of specific brands and products due to a lack of congruence, negative associations with the brand, or negative user stereotypes (Hogg, Banister, and Stephenson 2009). Boycotting is instead driven by an ideological discontent stemming from specific brands' misconduct (Yuksel 2013). In this sense, boycotters form an implicit commitment to reenter the relationship with the brand once specific conditions are met (Lee, Motion, and Conroy 2009). Therefore, while brand avoidance is a profound act of anticonsumption, often driven by brand hate (Pinto and Brandão 2020), boycotts are more likely to end if the brand redeems itself.

Among the many forms that anticonsumerism can take (Pecot, Vasilopoulou, and Cavallaro 2021), boycotting represents an active participation in or support for a protest against a company (Bennett 2007; Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Palacios-Florencio et al. 2021; Vissers and Stolle 2014). Thus, one can say that consumers intend to *enact boycotting* when they envision a specific strategy to harm a service or product provider (Kristofferson, White, and Peloza 2014; Palacios-Florencio et al. 2021; Xie and Bagozzi 2019), whereas they *support boycotting* when they express a desire to avoid buying from a company (Klein, Smith, and John 2004; Palacios-Florencio et al. 2021). On this basis, it is important to separately investigate the determinants of Enact Boycott and Support Boycott.

The Determinants of Boycotting Behavior

Several factors can compel boycotting behavior. A prominent one is subjective well-being, which can increase personal inner resources and activate individuals' attainment of their goals and preferences (Akyurek, Kars, and Bumin 2018; Pajunen 2021). Nevertheless, the literature says little about subjective well-being as a determinant of consumers' reactions to egregious behavior, especially when considering younger generations. As a notable exception, the recent study by Kuanr et al. (2021) found that well-being improves individuals' stability and enables

them to avoid brands that have transgressed moral or ethical norms. In this way, consumers sacrifice short-term satisfaction in favor of being consistent with their values.

In addition, people use moral reasoning to envision the likely consequences and experiences associated with a certain behavior, which shapes their intention to act (Ajzen and Fishbein 1977; Fishbein and Ajzen 1977). In other words, individuals mentally perform a relatively complete cost–benefit analysis on the possible consequences of behavioral alternatives (Ajzen 1991). For example, Dovidio et al. (1991) applied a cost–reward model to investigate the motivation to help a person in distress, while Klein, Smith, and John (2004) extended this approach to analyze people's boycott motivations. Because boycott behaviors imply a dilemma between one's individual benefit and adherence to a collective impulse (Sen, Gürhan-Canli, and Morwitz 2001), it is possible that consumers will evaluate the expected costs and benefits of such behaviors in response to an unethical situation (Klein, Smith, and John 2004). This article considers four domains of these subjective evaluations: First, it is likely that an individual Gen Zer will strive for consistency between their perceived self and boycotting as a coping behavior (i.e., self-congruity; Furchheim, Martin, and Morhart 2020; Xie, Bagozzi, and Meland 2015). Second, individuals will develop an extensive evaluation of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. On the one hand, intrinsic motivations are likely to activate boycotting behaviors because they are personally rewarding and reflect fundamental concerns for other people or the environment. In particular, Ethical Idealism (Palacios-Florencio et al. 2021) captures consumers' concerns about the possible adverse effects of their personal conduct on others. On the other hand, extrinsic motivations are likely to activate boycotting behaviors insofar as consumers believe that boycotting will stimulate positive evaluations from their social referents. In particular, Self-Expression (Saenger, Thomas, and Johnson 2013) represents consumers' willingness to share

their individual behavior with others. Finally, this article argues that consumers will evaluate the extent to which boycott behaviors effectively signal the necessity for appropriate conduct. To this end, Make a Difference (Klein, Smith, and John 2004) captures the instrumental value of boycotting as a means of provoking a positive change.

Lastly, it is likely that the situational characteristics of unethical situations affect the intention to boycott. The literature suggests that online and offline consumer activism may take different forms and be motivated by different factors (Kristofferson, White, and Peloza 2014). In particular, Gen Zers easily switch between the two contexts, even though they display different behaviors in each (Palley 2012; Prensky 2001; Taylor and Keeter 2010; Ward and De Vreese 2011). Scholars recognize that thinking about the self (vs. others) is attached to feasibility (vs. desirability) (Liberman and Trope 1998; Lu, Xie, and Xu 2013; Trope and Liberman 2010). This paradoxically suggests that experiencing an unethical situation firsthand might inhibit boycott intention compared with a situation learned *de relato*. We formalize this point by considering the effect of a first-person versus third-person perspective. ⚐Figure 1 graphically depicts the theoretical framework.

Hypothesis Development

Subjective Well-Being and Boycotts

Subjective well-being reflects a person's self-evaluation of their own quality of life (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2018); this encompasses not only cognitive evaluations of one's life events but also one's positive and negative affective states (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002). Notably, subjective well-being can be considered from both a hedonic perspective (related to pleasure, happiness, and life satisfaction) and a eudemonic perspective (related to an individual's perception of a meaningful life and self-realized lifespan growth) (Balderjahn et al. 2020). Overall, the literature is inconsistent in measuring subjective well-being, but it displays a

prevailing view of well-being as an outcome of individuals' behaviors, cognitions, and emotions (Diener et al. 2009; Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2018). This has led to conflicting results. On the one hand, a growing body of literature supports a positive relationship between boycotts and subjective well-being (Lee and Ahn 2016; Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021). On the other hand, boycotting requires sacrificing and thus might negatively affect subjective well-being (Balderjahn et al. 2020; McGouran and Prothero 2016). In this case, individuals striving for consistency might experience a value conflict (Furchheim, Martin, and Morhart 2020).

Nevertheless, some scholars adopt the opposite perspective: subjective well-being is a determinant of people's goals, attitudes, and preferences. Because well-being can increase personal inner resources (Akyurek, Kars, and Bumin 2018), it "determines to a large extent that person's ability to act in the world" (Pajunen 2021, p. 111). Happy individuals might attach less importance to risks and problems compared with unhappier individuals, making them more eager to take action to cope with those problems (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2018; Ouweneel and Veenhoven 2016). Further, there is empirical support for the traditional "happy worker hypothesis" when subjective well-being is assumed to be a determinant of job performance (e.g., Luna-Arocas and Danvila-del-Valle 2021). Positive emotions foster psychological, physical, and social resources (Fredrickson 2013; Garland and Fredrickson 2019) that predict people's motivation to pursue a goal (e.g., boycotting a brand; Heckhausen, Wrosch, and Schulz 2019; Kuanr et al. 2021). This is especially true among young people (Haase et al. 2021). There is evidence that, when in a positive mood, young adults show better social skills and more self-confidence, but when they are low in life satisfaction, they are less likely to be prosocial and more likely to be victimized (Kazdin, Esveldt-Dawson, and Matson 1982; Martin, Huebner, and Valois 2008). Relatedly, there seems to be a correlation between life satisfaction and a lower risk

of internet addiction (Benvenuti and Mazzoni 2018; Mazzoni et al. 2016). Moreover, young adolescents with positive emotions have fewer strenuous relationships later in life (Kansky, Allen, and Diener 2019). Generally speaking, happy people have supportive social relationships (Diener and Seligman 2002; Oishi et al. 2007) because positive affect is associated with extraverted characteristics such as sociability and affiliation (Lucas et al. 2000). Overall, a positive mood causes people to feel more sociable and to behave more socially, and is thus associated with higher-quality relationships (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2018). However, negative affective states (such as sadness or depression) are detrimental to the development of the aforementioned resources and instead promote goal disengagement (Kunzmann, Kappes, and Wrosch 2014). Growing up in tumultuous circumstances, Gen Zers are more prone to psychological distress, anxiety, and depression than earlier generations (Twenge et al. 2018), which make them appear apathetic (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010). Nevertheless, those circumstances provide them new stimuli and new sources of arousal (Raggiotto and Scarpi 2021). At the same time, Gen Zers stand up for what is right and are eager to engage in unconventional forms of participation (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Luttrell and McGrath 2021; Palan, Gentina, and Muratore 2010; Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021). Consequently, well-being constitutes a resource that helps young adults engage in important goals and social activities, such as boycotting behaviors, that aim to bring a positive change to the world. Therefore, we expect that high levels of subjective well-being determine Gen Zers' intentions to boycott in response to an unethical situation:

H_1: Subjective well-being positively affects the intention to (a) enact boycotts and (b) support boycotts.

Moral Reasoning and Boycotts

Ethical idealism and boycotts

Previous literature suggests that the decision to boycott a product or service is a way of practicing ethical consumer behavior; as such, it might be influenced by one's moral values (Burroughs and Rindfleisch 2002; Fernandes 2020; Furchheim, Martin, and Morhart 2020; Pinna 2020; Shim et al. 2021). People use different systems of moral reasoning to derive their assessments about the morality of a certain action (Forsyth 1980), although they may not consciously understand their own reasoning (Fernandes 2020; Haidt 2001). Nonetheless, consumers' identification with a social or environmental cause may lead them to express their moral values through boycotting. Ethical idealism represents a type of moral value that reflects an individual's attitudes toward the consequences of an action and how they will impact others' welfare (Forsyth 1980; Palacios-Florencio et al. 2021). The assumption is that people who are highly idealistic in their moral orientation are committed to not harming others and are more likely to recognize morally questionable behaviors (Bowes-Sperry and Powell 1999), whereas those who are less idealistic assume that harm is sometimes necessary to produce good.

