



Unmasking Consumer Behavior: A Deep Dive into Brand Boycotts in the Social Media Age – Exploring Filipino Demographic Variances, Perceptual Constructs, and Activist Actions

Allam, Kyla R.¹, Dichoso, Khristian², Frago, Kyle Cedric³, Igalinos, Willah Mae G.⁴, Idang, Lorin Maxine O.⁵, Oliquino, Sheer Lou S.⁶, Tolentino, Margareth Dane M.⁷, Vallespin, Mc Rollyn D.^{8*}

^{1,3,4,5,6,7}Institute of Health and Sciences Nursing, Far Eastern University-Manila, Sampaloc, Manila City, 1008, Metro Manila, Philippines

²Institute of Tourism and Hotel Management, Far Eastern University-Manila, Sampaloc, Manila City, 1008, Metro Manila, Philippines

^{8*}Undergraduate Studies, Institute of Education, Far Eastern University-Manila, Sampaloc, Manila City, 1008, Metro Manila, Philippines

ABSTRACT: The effectiveness of boycotting brands and companies as a means of nonviolent protest has come under increasing examination due to various factors affecting the lives of individuals and organizations involved in such movements. This study aims to learn the various elements of a boycott and assess its effectiveness. The study utilizes descriptive-correlational quantitative research methods to measure consumer's perceptions of boycotted brands. A random sample of 18–45-year-olds, including both working professionals and students, can capture a wide range of opinions, providing a measurable view of public sentiment and its correlation with boycott practices. The results of this study show that boycotts are an effective way to raise awareness. Although its focus is on social media platforms, which can fundamentally limit the reach and impact of boycott campaigns, research shows that boycott campaigns can still bring forth a call for action to create change. In our society, where social media has a significant influence, especially in the marketing environment, using these platforms for activism can have tangible results. The study acknowledges the limitations of the boycott, particularly its reliance on social media, but emphasizes its potential as a means for dialogue and social change.

KEYWORDS: Consumer activism, Far Eastern University, Protest, Public sentiment.

INTRODUCTION

This research examines the effectiveness of boycotts as a social movement related to the perspective of consumers, specifically employees and students. Boycotts have been officially practiced since 1891, when many Iranian citizens were boycotting Tobacco (Laird, Heather, 2005). A boycott is a movement in which citizens or a specific group try to pressure high authorities of specific companies to change their practices or values beyond what is proper. Instances like the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement, where many people around the world are trying to boycott many known companies for supporting Israel, related to the Israel-Palestine war. The boycotting movement is labeled as a legal method of mass mobilization of netizens to promote the voice of many consumers and to change what many people think is unfair (Alice, 2019).

This research assesses the perspective of consumers, specifically employees, and students, about the effectiveness of boycotts in buying their needed necessities, food, drinks, services, and many more. Consumers participating in the BDS movement faced a personal dilemma because as they practiced boycotting companies, their necessities to live were hindered and caused them to question the effectiveness of boycotting as a social movement to change the values and practices of known companies. Normally, a consumer's values and principles greatly affect their decisions to participate in a boycott movement. Unfortunately, personal needs, habits, social interactions, and peers influence this action, which makes it difficult to achieve consistent or widespread participation by many people in the boycott.

The effectiveness and sustainability of this research are crucial for understanding social movement dynamics and identifying key factors influencing their success or failure. It aids in designing efficient plans for boycotts and emphasizes the



importance of ethical considerations in policymaking. The study aims to promote morally driven methods for social change advocacy by providing insights to stakeholders like academia, advocacy organizations, governments, and the public. It emphasizes the importance of community involvement and symbolic interactionism in understanding demonstrator motivations and dynamics. Objective research should address involvement gaps, ethical issues, and diverse opinions to support a more educated and practical approach to social engagement and advocacy.

The research on boycotting has significant implications for various stakeholders, including consumers, companies, shareholders, employees, advocacy groups, and government agencies. Based on the findings, consumers may boycott a product or company, impacting their purchasing decisions. Companies may be affected by the boycott's outcomes, affecting their reputation, sales, and business success. Shareholders of a boycotted company may lose their investment and job security, while employees may lose their livelihood. Advocacy groups promoting social justice and ethical business practices may also be affected. Government agencies responsible for regulating business practices and protecting consumer rights may also be affected. The boycott's success depends on minimizing costs, reducing harm to innocent parties, and promoting fairness in resolving concerns.

A movement, such as a protest in the form of boycotting establishments, will always be affected by several factors and statements from others' perspectives, in which some interpret the act as ineffective. At the same time, some see it as the best way to make an impact towards its objectives. Some main points spearheaded by the pieces of literature cited are: (1) according to (Ijaz, 2023), boycotting as an act of awareness also benefits the government through citizen involvement; (2) according to (Ali et al., 2023), by being involved in the community, boycotting encompasses the situation and the people's stance to have an impact on the acknowledgment of the current situation. Social norms have a greater influence on consumers who want to boycott than the perception of behavioral control (Delistravrou, 2020), indicating that they place more value on other people's opinions than their own. Furthermore, according to (Hitchcock, 2020), a framework for establishing the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of the boycott movement relies on the values of justice, freedom, equality, joint struggle, and individual and collective agency—values that strongly overlap with social and racial justice activist, discourses that focus on intersectionality and justice for marginalized and oppressed peoples. This does not only consider whether the people are aware of the research but also whether the people have a wider perception of the concept.

An article by Chikhani, M. (2023) entitled, "Boycotting Brands for a Cause: Impact, Effectiveness, and Responsible Social Media Activism." has its strengths and weaknesses in which it provides a balanced overview of the issue, discussing both the reasons behind the movement and the impact they may have which also explored multiple perspectives, including those who support the movement and those who oppose them. Moreover, the boycott movement may have difficulties maintaining high participation levels while potentially diminishing consumer influence, which are obstacles to its desired effect (Lasarov, 2023.) Systemic problems frequently need more comprehensive adjustments, such as new laws, revised corporate policies, or community involvement programs. Both sides must unite in the battle for awareness to awaken the public and better understand the ongoing conflict; it also left room for questions like how it is effective and what other strategies besides boycotts would be more effective in resolving this issue. In addition, our study helped expand the gaps that the previous study had explored and find new outcomes; the existing studies emphasized the differences between the people involved and those who are unintentionally getting involved, whereas both sides conflict with each other's ideas regarding their stand.

In the previous literature of Lasarov (2023), boycotting faced challenges in maintaining high levels of participation as it required comprehensive solutions such as changes in policies and community engagement initiatives. The purpose of the movement must also be clear and notable because boycotting never works if the stand is not precise, and it will only create a feud in the community if the different perspectives of people contradict each other. It is not illegal, but it should not result in violence; therefore, damaging the reputation of brands can be an ethical issue. Moreover, According to Chikhani (2023), boycotting is one of the widespread forms of social activism, and ethical considerations must also be observed, such as doing responsible research and minding the unintended consequences of employees not involved in the brand's actions losing their jobs. Thus, being knowledgeable about the movement by understanding and researching its purpose is the most important step to make it effective and avoid internal conflicts. It is essential to note these considerations before any movement to avoid amoral conflicts and create a clearer viewpoint towards the research goals' succession.

The quantitative methodological approach of numerical surveying enables the researchers to collect large data through the respondents, specifically students and workers ages 18-45. The survey data obtained contains the respondents' insights regarding



the research topic to draw conclusions regarding the movement's effectiveness by the level of engagement. The theory of Symbolic Interactionism was also utilized to explain the connection between how protestors communicate their message, mainly through boycotting (Libretexts, 2022). In addition, the gaps presented, such as level of engagement, ethical considerations, and different viewpoints, must be addressed to ensure an unbiased and principled research development. Without considering these factors, the research will not be able to understand the different viewpoints on why people support or do not support a protest. As specific brands will be named, ethical considerations are essential to secure a nonviolent approach to the problem.

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To determine the demographic profile of consumers in terms of:
 - a. age
 - b. gender
 - c. occupational status
 - d. consumer preferences
 - e. usage of social media platforms
2. To explore consumers' perceptions in terms of:
 - a. significance of boycotting
 - b. practices of boycotting
3. To examine the impact and effectiveness of social media campaigns related to brand boycotts.
4. To identify alternative methods employed by consumers to express dissatisfaction with brands.
5. To investigate the relationship between the perceived significance of boycotting and the actual implementation of boycotting practices among consumers.
6. To investigate the differences between the demographic profile of consumers towards their significance and practices of boycotting.

METHODOLOGY

The researchers utilized a quantitative research method, specifically descriptive-correlational. This methodological approach enables the researchers to gather knowledge and draw understanding from a group of people by relying on facts and numerical data to test the effectiveness of boycotting. The data measured by the respondents will then serve as the basis for a scientific analysis (Allen, 2017). It is suitable for this research as it gains information from different perspectives that can be easily analyzed through statistical techniques (Kadence International, 2023). It is efficient in comparisons, thus easily detecting how effective or ineffective boycotting is. This method also aims to precipitate objective data to capture essential information without deviating from other issues and emphasize the research goal: test the effectiveness of boycotting in consumers' selection. In addition, survey questionnaires were used as a tool to know the opinions of the consumers regarding the research topic, which will consist of statements that will be answered based on their level of agreement.