With regard to boycotts, Palacios-Florencio et al. (2021) recently proposed ethical idealism as a precursor of the attitude toward boycotting. Indeed, the authors found that people with strong scores in ethical idealism try to avoid behaviors that are harmful to others and, as such, they will likely hold a negative attitude toward boycotts and refrain from supporting them. However, when consumers are asked to not only support but also partake in a boycott, they may be inclined to join the collective action to protect and promote their moral values (Fernandes 2020; Haidt 2001). Indeed, research suggests that enacting a boycott can represent a complex emotional expression of self-realization (Klein et al. 2004; Kozinets, Handelman, and Lee 2010). Thus, responsible consumers tend to act ethically because it is the right thing to do, and they expect to

feel guilt for failing to take action (e.g., Furchheim et al. 2020; Pecot, Vasilopoulou, and Cavallaro 2021; Shim et al. 2021).

To avoid those feelings, consumers tend to adopt a moral obligation, which is associated with a positive intention to purchase ethically (e.g., Peloza, White, and Shang 2013). While Gen Xers were raised in an environment that made them pragmatic and ambitious (Herbig, Koehler, and Day 1993), Gen Zers grew up in affluent conditions (Luttrell and McGrath 2021) and in a technology-advanced world (Martin and Gentry 2011). These factors have reshaped the priorities and values of the Gen Z cohort, making them more oriented toward incorporating their moral values in their lifestyle (Djafarova and Foots 2022). Gen Zers are a highly idealistic generation, and their personal ethics strongly influence their judgment in ethically challenging situations (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Wood 2013). Gen Zers value the "people first, then profit" ethos in their lives and consumption behaviors (Gutfreund 2016), and thus seek products and services that promote environmental protection and social values, such as support for employees and local communities (Dabija and Bejan 2017). In tandem, Gen Zers are keen to take actions to punish organizations that violate their ethical code, and this extends beyond just liking a campaign. In this sense, ethical idealism feeds their need to fight for change and should lead them to enact boycotts. Conversely, given the high importance of ethical values in a Gen Zer's life, we hypothesize that ethical idealism negatively affects the intentions to support a boycott, but not enact one. Formally,

H_2: Ethical idealism (a) positively affects the intention to enact boycotts and (b) negatively affects the intention to support boycotts.

Self-congruence and boycotts

Social identity theory suggests that individuals choose and support activities that are congruent with salient aspects of their identity (Tajfel 1982). Through both consumption and

anticonsumption activities, consumers construct and communicate their self-concepts (e.g., Klein et al. 2014). For decades, marketing research has used identity theory to understand why consumers perceive a product as "me" or "not me" (Kleine, Kleine, and Allen 1995) and to examine the congruence between individuals and their social referents (Belk 1988; Sirgy 1982). In this same vein, research on organizational identity suggests that the value congruence between individuals and organizations is central to cognitive social identification (Edwards 2005). The same applies to consumers' reactions to corporate social responsibility, which are contingent on the amount of congruence or overlap they perceive with a company's character (Bhattacharya and Sen 2003). Notably, self-identity also motivates consumers toward ethical behaviors (e.g., Barbarossa and De Pelsmacker 2016; Confente, Scarpi, and Russo 2020; Sparks and Shepherd 1992) because such consumers have incorporated ethical issues into their self-identity. For example, people who self-identify as "recyclers" are more likely to recycle than those who do not identify as such (e.g., Mannetti, Pierro, and Livi 2004). Because Gen Zers are highly idealistic, their consumption behaviors shape their identities (Djafarova and Foots 2022) but, at the same time, their identities (both online and offline) also influence their consumption habits (Djafarova and Bowes 2021). In this sense, Gen Zers are expected to assign importance to the congruence between what they say and what they do (Furchheim, Martin, and Morhart 2020; Kozinets, Handelman, and Lee 2010; Wood 2013; Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021). Thus, we expect Gen Zers to respond to unethical situations with boycotting to be consistent with their strong ethical values. Formally,

H_3: Self-congruence positively affects the intention to (a) enact boycotts and (b) support boycotts.

Self-expression and boycotts

The literature suggests that people not only strive for self-consistency but also want to express it by spreading word of mouth about their self-congruent consumption activities (Saenger, Thomas, and Johnson 2013). People's motivations include the desire to gain social status in the eyes of others (Robertson and Gatignon 1986) or achieve approval (Hennig-Thurau et al. 2004). Thus, individuals might be interested in self-expressing to be heard, to express who they are, or to simply inform others about their behaviors regardless of its potential influence (Saenger, Thomas, and Johnson 2013). Even though Gen Zers have been considered passive consumers, their extensive use of digital technologies and their connected and globalized world enriched their sources of stimulations and arousal, making them "energetic and strongly oriented toward self-improvement and challenges" (Raggiotto and Scarpi 2021, p. 283). In the context of boycotting, self-expression is a relevant antecedent because consumers need to realize the intrinsic rewards of boycott participation (e.g., potentially maintaining or boosting self-esteem) beyond the collective gains that a boycott can bring (Sen, Gürhan-Canli, and Morwitz 2001). Because Gen Zers grew up in a digital environment in which people have unfiltered access to celebrities and influencers via social media (Jacobson 2020), they likely recognize the importance of expressing their identity to an "always-on" audience. However, because of Gen Zers' fluidity between the online and offline realms, their expressions on digital channels may also manifest in the real world. Gen Zers are autonomous and use unconventional forms of participation in social life to express and construct their identities (Francis and Hoefel 2018; Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Wang, Mo, and Wang 2022). In this sense, social participation through boycotting is also a mean for self-expression. Therefore, self-expression is expected to

positively influence the intention to enact and support boycotts as a reaction to unethical situations. Formally,

H_4: Self-expression positively affects the intention to (a) enact boycotts and (b) support boycotts.

Making a difference and boycotts

The literature sees boycotting as a trade-off between the individual benefits of consumption and the collective benefits that a boycott can entail (e.g., Sen, Gürhan-Canli, and Morwitz 2001). Therefore, boycotts represent not only an individualistic anticonsumption behavior to enhance the self but also a collective action that aims to benefit other people (Klein et al. 2014; Sen, Gürhan-Canli, and Morwitz 2001). Boycott participation is indeed "prompted by the belief that a firm has engaged in conduct that is strikingly wrong and that has negative and possibly harmful consequences for various parties" (Klein et al. 2014, p. 96). This strong belief in the collective welfare is a characteristic of Gen Zers, who score high in the dimensions that support enhancement of others by transcending selfish interests (Sakdiyakorn, Golubovskaya, and Solnet 2021; Schwartz 2012). In particular, recent findings suggest that parents played an incremental role in instilling a set of values related to respect, justice, fairness, and equal rights; and their children were indeed raised with the mentality of doing good and being kind to others (Sakdiyakorn, Golubovskaya, and Solnet 2021). Extant research also suggests that Gen Zers score high in the desire to fight for systemic, transformational social change through their actions (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Luttrell and McGrath 2021), which is first reflected in their workplace behavior. Gen Zers look for companies that fit their cultural values and in which they can be in a position to truly make a contribution (Gabrielova and Buchko 2021). Gen Zers possess unique abilities and skills that make them more productive in the workplace (Ozkan and Solmaz 2015); consequently, they are self-confident and aware of their skills. This self-confidence transcends the boundaries of the workplace and impacts other aspects of life. Thus,

when facing ethical dilemmas, Gen Zers are confident that their actions have the power to make an impact toward a desired change (Braunsberger and Buckler 2011). Therefore, it is expected that the Gen Z generation will use boycotting as part of a bid to induce social change. Formally,

H_5: The willingness to make a difference positively affects the intention to (a) enact boycotts and (b) support boycotts.

Situational Characteristics and Boycotts

The role of online versus offline context on boycotts

The social context in which individuals operate plays a fundamental role in shaping their behaviors (Ashworth, Darke, and Schaller 2005; Kristofferson, White, and Peloza 2013). Most research has investigated the online and offline contexts separately, but only a few scholars have compared the two (e.g., Chayinska, Miranda, and González 2021; Vissers and Stolle 2014). Recent research on activism suggests that studying the interaction between the online and offline contexts is more useful than relying on the simplistic reasoning associated with the popular concept of slacktivism (Greijdanus et al. 2016; Kristofferson, White, and Peloza 2014). Recently, Lieberman and Schroeder (2020) analyzed the structural characteristics across the two contexts as determinants of social outcome. The present study takes special interest in two features that are specific to the online context: greater anonymity and wider information dissemination. Regarding the former, the greater anonymity of online contexts is associated with disinhibiting and aggressive behaviors, which can encourage moral outrages and social conflicts (Brady and Crockett 2019; Crockett 2017). In this vein, "psychologists have called for closer examination of the consequences of digital communication among adolescents" (Lieberman and Schroeder 2020, p. 17; see also Underwood and Ehrenreich 2017). Regarding the latter, individuals have access to larger audiences when online, which can help them achieve their communication or sharing goals easier and faster (Lieberman and Schroeder 2020). For this reason, online contexts may be an especially effective tool for organizing social groups or

movements (Theocharis et al. 2015). Relatedly, online contexts give activists more opportunity to distance themselves from other participants (Greijdanus et al. 2016; LeFebvre and Armstrong 2018).

Furthermore, the literature indicates that younger (vs. older) people engage in collective action more often when online (vs. offline) (Greijdanus et al. 2016; Hoffmann and Lutz 2021). In particular, differences between the two contexts can be found when investigating boycotting behaviors of younger people (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010; Ward and De Vreese 2011). Gen Zers have a distinct ability to seek information online and form networks around issues that matter to them (Ward and De Vreese 2011). However, the online context has a particular relevance for Gen Zers because they are constantly under the spotlight online). Consequently, they are eager to express themselves through online social participation (Luttrell and McGrath 2021; Palley 2012; Taylor and Keeter 2010). In fact, Gen Zers also use hashtag activism on social media to present their beliefs and values in supporting a cause, suggesting that they build an online presence to complete their identities beyond their offline activities (Luttrell and McGrath 2021). Moreover, studies suggest that nearly 60% of Gen Zers report that social life begins online because they feel more comfortable talking about their personal life there than in real life (Palley 2012; Taylor and Keeter 2010). Consequently, we might expect that, when exposed to an online unethical situation, they will be more likely to take an action compared with an offline context. Formally,

H_6: An online context positively affects the intention to (a) enact boycotts and (b) support boycotts, compared with an offline context.

First-person versus third-person perspective on boycotts

People tend to apply universal moral rules in their judgments when thinking from a third-person perspective, but attenuate their moral stances when thinking from a first-person perspective (Eyal, Liberman, and Trope 2008; Trope and Liberman 2010). According to construal level

theory (CLT; Liberman and Trope 2014; Trope and Liberman 2003), these differences in perspective represent a cognitive construct known as social distance, which reflects how people subjectively experience moral outrages in a consumption context in reference to the self. With the notable exception of Lo, Tsarenko, and Tojib (2019), the literature has neglected to study the impact of social distance on consumers' moral judgments. However, this effect could be especially relevant among Gen Zers, who are more likely to associate everyday consumption behaviors with their personal identities (Djafarova and Foots 2022; Francis and Hoefel 2018; Luttrell and McGrath 2021; Ziesemer, Hüttel, and Balderjahn 2021).

According to CLT, when making a decision, individuals attach desirability to a high-level representation of concepts (corresponding to abstract thinking) and they attach feasibility to low-level representations (corresponding to concrete thinking) (Liberman and Trope 1998; Lu, Xie, and Xu 2013). In other words, thinking about an unethical situation in the first-person might be associated with feasibility (thereby inhibiting subsequent behaviors), while thinking about the same situation from a third-person perspective (i.e., learned from others) may induce desirability (thereby encouraging response behaviors) (Liberman and Trope 1998; Lu, Xie, and Xu 2013). Consequently, consumers may be less likely to boycott when they experience an unethical situation from a first-person rather than a third-person perspective. Formally,

H_7: A first-person experience of an unethical situation positively affects the intention to (a) enact boycotts and (b) support boycotts compared with an indirect third-person unethical situation.

Control Variables

In addition to the previous hypotheses, this article includes two control variables in the analysis; namely, collectivism and masculinity (Hofstede and Bond 1984, 2011). These individual traits are embedded in a sociocultural context and help to explain cultural differences in people's values, behaviors, and attitudes.

As Hofstede (2011) suggests, people scoring high on individualism emphasize "I" over "we," are concerned about privacy, and react to transgressions of norms with guilt feelings rather than with shame. Meanwhile, people who score high in collectivism are likely to give priority to group goals and have their social behavior less determined by internal processes (Triandis 2001; Youngdahl et al. 2003).

The analysis also controlled for masculinity given the clear link between ethical behaviors and psychological gender identity (masculinity and femininity) (Pinna 2020). Masculinity traits are often associated with a weaker ethic of care (Zelezny, Chua, and Aldrich 2000) and less concern for health and safety issues then femininity traits. Moreover, masculinity-oriented cultures tend to adopt a moralistic attitude and "show a gap between men's values and women's values" (Hofstede 2011, p. 12).

Methodology

To test our hypotheses, we designed a survey including 2 (online vs. offline) × 2 (first-person vs. third-person perspective) experimental conditions using eight scenarios. In particular, consistent with H_6, we manipulated four empirical contexts—fake news, body shaming, food delivery, and fashion purchase—by presenting each context in a possible online versus offline situation. Moreover, fashion purchase and fake news were presented as if the subject heard about them, while body shaming and food delivery were presented as if they were directly experienced (consistent with H_7; Liberman and Trope 1998; Lu, Xie, and Xu 2013). We took care to ensure that the scenarios were concise (between 100 and 120 words); avoided any reference to gender, age, or nationality; and always used the preposition "you." All scenarios indicated that an unethical situation had occurred and—to simplify the attribution step in moral reasoning—clarified that the actor in the scenario was to blame (e.g., Shim et al. 2021). ⚐Table 1 depicts a taxonomy of the scenarios:

The eight scenarios were included in a questionnaire implemented on Qualtrics. The questionnaire featured measurement scales about Subjective Well-Being (eight items adapted from Diener et al. [2009]), Collectivism (six items adapted from Youngdahl et al. [2003]), and Masculinity (four items adapted from Youngdahl et al. [2003]). Respondents read one of the eight scenarios and then completed the scales on Enact Boycott (three items adapted from Xie and Bagozzi [2019]), Support Boycott (three items adapted from Palacios-Florencio et al. [2021]), Individual Self-Congruence (five items adapted from Xie, Bagozzi, and Meland [2015]), Ethical Idealism (eight items adapted from Palacios-Florencio et al. [2021]), Self-Expression (six items adapted from Saenger, Thomas, and Johnson [2013]), and Make a Difference (three items adapted from Klein, Smith, and John [2004]). Finally, respondents reported their gender and age before being quickly debriefed and thanked. It is worth noting that the items of the measurement scales (Subjective Well-Being, Masculinity, and Collectivism) presented *before* a scenario were cast to avoid any possible mention of the scenario and boycotting. Meanwhile, the items related to Support Boycott and Enact Boycott included an explicit reference to the actor responsible for the unethical situation presented in the scenario. Finally, the items related to Individual Self-Congruence, Ethical Idealism, Self-Expression, and Make a Difference explicitly mentioned boycotting the actor mentioned in the scenario.

We implemented a set of preventative measures to mitigate method biases (e.g., Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt 2015; MacKenzie and Podsakoff 2012; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff 2012; Richardson, Simmering, and Sturman 2009). First, the questionnaire assured respondents that they would remain anonymous, that there were no right or wrong answers, and that data would only be used for research purposes. Second, there were brief paragraphs between questionnaire pages to cue respondents' attention without influencing their responses as well as

to illustrate the scale range. Third, the survey initially presented the two dependent variables, followed by the independent variables, and finally the control variables and sociodemographics. Finally, we took care to reverse some items and separate pages to reduce information overload and feature fatigue.

The survey was active in late December 2021, and it involved a panel of 400 participants provided by Prolific (ages ranged from 18 to 25 years; all participants were fluent in English). We obtained 338 usable questionnaires, randomly assigned to the eight scenarios. In detail, 49.1% of the respondents were female (seven preferred not to disclose their gender) with an average age of M = 21.94 years (SD = 2.18). Out of the 339 questionnaires, 169 were collected with online scenarios and 170 had the "third-person perspective" scenario. In addition, the fake news and fashion scenarios received 85 observations each, while body shaming and food received 84 observations each (Table 1 reports the size of each experimental cell). Overall, the sampling procedure provided a balanced experimental cell. Age was homogeneous for the online and offline conditions (p(t = −.225, d.f. = 334.63) = .822) as well as for the first-person and third-person experienced and heard about condition (p(t = .877, d.f. = 333.93) = .381). There were more women than men in the offline condition, but the opposite was true in the online condition ($p(\chi^2 = 6.68$, d.f. = 1) = 1e-02); however, there were no gender differences between the first-person and third-person perspectives ($p(\chi^2 = .15$, d.f. = 1) = .7).

Prescenario Variables

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the data revealed three factors accounting for 56% of total variance (factor loadings: Subjective Well-Being = .6–.79; Collectivism = .59–.79; Masculinity = .73–.88) and with Cronbach's alphas above .8. The results of a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (LISREL 8.80; Jöreskog and Sörbrom 2003) showed a satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 238.53$, d.f. = 112; root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .058, p(RMSEA <

.05) = .1; normed fit index [NFI] = .95; nonnormed fit index [NNFI] = .97; comparative fit index, incremental fit index [CFI, IFI] = .98; standardized root mean square residual [SRMR] = .054; goodness-of-fit index [GFI] = .92; adjusted goodness-of-fit index [AGFI]=.89). Table 2 reports the survey items, factor loadings, and Cronbach's alphas.

A one-factor EFA did not indicate any common variance (variance explained 30.8%). Meanwhile, the data indicated average variances extracted [AVEs] above .5 (Subjective Well-Being = .52; Collectivism = .52; Masculinity = .68) and high composite reliability (Subjective Well-Being = .9; Collectivism = .87; Masculinity = .86). Moreover, the factors demonstrated small interfactor correlations (min = .10, max = .24) and possessed discriminant validity (Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt 2015).

In addition, the three variables were homogenous with respect to the two experimental conditions (i.e., online vs. offline and first-person vs. third-person perspective) as all t-tests provided *p*-values above .5. These analyses substantiated the viability of the two factors related to online versus offline context and first-person versus third-perspective.

Postscenario Variables

After factor purification, the final EFA resulted in a six-factor solution that accounted for 63% of total variance (factor loadings: Enact Boycott = .48–.73; Support Boycott = .82–.86; Individual Self-Congruence = .62–.80; Ethical Idealism = .55–.70; Self-Expression = .73–.90; Make a Difference = .65–.88) and with Cronbach's alphas above .8. The results of a CFA (LISREL 8.80; Jöreskog and Sörbrom 2003) showed a satisfactory fit (χ^2 = 553.30, d.f. = 282; RMSEA = .053, *p*(RMSEA < .05) = .19; NFI = .95; NNFI, CFI, IFI = .97; SRMR = .065; GFI = .89; AGFI = .86).

Table 3 reports the survey items, factor loadings, and Cronbach's alphas.