While the qualitative research method answers 'hows' and 'whys' and provides general perceptions of the public toward boycotting (Tenny et al., 2022), the quantitative research method provides measurable information such as public opinions that could induce large audience, data normalization, statistical tests that could bring the significant connections between public perception and boycotting (Coghlan et al., 2014). Using quantitative data, researchers can obtain more reliable data and conclude with a strong foundation beyond the limitation of qualitative research, which can only reflect public trends. Sample biases could occur when using quantitative research (Botha, 2021) as respondents have different levels of understanding of boycotting; therefore, researchers will use random sampling techniques. Additionally, the researchers will offer consent forms, clearly explain the study's goal, and ensure that the respondents' responses will be kept anonymous and private to respect their right to privacy. Quantitative research is time-consuming and costly (Kadence International, 2023); therefore, the researchers will clearly define the target population to approach a reliable data collection approach and use online survey platforms to obtain data cost-effectively.

The researchers utilized a random sampling technique wherein the respondents will be in an age bracket of 18 to 45 years old, working or students. In addition, the descriptive-correlational research design was utilized to obtain and elucidate information about the current situation of the specific topic (Dovetail, 2023) and to measure and assess the relationship between the two variables of the study. The researchers used a modified survey to gather information from the respondents. A structured modified



questionnaire will allow the researchers to conduct and make acquisitions based on the data gathered. Furthermore, the researchers initially gathered existing research and related literature about this study; the compiled information from a study by Shin (2018) entitled "Consumer motivation for the decision to boycott: The social dilemma." and a survey questionnaire (Start question, 2023) site was adapted by the researchers as the basis of the group in formulating the guide questions for the survey. Only those in the age bracket of 18 to 45 can be respondents to this study. The rights and well-being of the participants will also be considered, and informed consent will be given to ensure confidentiality on their part. Each section in the survey will be structured in a logical flow that progresses sequentially, which will build the information afterward so that the respondents' opinions about boycotting could affect their practices and engagements in different social media campaigns. The quantitative data that will be collected will be analyzed and interpreted to achieve the objectives and arrive at a relevant conclusion for this research.

In data analysis, the study used descriptive statistics to summarize the main features of the collected data, such as the variables; however, this did not generalize the main point of the responses, which depended on the question based on the study's objectives. Inferential statistics were also utilized, which means that the data gathered from the respondents predicted the population outcome. Likewise, it showed that the differentiation of responses accumulates the population's overall perspective towards the boycott's effectiveness. Microsoft Excel was then used as a software tool to help in tabulating the results of the gathered data, which served as a platform for encoding, formulating, computing, and summarizing the data with preciseness and conciseness of the variables that had been input for the descriptive statistics with the addition of pursuing avoidance of plagiarism.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the researchers' gathered data from the survey. The data gathered were arranged, presented, and interpreted by the researchers. This was done to draw logical conclusions. It presents the summary of findings and the conclusions drawn from the gathered data set.

A. Demographic Profile

Table 1.1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Consumers in terms of Age

| Age | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|
| 18-23 | 26 | 86.7% |
| 24-28 | 2 | 6.7% |
| 28-35 | 1 | 3.3% |
| 36-45 | 1 | 3.3% |
| Above 45 | 0 | 0% |
| TOTAL | 30 | 100.0% |

Table 1.1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of socio-demographic age. About 86.7% of the consumers are 18-23 years old. Next are 6.7% of consumers around 24-28 years old. There are also 3.3% of 28-35-year-olds and 3.3% of 36-46-year-olds.

Table 1.2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Consumers in terms of Gender

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|
| Male | 12 | 40% |
| Female | 17 | 56.7% |
| Unspecified | 1 | 3.3% |
| TOTAL | 30 | 100.0% |

Table 1.2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of socio-demographic gender. Most of the consumers, or 56.7%, are female, and 40% of the consumers are male. There is also 3.3% wherein the gender is unspecified.



Table 1.3 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Consumers in terms of Occupational Status

| Occupational Status | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Employed | 6 | 20% |
| Unemployed | 0 | 0% |
| Student | 24 | 80% |
| TOTAL | 30 | 100.0% |

Table 1.3 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of socio-demographic occupational states. Most of the consumers are students, with 80%. The other 20% were employed, and there were no unemployed consumers.