A one-factor EFA did not indicate any common variance (variance explained 30.8%). Meanwhile, the data indicated almost all AVEs above .5 (Enact Boycott = .68; Support Boycott = .73–.86; Individual Self-Congruence = .65; Ethical Idealism = .41; Self-Expression = .72; Make a Difference = .73) and high composite reliability (Enact Boycott = .68; Support Boycott = .73; Individual Self-Congruence = .76; Ethical Idealism = .57; Self-Expression = .83; Make a Difference = .73). Furthermore, the interfactor correlations were small (between .02 and .12) and possessed discriminant validity (Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt 2015).

Results

Figure 2 graphically reports the summary statistics of the dependent and independent variables resulting from the factor analyses.

Our hypotheses argue that Subjective Well-Being (H_1) and four variables related to moral reasoning—Ethical Idealism (H_2), Self-Congruence (H_3), Self-Expression (H_4), and Make a Difference (H_5)—affect inclinations toward boycotting (Enact Boycott and Support Boycott). We also included the effect of two control variables (Collectivism and Masculinity) and two experimental indicators (Online and Perspective). For each dependent variable, we calculated partial model estimates (Models 1–5) prior to running the full model (Model 6). Partial models included the intercept model, taken as a base model for further comparisons (Model 1), and models using the five independent variables (Model 2), the two controls (Model 3), the independent variables and controls (Model 4), and the two experimental indicators (Model 5). Overall, the data support our conceptual framework.

The Determinants of Enact Boycott

All models using Enact Boycott as a dependent variable were significantly different from the intercept model (Model 1), as indicated by the F-statistics tests. Model 6 also differed significantly from submodels 2–5 (all $p(F) < 1e\text{-}03$), indicating that the model with all the

independent variables better explained Enact Boycott than partial models (see Table 4). In the full model (Model 6, Table 4), the coefficient of Subjective Well-Being was positive and statistically significant, indicating that higher subjective well-being corresponds to a higher intention to enact boycotting. Thus, the data support H_{1a}. These effects were robust in the submodels (Models 2 and 4, Table 4). Interestingly, Ethical Idealism reported a positive and significant coefficient, suggesting that it positively influences the intention to Enact Boycott, in support of H_{2a}. The coefficients of Self-Congruence and Make a Difference were both positive and statistically significant, in support of H_{3a} and H_{5a}. Finally, there was no significant effect for the Self-Expression variable and thus no support for H_{4a}. This result is also consistent in Model 2 and Model 4. It is worth noting that Self-Congruence reported the highest effect size, possibly underscoring the strong influence of Gen Zers' willingness to communicate their self-identity through anticonsumption behaviors. Notably, and contrary to our expectations, the full model (Model 6, Table 5) provided a significant but negative effect of the online context, which leads to the rejection of H_{6a}. Consistent with our expectations, Model 6 reported a negative and significant effect of the first-person perspective, supporting H_{7a}. Finally, no effects were found for Collectivism and Masculinity.

The Determinants of Support Boycott

The models for Support Boycott paint a different picture. As indicated by the F-statistics tests, all models using Support Boycott as a dependent variable were significantly different from the intercept model (Model 1). Model 6 also differed significantly from submodels 2–5 (all $p(F) <$ 1e-03), indicating that the model with all the independent variables better explains Support Boycott than partial models (see Table 5). In the full model (Model 6, Table 5), the Subjective Well-Being coefficient was negative and statistically significant. In contrast to Enact Boycott, this finding indicates that Gen Zers scoring high in Subjective Well-Being are less likely to

Support Boycott. These effects were robust in the submodels (Models 2 and 4, Table 4). Thus, the data do not support H_{1b}. The coefficients of Self-Congruence and Make a Difference were both positive and statistically significant, supporting H_{3b} and H_{5b}, respectively. However, the data lack support for the effects of Ethical Idealism and Self-Expression, leading to the rejection of H_{2b} and H_{4b}. Notably, the size effect of Self-Congruence did not surpass the other effects, which contrasts the case of Enact Boycott. Surprisingly, the online versus offline context had no significant effect on Support Boycott—a rejection of H_{6b}. Consistent with our expectations, Model 6 reported a negative and significant effect of the first-person perspective, in support of H_{7a}. Finally, Masculinity produced a significant and negative effect; Collectivism did not.

Discussion

While scholarship has widely investigated the effects of different factors on subjective well-being, less is known about the effect of well-being on consumer behaviors (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2018). This is especially true when considering young generations, like Gen Z. That said, there is some evidence that young consumers with high subjective well-being are better able to utilize the digital environment without becoming addicted (Mazzoni et al. 2016). Other studies suggest that subjective well-being can influence the behaviors of consumers who are confronted with unethical situations (Kuanr et al. 2021). Moreover, it is clear that aspects of well-being play different roles in stimulating or inhibiting individuals' behavioral responses.

Overall, the results of this study support the notion that young consumers display their true values and act accordingly when exposed to an unethical situation. Indeed, the data affirm the claim that Gen Zers are the "true generation" (Francis and Hoefel 2018): They are not apathetic, as some believe (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010), but instead struggle for self-consistency while trying to build their own identities through unconventional forms of consumerism. As the results suggest, Gen Zers appear to be ready to "stand up and sit-in or die-in for their causes … just as

many late baby boomers and early Gen Xers have done in the past" (Luttrell and McGrath 2021, p. 32). In fact, when Gen Zers score high on subjective well-being, they can mobilize internal resources to cope with a moral outrage by enacting boycotts. Consistently, they do not feel the need to express themselves just by supporting boycotts with social media likes or by word of mouth. In fact, they appear to be aware of their individual role in the market arena and choose to make independent decisions to positively influence the future, rather than merely express themselves for the sake of social recognition.

In this vein, Gen Zers differ from other generations in the degree to which they lean on their moral reasoning when making consumption choices (Atanasova and Eckhardt 2021; Strenze 2021). This distance from the materialism of older generations deserves a cultural explanation that can transcend the common approach of Hofstede (2011), given that the two indicators of Collectivism and Masculinity did not add much information to our models. In this regard, the literature suggests the necessity of weighing the balance between materialistic values (whereby consumption is critical to achieving the right social image) and postmaterialistic values (whereby people reduce or rethink individual consumption for the sake of others' well-being and the environment) (Atanasova and Eckhardt 2021; Furchheim, Martin, and Morhart 2020; Inglehart 2008). In the end, the resulting lack of clear behavioral guidance might activate the inhibition system in the brain, provoking a lower intention to boycott. Nevertheless, the sociological literature suggests that the prevailing of postmaterialism on materialism is likely to galvanize unconventional political action, such as boycotting or protesting (Vassallo 2020). In fact, postmaterialism is connected to a greater demand for values satisfaction, quality of life, and self-expression, in opposition to the narrow focus of materialism on achieving satisfaction and status through the consumption and possession of goods (e.g., Atanasova and Eckhardt 2021; Inglehart

2008; Kasser et al. 2004). Fittingly, postmaterialism is prevailing in young generations (Delistavrou, Krystallis, and Tilikidou 2020; Islam et al. 2018; Strenze 2021), who are more likely to enact their individual values in the form "of informal, individualized and everyday activities" (Harris, Wyn, and Younes 2010, p. 10). Dittmar et al. (2014; see also Watson 2021) found a robust negative relationship between materialism and well-being, suggesting a poor satisfaction of psychological needs at the top of the Maslow hierarchy. Thus, since postmaterialism values are connected to the eudemonic component of subjective well-being, people are more likely to support and participate in social actions related to human rights, freedom of speech, and environmental conservation in postmaterialism cultures.

Conclusion

Theoretical Implications

These results contribute to the literature in several ways. First, they add to the literature on subjective well-being by treating it less as an outcome and more as a factor that can activate or inhibit response behaviors to unethical situations within a specific cohort of consumers—namely, Gen Zers. As the first generation of digital natives who can fluidly navigate the online and offline contexts, they may spend a lot of time in their social media interactions, developing different selves or personalities to align their identities with the requirements of each community (Furchheim, Martin, and Morhart 2020; Valkenburg and Peter 2011). Conversely, our results are consistent with a view of Gen Zers feeling good about themselves and their lives that translates into similar moral reasoning and subsequent actions consistently across online and offline contexts. Second, we contribute to the literature on boycotting (e.g., Fernandes 2020; Klein et al. 2014) by expanding the current understanding of how Gen Z confronts moral outrage. In particular, the results confirm that Gen Zers try to be congruent with their own values and make

a difference through their behaviors and thereby maintain their identity as people who transcend selfish interests (Bolton and Reed 2004; Oyserman 2009).

Furthermore, this research adds empirical support to the CLT literature by focusing on social distance in the context of ethical transgressions. So far, only Lo, Tsarenko, and Tojib (2019) have investigated the impact of social distance on consumers' moral judgments. The present study adds to this literature by affirming that unethical situations experienced from a third-person perspective (i.e., reported by others) foster a high-level construal (as in our scenarios about fake news and the environmental impact of fashion companies), which then stimulates moral stances rooted in good intentions. Meanwhile, the results cast some doubts on whether actual boycotting behaviors will follow. Conversely, when people learn about an unethical situation in the first-person (such as in our scenarios about body shaming and food delivery), they experience a low-level construal that attenuates moral stances. This finding is consistent with the CLT prediction that feasibility prevails over desirability (Lo, Tsarenko, and Tojib 2019; Lu, Xie, and Xu 2013; Trope and Liberman 2010). Overall, a form of the "not in my backyard" effect seems to also apply to Gen Zers, which deserves further investigation.

As a final point, the results exhibited no effect or marginal explanatory power of the culture-related control variables (namely, Masculinity and Collectivism; Hofstede 2011). Against the popular perspective of Hofstede's conceptualization of cultural dimensions, there is a nascent and fruitful stream of literature on postmaterialism that may provide a compelling explanation of our results. From this perspective, the effect of Gen Zers' subjective well-being on their boycott responses is rooted in their emphasis on postmaterialism (with its focus on quality of life and social and environmental welfare) rather than on traditional materialism (with its focus on obtaining higher status through the possession and consumption of goods) (Inglehart 2008).

Given the prevailing attention on materialism among scholars (Atanasova and Eckhardt 2021; Longmire, Chan, and Lawry 2021), the implied impact of postmaterialism merits further research from marketing scholars.

Managerial Implications

For managers, a more granular exploration of Gen Zers' boycotting behaviors can help to illuminate how this generation is shaping the future of consumption.

Brands that target Gen Zers need to be aware that young people display a high level of ethicality, which leads them to support and buy from brands that are aligned with their own values. Because activism is part of Gen Zers' identity, organizations that want to attract and retain these consumers—as well as avoid boycotts—need to seriously rethink how they deliver value and "walk the talk" (Schoeneborn, Morsing, and Crane 2020). As digital natives who move seamlessly between online and offline domains, Gen Zers will rapidly detect any misalignment between what brands say and do. Thus, managers who want to avoid conflicts need to embrace authentic communication strategies and engage in continuous social media listening. Indeed, authenticity is "one of the cornerstones of contemporary marketing" (Brown, Kozinets, and Sherry 2003, p. 21; see also Nunes, Ordanini, and Giambastiani 2021), and this should be especially true for Gen Z.

Compared with Millennials, who have been defined as the "me" generation (Luttrell and McGrath 2021), Gen Zers see consumption as an expression of individual identity and ethical concern. Therefore, they expect brands to make a step forward from corporate social responsibility stances and "take a stand" on controversial social and political issues (e.g., Mukherjee and Althuizen 2020) that are consistent with their values.

Moreover, for Gen Zers who are always online, the online–offline boundary is fuzzy. Consequently, brands should devote particular attention to creating a coherent image and communication activity in both realms. This is particularly relevant for social media platforms. In fact, many unethical behaviors (e.g., bearing false identities, body shaming, insulting, sharing misinformation) that are punished or socially blamed offline do not receive the same treatment online. Gen Zers, as digital natives who fluidly switch between online and offline contexts, should be engaged by platforms to help develop tools to attenuate or eliminate the unethical behaviors that pollute so much of the internet. We suggest that managers invest in drawing young adults into online brand or product communities, as this could increase their support for companies' activities.

The present article also supports the idea that Gen Zers will be increasingly interested in making a difference and contributing to society through their work, especially in marketing-related roles (e.g., Good, Hughes, and Wang 2022). At the same time, many firms will need to sharpen their ability to address grand challenges if they want to remain profitable (Chandy et al. 2021; De Ruyter et al. 2021). Thus, firms should seriously consider how to create a forward-looking marketing practice that resonates with Gen Zers' shift in personal values compared with older generations. Consistently, research needs to determine how young people's subjective well-being will guide their consumption choices, educational routes, and future positions in companies.

Finally, we encourage educational institutions to add courses on ethical business conduct to boost young consumers' awareness of companies' behaviors and help them refine their critical thinking skills as adult consumers.

Limitations and Future Research Avenues

Despite this study's theoretical and managerial contributions, it features some limitations that should be acknowledged. First, we focused on Gen Zers and did not compare them with other

generational cohorts. Future research might complement the results by analyzing how subjective well-being changes over lifespans and affects boycotting intentions. Moreover, it would be interesting to analyze actual boycotting behavior through field experiments. Future research could also achieve more nuance by applying content analysis techniques to social media posts or interviews with generational members. Furthermore, scholars could glean interesting insights from investigating the relationship between perceived social distance, moral stances, and subjective well-being. Finally, this article focused on collectivism and masculinity as possible cultural effects, but disregarded other relevant cultural dimensions (i.e., power distance, uncertainty avoidance, long-term vs. short-term orientation, indulgence vs. restraint; e.g., Hofstede 2011). In light of the results, future studies would be more profitable and conclusive by including materialism and postmaterialism.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests
The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding
The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

References

Ajzen, I. (1991), "The Theory of Planned Behavior," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50 (2), 179–211.

Ajzen, I. and M. Fishbein (1977), "Attitude-Behavior Relations: A Theoretical Analysis and Review of Empirical Research," *Psychological Bulletin*, 84 (5), 888–918.

Akyurek, G., S. Kars, and G. Bumin (2018), "The Determinants of Occupational Therapy Students' Attitudes: Mindfulness and Well-Being," *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7 (3), 242–50.

Ashworth, L., P. Darke, and M. Schaller (2005), "No One Wants to Look Cheap: Trade-Offs Between Social Disincentives and the Economic and Psychological Incentives to Redeem Coupons," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (4), 295–306.

Atanasova, A. and G.M. Eckhardt (2021), "The Broadening Boundaries of Materialism," *Marketing Theory*, 21 (4), 481–500.

Azimi, S., Y. Andonova, and C. Schewe (2021), "Closer Together or Further Apart? Values of Hero Generations Y and Z During Crisis," *Young Consumers*, 23 (2), 179–96.

Balderjahn, I., M.S. Lee, B. Seegebarth, and M. Peyer (2020), "A Sustainable Pathway to Consumer Well-Being. The Role of Anticonsumption and Consumer Empowerment," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 54 (2), 456–88.

Barbarossa, C. and P. De Pelsmacker (2016), "Positive and Negative Antecedents of Purchasing Eco-Friendly Products: A Comparison Between Green and Non-Green Consumers," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134 (2), 229–47.

Belk, R.W. (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (2), 139–168.

Bennett, W.L. (2007), "Civic Learning in Changing Democracies: Challenges for Citizenship and Civic Education," in Dahlgren, P. (ed), *Young Citizens and New Media*. Routledge, 59-77.

Benvenuti, M. and E. Mazzoni (2018), "Surfing the Web: The Role of Social-Support in the Adolescents' Internet Use," *Progress in Human Computer Interaction*, 1 (3), 1–14.

Bhattacharya, C.B. and S. Sen (2003), "Consumer–Company Identification: A Framework for Understanding Consumers' Relationships with Companies," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (2), 76–88.

Bolton, L.E. and A. Reed (2004), "Sticky Priors: The Perseverance of Identity Effects on Judgment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41 (4), 397–410.

Bowes-Sperry, L. and G.N. Powell (1999), "Observers' Reactions to Social-Sexual Behavior at Work: An Ethical Decision Making Perspective," *Journal of Management*, 25 (6), 779–802.

Brady, W.J. and M.J. Crockett (2019), "How Effective Is Online Outrage?" *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23 (2), 79–80.

Braunsberger, K. and B. Buckler (2011), "What Motivates Consumers to Participate in Boycotts: Lessons from the Ongoing Canadian Seafood Boycott," *Journal of Business Research*, 64 (1), 96–102.

Brown, S., R.V. Kozinets, and J.F. Sherry Jr. (2003), "Teaching Old Brands New Tricks: Retro Branding and the Revival of Brand Meaning," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (3), 19–33.

Burroughs, J.E. and A. Rindfleisch (2002), "Materialism and Well-Being: A Conflicting Values Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (3), 348–70.

Chandy, R.K., G.V. Johar, C. Moorman, and J.H. Roberts (2021), "Better Marketing for a Better World," *Journal of Marketing*, 85 (3), 1–9.

Chayinska, M., D. Miranda, and R. González (2021), "A Longitudinal Study of the Bidirectional Causal Relationships Between Online Political Participation and Offline Collective Action," *Computers in Human Behavior*, 121, 106810.

Confente, I., D. Scarpi, and I. Russo (2020), "Marketing a New Generation of Bio-Plastics Products for a Circular Economy: The Role of Green Self-Identity, Self-Congruity, and Perceived Value," *Journal of Business Research*, 112, 431–39.

Crockett, M.J. (2017), "Moral Outrage in the Digital Age," *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1 (11), 769–71.

Dabija, D.C. and B.M. Bejan (2017, May), "A Cross-Generational Perspective on Green Loyalty in Romanian Retail," Griffiths School of Management and IT Annual Conference on Business, Entrepreneurship and Ethics. Springer, 1–23.

Delistavrou, A., A. Krystallis, and I. Tilikidou (2020), "Consumers' Decision to Boycott 'Unethical' Products: The Role of Materialism/Post Materialism," *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 48 (10), 1121–38.

De Ruyter, K., D.I. Keeling, K. Plangger, M. Montecchi, M.L. Scott, and D.W. Dahl (2021), "Reimagining Marketing Strategy: Driving the Debate on Grand Challenges," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50, 13–21.

Diener, E., R.E. Lucas, and S. Oishi (2018), "Advances and Open Questions in the Science of Subjective Well-Being," *Collabra: Psychology*, 4 (1), 1–49.

Diener, E., and M.E. Seligman (2002), "Very Happy People," *Psychological Science*, 13 (1), 81–84.

Diener, E., D. Wirtz, R. Biswas-Diener, W. Tov, C. Kim-Prieto, D.W. Choi, and S. Oishi (2009), "New Measures of Well-Being," in *Assessing Well-Being: The Collective Works of Ed Diener*, E. Diener, ed. Springer, 247–66.

Dittmar, H., R. Bond, M. Hurst, and T. Kasser (2014), "The Relationship Between Materialism and Personal Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107 (5), 879–924.

Djafarova, E. and T. Bowes (2021), "'Instagram Made Me Buy It': Generation Z Impulse Purchases in Fashion Industry," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 59, 102345.

Djafarova, E. and S. Foots (2022), "Exploring Ethical Consumption of Generation Z: Theory of Planned Behaviour," *Young Consumers*, 23 (3), 413–43.

Dovidio, J.F., J.A. Piliavin, S.L. Gaertner, D.A. Schroeder, and R.D. Clark III (1991), "The Arousal: Cost-Reward Model and the Process of Intervention: A Review of the Evidence," in *Prosocial Behavior*, M. S. Clark, ed. SAGE Publications, 86–118.