Table 1.4 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Consumers in terms of Consumer’s Selection

| Company | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Starbucks | 13 | 17.6% |
| McDonalds | 28 | 37.8% |
| Dove | 6 | 8.1% |
| Adidas | 11 | 14.9% |
| Nike | 13 | 17.6% |
| Others: HM, Jollibee, Dunkin Donuts | 3 | 4% |
| TOTAL | 74 | 100.0% |

Table 1.4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of socio-demographic consumer selections. McDonald’s is the main selection with about 37.8%, followed by Starbucks and Nike with 17.6%. The consumers also selected Adidas for about 14.9%. Dove was chosen by 8.1%, and another brand was selected by 4%.

Table 1.5 Frequency, Ranking, and Percentage Distribution of Consumers in Terms of Social Media Used

| Social Media | Frequency | Distribution | Rank |
|--------------|------------|--------------|------|
| Facebook | 25 | 24.75% | 1 |
| Twitter/X | 15 | 14.85% | 3 |
| Instagram | 25 | 24.75% | 1 |
| YouTube | 14 | 13.86% | 4 |
| TikTok | 22 | 21.78% | 2 |
| Others: | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 101 | 100% | |

Table 1.5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of consumers' social media applications. Facebook and Instagram are the primary selections, with 24.75%. Followed by TikTok, having 21.78%; behind it is Twitter/X, which has 14.85%, and YouTube receives the lowest percentage of 13.86%. According to Walsh (2024), social media platforms have become essential for spreading information and connecting with others. With strong social media strategies, it engages target audiences and is a platform to boost awareness for various goals. Social media such as Facebook, which has become more popular than ever, is still number one as ads, groups, and entertainment have been newly adapted in the app. Furthermore, Instagram, an image-based social platform, is still popular nowadays, especially for those below 35, as it enables one to share every aspect of one's life through photos. Lastly, TikTok, the fastest-growing app worldwide, is the most popular among Generation Z due to its short-form videos that bring joy and creativity.



B.1 Consumer’s Perceived Significance of Boycotting

Table 2. Consumers’ Perceived Significance of Boycotting

| Boycott’s Attitude | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation | Rank |
|---|-------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| 1. Boycotting is an effective way to promote social change. | 3.73 | 3.38 | Agree | 3 |
| 2. Boycotting adheres to the people’s concerns. | 3.73 | 3.35 | Agree | 3 |
| 3. Utilizing boycotts as a tactic to influence other companies is a good idea. | 3.73 | 3.39 | Agree | 3 |
| 4. Participating in a boycott is more effective than other protests or petitions. | 3.33 | 3.01 | Agree | 4 |
| 5. Boycotting brands is ethical if it is confirmed that they are involved in societal issues. | 3.93 | 3.52 | Agree | 2 |
| 6. Boycotting engages people to be aware about contemporary issues. | 4.13 | 3.72 | Strongly Agree | 1 |
| GRAND MEAN | 3.76 | | AGREE | |

Legend: 0.00 – 1.00 (strongly disagree), 1.01 – 2.00 (disagree), 2.01 – 3.00 (neutral), 3.01 – 4.00 (agree), 4.01 – 5.00 (strongly agree)

Table 2 shows that boycotting makes people aware of the issues nowadays. Consumers also agreed to effectively promote social change, adhere to people's concerns, and influence companies. According to Asare (2023), there is much skepticism about the effectiveness of boycotting. However, in the past years, it has been proven that it works, starting from raising awareness, raising the needs of the victims, and protesting to the higher-ups. Change can happen, and it did in the past. These collective actions stopped discrimination and created serious political change from the Anti-apartheid movement to the Montgomery Bus Boycotts. Moreover, boycotting, being more effective than other protests, was ranked the lowest. It may be due to several factors, such as not highly impacting a company's sales revenue and it becoming less effective due to varying levels of people’s interest (King, 2017).

B.2 Consumers’ Perspective and Practices of Boycotting

Table 3. Consumers’ Perspective and Practices of Boycotting

| Perspective/Practices | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation | Rank |
|--|-------------|----------------|-------------------------|------|
| 7. I am aware of brands that are being boycotted. | 3.83 | 3.49 | Most of the time | 2 |
| 8. I am responsible for choosing the right brands to consume. | 4.26 | 3.83 | Always | 1 |
| 9. I am willing to discontinue buying a product to support a boycott. | 3.73 | 3.37 | Most of the time | 3 |
| 10. I actively research a brand's business practices before making a purchase. | 3.5 | 3.18 | Most of the time | 4 |
| 11. I engage in conversations or debates about brand boycotts. | 3.33 | 3.03 | Most of the time | 5 |
| GRAND MEAN | 3.73 | | MOST OF THE TIME | |

Legend: 0.00 – 1.00 (never), 1.01 – 2.00 (rarely), 2.01 – 3.00 (sometimes), 3.01 – 4.00 (most of the time), 4.01 – 5.00 (always)

Table 3 shows that most of the time, consumers are aware of brands being consumed and consider boycotting practices. According to (Sarro, 2017), “Most customers prefer buying products from a brand they are familiar with. This is because they seek a certain amount of trust while purchasing.” This explains how consumers buy their preferred products, which also aligns with their responsibility to choose the right brands to consume since they are responsible for creating the options for what to consume and their interests. Accordingly, based on an article, “Nearly two-thirds (64 percent) of consumers around the world will buy or boycott a brand solely because of its position on a social or political issue, a staggering increase of 13 points from last year. (Edelman,



2018)” This states that consumers are aware of brands that are to be boycotted or are being boycotted due to the political beliefs or general beliefs of a certain brand, which mainly affects how they perceive the consumption of the products as well as the impact of the brand in accordance to the percentage of its consumption; hence, it raises the concept of how aware people are in choosing the right brands to consume for the betterment of the economy and society as well as to support boycott on brands.

Moreover, despite being ranked the lowest with a mean of 3.33, it still indicates that people have conversations or debates about brand boycotts most of the time. In contrast, according to (Ahmad et al., 2021), “When something negative to consumer's ideas occurs, they generally tend to criticize the state of affairs and to take in movements.” With this, it states that people tend to make a conversation and criticize the ongoing events aimed by a movement in addition to the massive world of the online community; however, it is not an open conversation yet to the whole population since different perspectives arise.

C. Impact of Social Media Campaigns on Brands Boycott

Table 4. Consumers’ Perspective on the Impact of Social Media Campaigns on Brands Boycott

| Impact of Social Media Campaigns on Brands Boycott | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation | Rank |
|--|-------------|----------------|---------------------------|------|
| 12. How strong are social media campaigns in your choice to boycott a brand? | 3.9 | 3.53 | Highly Influential | 2 |
| 13. How influential are social media influencers in mobilizing support for brand boycotts through social media platforms? | 3.6 | 3.27 | Highly Influential | 3 |
| 14. How influential are consumer perceptions of the authenticity and effectiveness of brand responses to social media-led boycott movements? | 4.1 | 3.67 | Extremely Influential | 1 |
| GRAND MEAN | 3.86 | | HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL | |

Legend: 0.00 – 1.00 (not influential at all), 1.01 – 2.00 (slightly influential), 2.01 – 3.00 (moderately influential), 3.01 – 4.00 (highly influential), 4.01 – 5.00 (extremely influential)

Table 4 shows that the impact of social media campaigns on brand boycotts moderately influences the people’s perspective with its strength of influence in the choice to boycott a brand, strength of influence of social media influencers in mobilizing support for brand boycott through social media platforms, and strength of influence of consumer perceptions of the authenticity and effectiveness of brand responses to social media-led boycott movements all accumulating 3.33 which is equivalent to moderately influential on the effectiveness of boycott. According to Park (2024), social media is the impulse behind shaping public views and guiding societal movements. With social media, users can now easily gain information about brands' stand on a societal movement/issue, which can greatly affect their reputation. The influence of social media campaigns and the various sentiments shared through the platform can damage a brand's standing in the market, translating to the consumer's perception of the brand.

D. Alternative Ways to Voice Dissatisfaction with Brands

Table 5. Consumer’s Alternative Ways of Voicing Dissatisfaction with Brands

| Ways to Voice Dissatisfaction with Brands | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation | Rank |
|---|-------------|----------------|-------------------------|------|
| 15. I leave negative reviews online to express my dissatisfaction with a brand. | 3.03 | 2.76 | Sometimes | 6 |
| 16. I spread awareness on social media regarding a brand’s issue. | 3.56 | 3.25 | Sometimes | 2 |
| 17. I contact the brand directly to express any concerns. | 3.43 | 3.15 | Sometimes | 3 |
| 18. I persuade friends and family to boycott. | 3.2 | 2.88 | Sometimes | 5 |
| 19. I join or support advocacy groups. | 3.26 | 2.94 | Sometimes | 4 |
| 20. I participate in protests or demonstrations. | 3.56 | 3.26 | Sometimes | 1 |
| GRAND MEAN | 4.00 | | MOST OF THE TIME | |