Edwards, M.R. (2005), "Organizational Identification: A Conceptual and Operational Review," *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7 (4), 207–30.

Eyal, T., N. Liberman, and Y. Trope (2008), "Judging Near and Distant Virtue and Vice," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44 (4), 1204–09.

Fernandes, D. (2020), “Politics at the Mall: The Moral Foundations of Boycotts,” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 39 (4), 494–513.

Fishbein, M. and I. Ajzen (1977), “Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 10 (2), 130-132.

Forsyth, D. R. (1980), “A Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (1), 175–84.

Francis, T. and F. Hoefel (2018), “‘True Gen’: Generation Z and Its Implications for Companies,” McKinsey & Company (November 12), https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/consumer-packaged-goods/our-insights/true-gen-generation-z-and-its-implications-for-companies.

Fredrickson, B.L. (2013), “Positive Emotions Broaden and Build,” in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 47. Academic Press, 1–53.

Furchheim, P., C. Martin, and F. Morhart (2020), “Being Green in a Materialistic World: Consequences for Subjective Well–Being,” *Psychology & Marketing*, 37 (1), 114–30.

Gabrielova, K. and A.A. Buchko (2021), “Here Comes Generation Z: Millennials as Managers,” *Business Horizons*, 64 (4), 489–99.

Garland, E.L. and B.L. Fredrickson (2019), “Positive Psychological States in the arc from Mindfulness to Self-Transcendence: Extensions of the Mindfulness-to-Meaning Theory and Applications to Addiction and Chronic Pain Treatment,” *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 28, 184–91.

Good, V., D.E. Hughes, and H. Wang (2022), “More Than Money: Establishing the Importance of a Sense of Purpose for Salespeople,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50 (2), 272–95.

Graj, I. (2020), “Gen Z Perspectives on Climate Change and the Future: Having the Courage to Imagine and Fight for a Better World,” Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection, https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/3283/.

Greijdanus, H., C.A. de Matos Fernandes, F. Turner-Zwinkels, A. Honari, C.A. Roos, and J. Gutfreund (2016), “Move Over, Millennials: Generation Z Is Changing the Consumer Landscape,” *Journal of Brand Strategy*, 5 (3), 245–49.

Haase, K.R., T. Cosco, L. Kervin, I. Riadi, and M.E. O’Connell (2021), “Older Adults’ Experiences with Using Technology for Socialization During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Cross-Sectional Survey Study,” *JMIR Aging*, 4 (2), e28010.

Haidt, J. (2001), “The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment,” *Psychological Review*, 108 (4), 814–34.

Harris, A., J. Wyn, and S. Younes (2010), “Beyond Apathetic or Activist Youth: ‘Ordinary’ Young People and Contemporary Forms of Participation,” *Young*, 18 (1), 9–32.

Heckhausen, J., C. Wrosch, and R. Schulz (2019), “Agency and Motivation in Adulthood and old age,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 191–217.

Hennig-Thurau, T., K.P. Gwinner, G. Walsh, and D.D. Gremler (2004), “Electronic Word-of-Mouth via Consumer-Opinion Platforms: What Motivates Consumers to Articulate Themselves on the Internet?” *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18 (1), 38–52.

Henseler, J., C.M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt (2015), "A new Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-Based Structural Equation Modeling," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43 (1), 115–35.

Herbig, P., W. Koehler, and K. Day (1993), "Marketing to the baby bust generation," *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 10 (1), 1–9.

Hoffmann, C.P. and C. Lutz (2021), "Digital Divides in Political Participation: The Mediating Role of Social Media Self-Efficacy and Privacy Concerns," *Policy & Internet*, 13 (1), 6–29.

Hofstede, G. (2011), "Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context," *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2 (1), https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014.

Hofstede, G. and M.H. Bond (1984), "Hofstede's Culture Dimensions: An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Survey," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15 (4), 417–33.

Hogg, M.K., E.N. Banister, and C.A. Stephenson (2009), "Mapping Symbolic (Anti-) Consumption," *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (2), 148–59.

Inglehart, R.F. (2008), "Changing Values Among Western Publics from 1970 to 2006," *West European Politics*, 31 (1–2), 130–46.

Islam, T., Z. Sheikh, Z. Hameed, I.U. Khan, and R.I. Azam (2018), "Social Comparison, Materialism, and Compulsive Buying Based on Stimulus-Response-Model: A Comparative Study Among Adolescents and Young Adults," *Young Consumers*, 19 (1), 19–37.

Jacobson, J. (2020), "You Are a Brand: Social Media Managers' Personal Branding and 'the Future Audience'," *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 29 (6), 715–27.

Jöreskog, Karl G. and Dag Sörbrom (2003), *LISREL 8.7 for MAC OS 9 and X 2003*. Scientific Software International.

Kansky, J., J.P. Allen, and E. Diener (2019), "The Young Adult Love Lives of Happy Teenagers: The Role of Adolescent Affect in Adult Romantic Relationship Functioning," *Journal of Research in Personality*, 80, 1–9.

Kasser, T., R.M. Ryan, C.E. Couchman, and K.M. Sheldon (2004), "Materialistic Values: Their Causes and Consequences," in *Psychology and Consumer Culture: The Struggle for a Good Life in a Materialistic World*, T. Kasser, and A.D. Kanner, eds. American Psychological Association, 11–28.

Kazdin, A.E., K. Esveldt-Dawson, and J.L. Matson (1982), "Changes in Children's Social Skills Performance as a Function of Preassessment Experiences," *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 11 (3), 243–48.

Klein, J.G., N.C. Smith, and A. John (2004), "Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (3), 92–109.

Kleine, S.S., R.E. Kleine III, and C.T. Allen (1995), "How Is a Possession 'Me' or 'Not Me'? Characterizing Types and an Antecedent of Material Possession Attachment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22 (3), 327–43.

Kozinets, R.V. and J.M. Handelman (2004), "Adversaries of Consumption: Consumer Movements, Activism, and Ideology," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (3), 691–704.

Kozinets, R.V., J.M. Handelman, and M.S. Lee (2010), "Don't Read This; or, Who Cares What the Hell Anti-Consumption Is, Anyways?," *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 13 (3), 225–33.

Kristofferson, K., K. White, and J. Peloza (2014), "The Nature of Slacktivism: How the Social Observability of an Initial Act of Token Support Affects Subsequent Prosocial Action," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (6), 1149–66.

Kuanr, A., D. Pradhan, T. Lyngdoh, and M.S. Lee (2021), "Why Do Consumers Subvert Brands? Investigating the Influence of Subjective Well-Being on Brand Avoidance," *Psychology & Marketing*, 39 (3), 612–33.

Kunzmann, U., C. Kappes, and C. Wrosch (2014), "Emotional Aging: A Discrete Emotions Perspective," *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 380.

Lee, M.S. and C.S.Y. Ahn (2016), "Anti-Consumption, Materialism, and Consumer Well-Being," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 50 (1), 18–47.

Lee, M.S., K.V. Fernandez, and M.R. Hyman (2009a), "Anti-Consumption: An Overview and Research Agenda," *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (2), 145–47.

Lee, M.S., J. Motion, and D. Conroy (2009b), "Anti-Consumption and Brand Avoidance," *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (2), 169–80.

LeFebvre, R.K. and C. Armstrong (2018), "Grievance-Based Social Movement Mobilization in the #Ferguson Twitter Storm," *New Media & Society*, 20 (1), 8–28.

Liberman, N. and Y. Trope (1998), "The Role of Feasibility and Desirability Considerations in Near and Distant Future Decisions: A Test of Temporal Construal Theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75 (1), 5–18.

Liberman, N. and Y. Trope (2014), "Traversing Psychological Distance," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18 (7), 364–69.

Lieberman, A. and J. Schroeder (2020), "Two Social Lives: How Differences Between Online and Offline Interaction Influence Social Outcomes," *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 31, 16–21.

Lo, C.J., Y. Tsarenko, and D. Tojib (2019), "To Tell or Not to Tell? The Roles of Perceived Norms and Self-Consciousness in Understanding Consumers' Willingness to Recommend Online Secondhand Apparel Shopping," *Psychology & Marketing*, 36 (4), 287–304.

Longmire, S.J., E.Y. Chan, and C.A. Lawry (2021), "Find Me Strength in Things: Fear Can Explain Materialism," *Psychology & Marketing*, 38 (12), 2247–58.

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

Lucas, R.E., E. Diener, A. Grob, E.M. Suh, and L. Shao (2000), "Cross-Cultural Evidence for the Fundamental Features of Extraversion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (3), 452–68.

Luna-Arocas, R., and I. Danvila-del-Valle (2021), "Does Positive Well-Being Predict job Performance Three Months Later?" *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 16 (4), 1555–69.

Luttrell, R. and K. McGrath (2021), *Gen Z: The Superhero Generation*. Rowand & Littlefield Publishing Group.

MacKenzie, S.B. and P.M. Podsakoff (2012), "Common Method Bias in Marketing: Causes, Mechanisms, and Procedural Remedies," *Journal of Retailing*, 88 (4), 542–55.

Makri, K., B.B. Schlegelmilch, R. Mai, and K. Dinhof (2020), "What We Know About Anticonsumption: An Attempt to Nail Jelly to the Wall," *Psychology & Marketing*, 37 (2), 177–215.

Mannetti, L., A. Pierro, and S. Livi (2004), "Recycling: Planned and Self-Expressive Behaviour," *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24 (2), 227–36.

Martin, J. and W.A. Gentry (2011), "Derailment Signs Across Generations: More in Common Than Expected," *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 14 (3), 177–95.