Legend: 0.00 – 1.00 (never), 1.01 – 2.00 (rarely), 2.01 – 3.00 (sometimes), 3.01 – 4.00 (most of the time), 4.01 – 5.00 (always)



Table 5 shows the data gathered about consumers' alternative ways of voicing their dissatisfaction with brands. This shows that consumers sometimes leave their dissatisfaction with brands in different ways, such as participating in protests, spreading awareness on social media regarding the issue, and contacting the brand directly for any concerns. According to Ang (2022), consumer's emotions, moral, and ethical values play a big role in their participation in a boycott. This also leads to a more effective way of boycotting when the person is emotionally driven to the issue. However, employing too many emotions in voicing their dissatisfaction might be detrimental to the issue in a way that may lead to unreasonable actions. Advocacy Unified Network (2023) states that participating advocacy groups can amplify the impact and provide opportunities to the affected people. One way or another, the goal is to prevent future mistakes and create a better system.

E. Correlation Between Consumer’s Perception of Boycott Attitude and Consumer’s Perspective and Practices

Table 6. Correlation between Consumer’s Perception of Boycott Attitude and Consumer’s Perspective and Practices

| Variables | N | r Value | Interpretation | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|----|---------|----------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|
| Significance of Boycotting Consumer’s perspective and practices | 30 | 0.0386 | Positive Correlation | 0.0015 | Failed to reject Ho | Significant |

*P-value: $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ (Significant); $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ (not significant)

Table 6 shows the relationship between the significance of boycotting and consumer’s perspectives and practices. This indicates a positive correlation between the significance of boycotting and consumer’s perspectives and practices. Moreover, the p-value (0.0015) is less than the significance level (0.05). With that, the researchers failed to reject the null hypothesis. The statistical conclusion states that a significant relationship exists between the respondent’s perception of boycott attitude and the consumer’s perspective and practices.

F. Differences Between the Demographic Profile of Consumers Towards Their Significance and Practices of Boycotting

Table 7. Differences between the Demographic Profile of Consumers Towards their Significance and Practices of Boycotting

| Indicator | Demographic Profile | Mean | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Significance of Occupational Status | Student | 0.18 | 0.33 | Failed to reject Ho | Not significant |
| | Workers | 0.03 | | | |

*P-value: $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ (Significant); $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ (not significant)

Table 7 shows the result of the comparison between the perspectives of students and workers in terms of the significance and practices of boycotting. The p-value was 0.332922 or 0.33. Because the p-value (0.33) is greater than the level of significance (0.05), the researchers failed to reject the null hypothesis, implying that there are no significant differences between the perspective of the students and workers towards the significance and practices of boycotting. Regardless of differences in occupational status, this data supports the claim that boycott is perceived the same to a student and a worker (Jae & Jeon, 2016).

CONCLUSION

Results have shown that boycotting is an effective tool to raise awareness, especially about contemporary issues. It contributes to societal change and engages people in the world's current problems. However, boycotting is still subject to ethical issues, and the movement is only ethical if they are proven to have a negative impact on society. In addition, it is not highly agreed that boycotting is the most effective form of protest. As boycotting is mostly spread on social media, it is noted to be only moderately influential. Some people mostly agreed to raise awareness by participating in protests or demonstrations and contacting the brand



for any concerns. As boycotting increases awareness, consumers are willing to stop buying products from involved brands. Thus, this still shows that boycotting is also an effective call for action. Workers and students can be powerful forces in boycotts when driven by ethical concerns and a desire for change. However, boycotting might only be successful if the issue is proven by carefully researching the situation and considering the potential impact on all parties involved. Hence, employing effective tactics can all play a role in the success of a boycott or a company's response to one.

Overall, the connection between workers, students, social media, and boycotts is an influential one. By utilizing social media effectively, consumers can raise awareness, mobilize action, and ultimately influence the behavior of companies through boycotts. To conclude, there is a positive relationship between the consumer's involvement and boycotting, wherein this involvement can be intertwined with different societal issues. This also strengthens the overall message of the boycott issue and the effectiveness of pressuring the target companies to address the issue.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This research delves into the perceptions of college students and professionals aged 18 and older about their role as consumers, their intimate relationships, and the importance of exclusion. To expand the scope of this study, future researchers are encouraged to conduct more comprehensive studies with broader populations. Using longitudinal study methods and including mediational analyses may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of consumer behavior and the evolving significance of exclusions over time. Such an approach offers deeper insight into the topic and facilitates the identification of subtle patterns and behaviors that may occur across population groups and over time. For future researchers interested in using the questionnaire from this study as a basis for their research, here is the link to access it: (https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vRuK3ioG5sRtBQBABF1_2sAQjz0Xo81239YqtiCKuoDNeBqBZPC0j8_YsF4Nvc_SA/pub).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To this day, the researchers would like to express their deepest gratitude to the individuals, communities, and organizations whose contributions and support have helped them complete this research study. First and foremost, the researchers would like to thank the almighty God for His unending guidance and gift for this research study. The researchers would also like to extend their warmest and heartfelt appreciation to their advisor, Prof. Mc Rollyn D. Vallespin, for his dedication and time to help the researchers complete the requirements of the research, for his guidance, invaluable insights, and continuous feedback, and criticism to make this research enhance its depth and encourage the researchers to fulfill their goal. This research would not have been possible without the researchers' families, relatives, and loved ones whose unwavering support, financially, emotionally, and mentally, have helped the researchers withstand the stress and challenges faced in completing the research study, in which these people contributed to the success of the research and significantly impact the commitment of the researchers to completing the research study. Their love and belief in the researchers have enhanced their abilities and skills to surpass the challenges in completing the study. The researchers also expressed their appreciation to the university, Far Eastern University-Manila, for providing the accessible resources that greatly helped gather data and having the different institutions that made the data-gathering procedure possible. Lastly, the researchers would like to thank their colleagues and friends for their understanding and encouragement to the researchers. Their encouragement and efforts are indeed a great contribution to the success of the research, which was indispensable during the hardships faced by the researchers in accomplishing their tasks and responsibilities.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, Y., Gautam, A. & Pandey, S. (2021). Consumer Motivations for Boycott. *Pacific Business Review*. pp 51-63. http://www.pbr.co.in/2021/2021_month/December/7.pdf
2. Ali, M., Chugtai, A. & Nolan, D. (2023, December 15). Boycotts and protests – how are people around the world defying Israel? *Aljazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/amp/news/2023/12/15/boycotts-and-protests-how-are-people-around-the-world-defying-israel?fbclid=IwAR1RHsdXzkws19dNqaUjtciejKqQLKJkJPpUUWWcqMm6KW5tOpqyldhrbLs>
3. Alice, L. B. (2019). Boycotts in the struggle for Human Rights. <https://repository.gchumanrights.org/items/6b7bcd61-a915-4dc8-9067-fb04d479c185>