Martin, K., E.S. Huebner, and R.F. Valois (2008), "Does Life Satisfaction Predict Victimization Experiences in Adolescence?" *Psychology in the Schools*, 45 (8), 705–14.

Mazzoni, E., L. Baiocco, D. Cannata, and Dimas (2016), "Is Internet the Cherry on Top or a Crutch? Offline Social-Support as Moderator of the Outcomes of Online Social-Support on Problematic Internet Use," *Computers in Human Behavior*, 56, 369–74.

McGouran, C. and A. Prothero (2016), "Enacted Voluntary Simplicity–Exploring the Consequences of Requesting Consumers to Intentionally Consume Less," *European Journal of Marketing*, 50 (1/2), 189–212.

Mukherjee, S. and N. Althuizen (2020), "Brand Activism: Does Courting Controversy Help or Hurt a Brand?" *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 37 (4), 772–88.

Nunes, J.C., A. Ordanini, and G. Giambastiani (2021), "The Concept of Authenticity: What It Means to Consumers," *Journal of Marketing*, 85 (4), 1–20.

Oishi, S., E. Diener, D.W. Choi, C. Kim-Prieto, and I. Choi (2007), "The Dynamics of Daily Events and Well-Being Across Cultures: When Less Is More," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93 (4), 685–98.

Ouweneel, P. and R. Veenhoven (2016), "Happy Protest Voters: The Case of Rotterdam 1997–2009," *Social Indicators Research*, 126 (2), 739–56.

Oyserman, D. (2009), "Identity-Based Motivation: Implications for Action-Readiness, Procedural-Readiness, and Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19 (3), 250–60.

Ozkan, M. and B. Solmaz (2015), "Mobile Addiction of Generation Z and Its Effects on Their Social Lifes: (An Application Among University Students in the 18–23 Age Group)," *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 205, 92–98.

Pajunen, T. (2021), "Generating Aesthetic Capital: Prospects from Autobiographical Narratives," in *Appearance as Capital: The Normative Regulation of Aesthetic Capital Accumulation and Conversion*, Outi Sarpila, Iida Kukkonen, Tero Pajunen, and Erica Åberg, eds. Emerald Publishing Limited, 103–15.

Palacios-Florencio, B., M.Á. Revilla–Camacho, D. Garzón, and C. Prado–Román (2021), "Explaining the Boycott Behavior: A Conceptual Model Proposal and Validation," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20 (5), 1313–25.

Palan, K.M., E. Gentina, and I. Muratore (2010), "Adolescent Consumption Autonomy: A Cross-Cultural Examination," *Journal of Business Research*, 63 (12), 1342–48.

Palley, W. (2012), *Gen Z: Digital in Their DNA*. Thompson.

Pecot, F., S. Vasilopoulou, and M. Cavallaro (2021), "How Political Ideology Drives Anti-Consumption Manifestations," *Journal of Business Research*, 128, 61–69.

Peloza, J., K. White, and J. Shang (2013), "Good and Guilt-Free: The Role of Self-Accountability in Influencing Preferences for Products with Ethical Attributes," *Journal of Marketing*, 77 (1), 104–19.

Pinna, M. (2020), “Do Gender Identities of Femininity and Masculinity Affect the Intention to buy Ethical Products?” *Psychology & Marketing*, 37 (3), 384–97.

Pinto, O. and A. Brandão (2020), “Antecedents and Consequences of Brand Hate: Empirical Evidence from the Telecommunication Industry,” *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 30 (1), 18–35.

Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. MacKenzie, and N.P. Podsakoff (2012), “Sources of Method Bias in Social Science Research and Recommendations on How to Control it,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–69.

Prensky, M. (2001), “Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants,” *On the Horizon*, 9 (5), 1–6.

Raggiotto, F. and D. Scarpi (2021), “Generation Z Active Sports Tourism: A Conceptual Framework and Analysis of Intention to Revisit,” in *Generation Z Marketing and Management in Tourism and Hospitality*, Nikolaos Stylos, Roya Rahimi, Bendegul Okumus, and Sarah Williams, eds. Palgrave Macmillan, 281–302.

Richardson, H.A., M.J. Simmering, and M.C. Sturman (2009), “A Tale of Three Perspectives: Examining Post Hoc Statistical Techniques for Detection and Correction of Common Method Variance,” *Organizational Research Methods*, 12 (4), 762–800.

Robertson, T.S. and H. Gatignon (1986), “Competitive Effects on Technology Diffusion,” *Journal of Marketing*, 50 (3), 1–12.

Saenger, C., V.L. Thomas, and J.W. Johnson (2013), “Consumption-Focused Self-Expression Word of Mouth: A New Scale and Its Role in Consumer Research,” *Psychology & Marketing*, 30 (11), 959–70.

Sakdiyakorn, M., M. Golubovskaya, and D. Solnet (2021), “Understanding Generation Z Through Collective Consciousness: Impacts for Hospitality Work and Employment,” *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102822.

Schoeneborn, D., M. Morsing, and A. Crane (2020), “Formative Perspectives on the Relation Between CSR Communication and CSR Practices: Pathways for Walking, Talking, and T(w)alking,” *Business & Society*, 59 (1), 5–33.

Schwartz, S.H. (2012), “An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values,” *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2 (1), https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116.

Sen, S., Z. Gürhan-Canli, and V. Morwitz (2001), “Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (3), 399–417.

Shaw, D., and T. Newholm (2002), “Voluntary Simplicity and the Ethics of Consumption,” *Psychology & Marketing*, 19 (2), 167–85.

Shim, K., H. Cho, S. Kim, and S.L. Yeo (2021), “Impact of Moral Ethics on Consumers’ Boycott Intentions: A Cross-Cultural Study of Crisis Perceptions and Responses in the United States, South Korea, and Singapore,” *Communication Research*, 48 (3), 401–25.

Sirgy, M.J. (1982), “Self-Concept in Consumer Behavior: A Critical Review,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (3), 287–300.

Sparks, P. and R. Shepherd (1992), “Self-Identity and the Theory of Planned Behavior: Assessing the Role of Identification with ‘Green Consumerism’,” *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55 (4), 388–99.

Strenze, T. (2021), “Value Change in the Western World: The Rise of Materialism, Post-Materialism or Both?” *International Review of Sociology*, 1–18.

Tajfel, H. (1982), “Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31 (3), 536–53.

Taylor, P. and S. Keeter (2010), “Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next,” Pew Research Center (January 9), www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/millennials-confident-connected - open-to-change.pdf.

Theocharis, Y., W. Lowe, J.W. Van Deth, and G. García-Albacete (2015), “Using Twitter to Mobilize Protest Action: Online Mobilization Patterns and Action Repertoires in the Occupy Wall Street, Indignados, and Aganaktismenoi Movements,” *Information, Communication & Society*, 18 (2), 202–20.

Triandis, H.C. (2001), “Individualism–Collectivism and Personality,” *Journal of Personality*, 69 (6), 907–24.

Trope, Y. and N. Liberman (2003), “Temporal Construal,” *Psychological Review*, 110 (3), 403–21.

Trope, Y. and N. Liberman (2010), “Construal-Level Theory of Psychological Distance,” *Psychological Review*, 117 (2), 440–63.

Twenge, J.M., T.E. Joiner, M.L. Rogers, and G.N. Martin (2018), “Increases in Depressive Symptoms, Suicide-Related Outcomes, and Suicide Rates among US Adolescents After 2010 and Links to Increased New Media Screen Time,” *Clinical Psychological Science*, 6 (1), 3–17.

Underwood, M.K. and S.E. Ehrenreich (2017), “The Power and the Pain of Adolescents’ Digital Communication: Cyber Victimization and the Perils of Lurking,” *American Psychologist*, 72 (2), 144–58.

Valkenburg, P.M. and J. Peter (2011), “Online Communication Among Adolescents: An Integrated Model of Its Attraction, Opportunities, and Risks,” *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 48 (2), 121–27.

Vassallo, F. (2020), “After the Crisis: Political Protest in the Aftermath of the Economic Recession,” *Comparative European Politics*, 18 (1), 45–72.

Vissers, S. and D. Stolle (2014), “The Internet and New Modes of Political Participation: Online Versus Offline Participation,” *Information, Communication & Society*, 17 (8), 937–55.

Wang, W., T. Mo, and Y. Wang (2022), “Better Self and Better Us: Exploring the Individual and Collective Motivations for China’s Generation Z Consumers to Reduce Plastic Pollution,” *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 179, 106111.

Ward, J. and C. de Vreese (2011), “Political Consumerism, Young Citizens and the Internet,” *Media, Culture & Society*, 33 (3), 399–413.

Watson, D.C. (2021), “Neuroticism Versus Emotionality as Mediators of the Negative Relationship Between Materialism and Well-Being,” *Heliyon*, 7 (4), e06783.

Wilson, A.E., P.R. Darke, and J. Sengupta (2021), “Winning the Battle but Losing the war: Ironic Effects of Training Consumers to Detect Deceptive Advertising Tactics,” *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–17.

Wood, S. (2013), “Generation Z as Consumers: Trends and Innovation,” *Institute for Emerging Issues: NC State University*, 119 (9), 7767–79.

Xie, C. and R.P. Bagozzi (2019), “Consumer Responses to Corporate Social Irresponsibility: The Role of Moral Emotions, Evaluations, and Social Cognitions,” *Psychology & Marketing*, 36 (6), 565–86.

Xie, C., R.P. Bagozzi, and K.V. Meland (2015), "The Impact of Reputation and Identity Congruence on Employer Brand Attractiveness," *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33 (2), 124–46.

Youngdahl, W.E., D.L. Kellogg, W. Nie, and D.E. Bowen (2003), "Revisiting Customer Participation in Service Encounters: Does Culture Matter?" *Journal of Operations Management*, 21 (1), 109–20.