4. Al-Khalidi, S. & Saafan, F. (2023, November 24). Boycott campaigns over Gaza war hit Western brands in some Arab countries. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/business/retail-consumer/boycott-campaigns-over-gaza-war-hit-western-brands-some-arab-countries-2023-11-22/?fbclid=IwAR3SXgsLDS0GceB3Cnui6dvWh6qMpFZN5_DI7FqD4F5FwiE3YwN2o3txumE
5. Allen, M. (2017). The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research methods (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411
6. Ang, C. (2022). Boycott Practices: A Study on the Lasallian Youth's Perceptions and Involvement with Consumer Activism. https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1060&context=conf_shsrescon.
7. Asare, J. G. (2024, February 20). Do boycotts actually work? Examining the use of boycotts to drive social change. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/janicegassam/2023/12/22/do-boycotts-actually-work-examining-the-use-of-boycotts-to-drive-social-change/?sh=4a783bd3bbb5>
8. Botha, M. (2021, August 26). How to avoid sampling bias in research. Alchemer. <https://www.alchemer.com/resources/blog/how-to-avoid-sampling-bias-in-research/>
9. Chikhani, M. (2023, November 3). Boycotting Brands for a Cause: Impact, Effectiveness, and Responsible Social Media Activism. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/boycotting-brands-cause-impact-effectiveness-social-chikhani--fkpef>
10. Coghlan, D., Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). The SAGE encyclopedia of action research (Vols. 1-2). London, : SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446294406
11. Corbo, A. (2022, December 29). What is inferential statistics? Built In. <https://builtin.com/data-science/inferential-statistics>
12. Coursera Staff (2023, November 30). The 7 Data Analysis Software You Need to Know. Coursera. <https://www.coursera.org/in/articles/data-analysis-software>
13. Delistravrou, A. (2020). Consumers' decision to boycott "unethical" products: the role of materialism/post-materialism. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJRDM-04-2019-0126/full/html>
14. Dovetail Editorial Team. (2023). What is descriptive research? <https://dovetail.com/research/descriptive-research/>
15. Edelman (2018, October 2). Two-Thirds of Consumers Worldwide Now Buy on Beliefs. Edelman. <https://www.edelman.com/news-awards/two-thirds-consumers-worldwide-now-buy-beliefs>
16. Hitchcock, J. (2020). A Rhetorical Frame Analysis of Palestinian-Led Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) Movement Discourse. ProQuest. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=framework+about+effectiveness+of+boycott+in+israel&btnG=#d=gs_qabs&t=1709039247829&u=%23p%3DNDVQbGs38BfwJ
17. Ijaz, A. (2023, November 9). Israel: why the brand boycotts probably won't make much difference. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/israel-why-the-brand-boycotts-probably-wont-make-much-difference-217125>
18. Kadence International. (2023, June 5). What is quantitative research? Kadence. <https://kadence.com/en-us/what-is-quantitative-research/>
19. King, B. (2017, March 29). Do Boycotts Work? <https://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/news/2017/king-corporate-boycotts.html#:~:text=But%20it%20turns%20out%20that's,still%20purchase%20that%20company's%20products.>
20. Libretexts. (2022, September 5). 4.12: Symbolic Interactionist theory. Social Sci LibreTexts. [https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Courses/Lumen_Learning/Introduction_to_Sociology_\(Lumen\)/04%3A_Module_1_-_Foundations_of_Sociology/4.12%3A_Symbolic_Interactionist_Theory](https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Courses/Lumen_Learning/Introduction_to_Sociology_(Lumen)/04%3A_Module_1_-_Foundations_of_Sociology/4.12%3A_Symbolic_Interactionist_Theory)
21. Sarro, D. (2017, March 16). Why Customers Consider Buying Products From Familiar Brands and The Role Played by Promotional Products!. LinkedIn.com. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/why-customers-consider-buying-products-from-familiar-brands-sarro#:~:text=Most%20customers%20prefer%20buying%20products,more%20value%20with%20every%20purchase>
22. Sepulveda, L. (2023, December 8). Why are people boycotting Starbucks? What to know. Azcentral. <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix/2023/12/08/why-are-people-boycotting-starbucks/71830276007/>
23. Simplilearn (2023, October 19). What is Descriptive Statistics: Definition, Types, Applications, and Examples. Simple learn. <https://www.simplilearn.com/what-is-descriptive-statistics-article>
24. Shin, S. (2018). Consumer motivation for the decision to boycott: The social dilemma. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12444>



25. Start question. (2023). Why do people boycott brands? <https://www.startquestion.com/survey-ideas/why-do-people-boycott-brands/>
26. Tenny, S., Brannan, J. M., & Brannan, G. D. (2022, September 18). Qualitative study. StatPearls - NCBI Bookshelf. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK4703>
27. UNICEF. (2021). Defining Social Norms and Related Concepts. <https://www.unicef.org/media/111061/file/Social-norms-definitions-2021.pdf>.
28. Violence. (2024). <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/violence>
29. Walsh, S. (2024, April 3). The Top 10 Social Media Sites & Platforms. <https://www.searchenginejournal.com/social-media/social-media-platforms/>
30. Wesolowski, K. (2023, December 3). 'No Thanks' app calls for boycott of Israel-related products. DW. <https://amp.dw.com/en/no-thanks-viral-app-calls-for-a-boycott-of-israel-related-products/a-67619309?fbclid=IwAR0vnY-LfUpGEO4GrvtxKfCeIBSOuDg36Amwm0IOCeFjqvZ1IsYUzVtiYe8>
31. Jae, M. K., & Jeon, H. R. (2016). A study of ethnic perception gap on consumer boycott of Korean and Canadian University students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1108/apjie-12-2016-009>
32. Park, E. (2024, February 13). Impact of social media impact on Starbucks boycott. *The Spectator*. <https://caxynews.com/7452/features/impact-of-social-media-impact-on-starbucks-boycott/>

Cite this Article: Allam, Kyla R., Dichoso, Khristian, Frago, Kyle Cedric, Igcaltinos, Willah Mae G., Idang, Lorin Maxine O., Oliquino, Sheer Lou S., Tolentino, Margareth Dane M., Vallespin, Mc Rollyn D. (2024). Unmasking Consumer Behavior: A Deep Dive into Brand Boycotts in the Social Media Age – Exploring Filipino Demographic Variances, Perceptual Constructs, and Activist Actions. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 7(5), 2559-2569