Yuksel, U. (2013), "Non-Participation in Anti-Consumption: Consumer Reluctance to Boycott," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 33 (3), 204–16.

Yuksel, U., N.T. Thai, and M.S. Lee (2020), "Boycott Them! No, Boycott This! Do Choice Overload and Small–Agent Rationalization Inhibit the Signing of Anti-Consumption Petitions?" *Psychology & Marketing*, 37 (2), 340–54.

Zarantonello, L., S. Romani, S. Grappi, and R.P. Bagozzi (2016), "Brand Hate," *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25 (1), 11–25.

Zavestoski, S. (2002), "The Social–Psychological Bases of Anticonsumption Attitudes," *Psychology & Marketing*, 19 (2), 149–65.

Zelezny, L.C., P.P. Chua, and C. Aldrich (2000), "Elaborating on Gender Differences in Environmentalism," *Journal of Social Issues*, 56 (3), 443–58.

Ziesemer, F., A. Hüttel, and I. Balderjahn (2021), "Young People as Drivers or Inhibitors of the Sustainability Movement: The Case of Anti-Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 44 (3), 427–453.

Figure 1. Theoretical Model and Hypotheses.

Figure 2. Summary Factor Statistics.

Table 1. The Taxonomy of the Scenarios.

Context	**Perspective**	**Description of the Online Case (Actor to Boycott)**	**Description of the Offline Case (Actor to Boycott)**	**Size of the Experimental Cell**
				Online–Offline
Food	First-person perspective	Waste sorting of packaging (boycott the restaurant)	Food waste disposal (boycott of the restaurant)	41–43
Fashion	Third-person perspective	Dangerous materials used in clothes (boycott the fashion brand)	Incineration of waste clothing (boycott the fashion brand)	43–42
Body shaming	First-person perspective	Social media influencer body shamed (boycott the social media platform)	Athlete body shamed by instructor (boycott the gym)	42–42
Fake news	Third-person perspective	Fake news about a brand on a social	Fake news about a technology in a	43–42

Context	Perspective	Description of the Online Case (Actor to Boycott)	Description of the Offline Case (Actor to Boycott)	Size of the Experimental Cell
				Online–Offline
		media (boycott the social media platform)	newspaper (boycott the newspaper)	

Table 2. Prescenario Variables.

Factors (# of Items)	Item	Interitem Correlation		Cronbach's Alpha
		Min	Max	
Subjective Well-Being (8) Adapted from Diener et al. (2009)	I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.	.41	.64	.89
	My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.	.43	.59	
	I am engaged and interested in my daily activities.	.37	.64	
	I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.	.47	.59	
	I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me.	.42	.59	
	I am a good person and live a good life.	.48	.67	
	I am optimistic about my future.	.43	.67	
	People respect me.	.37	.49	
Collectivism (6) Adapted from Youngdahl et al. (2003)	Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group (either at the school or work place).	.42	.58	.86
	Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties.	.38	.58	
	Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.	.52	.63	
	Group success is more important than individual success.	.38	.63	
	Individuals should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.	.40	.67	
	Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer.	.45	.67	
Masculinity (3) Adapted from Youngdahl et al. (2003)	It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women.	.61	.65	.85
	Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.	.61	.74	
	Solving difficult problems usually requires active forcible approach, which is typical of men.	.65	.74	

Table 3. Postscenario Variables.

Factors (# Items)	Item	Interitem Correlation		Cronbach's Alpha
		Min	Max	
Enact Boycotting (3) Adapted from Xie and Bagozzi (2019)	I will stop using a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.51	.83	.84
	I will ask my friends and relatives to stop using a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.59	.83	
	I will report to the authority a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.51	.59	
Support Boycotting (3) Adapted from Palacios-Florencio et al. (2021)	I like the idea of participating in a boycott of a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.69	.76	.89
	I wouldn't feel guilty if I participated in a boycott of a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.69	.73	
	I would never take part in a boycott of a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.73	.76	
Individual Self-Congruence (5) Adapted from Xie, Bagozzi, and Meland (2015)	It would make me feel good to be a person boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.55	.62	.90
	Being someone boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news is an important part of who I am.	.61	.74	
	I would be ashamed to be a person who does not boycott a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.55	.70	
	Boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news is very important to me.	.61	.74	
	I strongly desire to boycott of a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.59	.74	
Ethical Idealism (6) Adapted from Palacios-Florencio et al. (2021)	People should make certain that fake news on social media never intentionally harm another, even to a small degree.	.24	.58	.80
	Risks related to fake news on social media should never be tolerated, irrespective of how small the risks might be.	.26	.58	
	The existence of potential harm related to fake news on social media is always wrong, irrespective of the benefits to be gained.	.24	.52	

Factors (# Items)	Item	Interitem Correlation		Cronbach's Alpha
		Min	Max	
	Fake news on social media should never psychologically or physically harm another person.	.33	.52	
	Fake news on social media should not threaten the dignity and welfare of others in any way.	.39	.49	
	If fake news on social media could harm an innocent other, then it should not be done.	.35	.46	
Self-Expression (6) Adapted from Saenger, Thomas, and Johnson (2013)	I like to talk about me boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news so people can get to know me better.	.59	.74	.94
	I like the attention I get when I talk to people about me boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.61	.81	
	I talk to people about me boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news to let them know more about me.	.67	.81	
	I like to communicate me boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news to people who are interested in knowing about me.	.68	.84	
	I like the idea that people want to learn more about me boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.59	.77	
	I like it when people pay attention to what I say about me boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news.	.65	.77	
Make a Difference (3) Adapted from Klein, Smith, and John (2004)	Boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news is an effective mean to make a social media platform change its actions.	.63	.77	.88
	Everyone should take part in the boycott of a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news because every contribution, no matter how small, is important.	.63	.76	
	By boycotting a social media that does not control for the diffusion of fake news, I can	.76	.77	

Factors (# Items)	Item	Interitem Correlation		Cronbach's Alpha
		Min	Max	
	help change social media platforms' decision.			

Notes: All items are related to the scenario "fake news, online context, third-person perspective." Text in the survey has been adapted for each scenario.

Table 4. The Determinants of Enact Boycott.

		Dependent Variable:					
		Enact Boycott					
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
H_{1a}	Subjective Well-being		.166** (.071)		.176** (.072)		.168** (.070)
H_{2a}	Ethical Idealism		.151** (.066)		.153** (.067)		.170*** (.064)
H_{3a}	Self-Congruence		.419*** (.061)		.417*** (.062)		.458*** (.060)
H_{4a}	Self-Expression		.067 (.057)		.073 (.058)		.055 (.056)
H_{5a}	Make a Difference		.279*** (.058)		.277*** (.058)		.225*** (.057)
H_{6a}	Online Context					−.523*** (.183)	−.586*** (.145)
H_{7a}	First-Person Perspective					−.707*** (.183)	−.509*** (.146)
Controls	Collectivism			.096 (.078)	−.039 (.065)		−.046 (.062)
	Masculinity			−.114* (.063)	−.013 (.052)		.003 (.050)
	Constant	4.597*** (.094)	−.091 (.500)	4.470*** (.349)	.034 (.538)	5.210*** (.158)	.671 (.534)
	Observations	338	337	338	337	338	337
	R^2	.000	.390	.013	.391	.064	.439
	Adjusted R^2	.000	.381	.007	.378	.059	.423
	Residual SE	1.729 (d.f. = 337)	1.362 (d.f. = 331)	1.724 (d.f. = 335)	1.365 (d.f. = 329)	1.678 (d.f. = 335)	1.315 (d.f. = 327)
	F-statistic		42.328*** (d.f. = 5; 331)	2.121 (d.f. = 2; 335)	30.161*** (d.f. = 7; 329)	11.482*** (d.f. = 2; 335)	28.392*** (d.f. = 9; 327)

*p < .1, **p < .05, ***p < .01.

Table 5. The Determinants of Support Boycott.

		Dependent Variable:					
		Support Boycott					
		(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**	**(6)**
H_{1b}	Subjective Well-being		−.396*** (.082)		−.373*** (.083)		−.382*** (.082)
H_{2b}	Ethical Idealism		.093 (.076)		.076 (.076)		.082 (.076)
H_{3b}	Self-Congruence		.239*** (.071)		.228*** (.070)		.248*** (.070)
H_{4b}	Self-Expression		−.125* (.066)		−.088 (.066)		−.096 (.066)
H_{5b}	Make a Difference		.264*** (.067)		.233*** (.067)		.203*** (.067)
H_{6b}	Online Context					−.205 (.187)	−.234 (.171)
H_{7b}	First-Person Perspective					−.496*** (.187)	−.384** (.172)
Controls	Collectivism			−.044 (.077)	−.025 (.074)		−.028 (.073)
	Masculinity			−.275*** (.061)	−.188*** (.059)		−.176*** (.059)
	Constant	4.825*** (.095)	4.534*** (.580)	5.656*** (.342)	5.131*** (.615)	5.174*** (.163)	5.528*** (.629)
	Observations	338	337	338	337	338	337
	R^2	.000	.188	.061	.213	.024	.229
	Adjusted R^2	.000	.176	.055	.196	.018	.208
	Residual SE	1.738 (d.f. = 337)	1.580 (d.f. = 331)	1.689 (d.f. = 335)	1.560 (.d.f. = 329)	1.722 (d.f. = 335)	1.549 (d.f. = 327)
	F-statistic		15.317*** (d.f. = 5; 331)	10.790*** (d.f. = 2; 335)	12.725*** (d.f. = 7; 329)	4.064** (d.f. = 2; 335)	10.786*** (d.f. = 9; 327)

*p < 0.1, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01.