*What drives buycotters, boycotters and dualcotters? An analysis of political consumerism in Spain.**

¿Qué mueve a los «buycotters», «boycotters» y «dualcotters»? Un análisis del político en España

Amparo Novo Vázquez

Universidad de Santiago de Compostela,
amparo.novo@usc.es (ESPAÑA)

María Rosalía Vicente

Universidad de Oviedo
mrosalia@uniovi.es (ESPAÑA)

Recibido: 12.10.2023
Aceptado: 08.07.2024

ABSTRACT

Political consumerism, as a means of participation through the marketplace, is increasing in most Western democracies. Consequently, companies have been obliged to make themselves accountable to customers. This paper analyses the factors associated with three types of political consumers: boycotters, buycotters, and dualcotters as opposed to those consumers who are not politically involved. Using data from a representative sample of the Spanish population, we focus on the role that the self-perceived efficacy of individuals as consumers plays on political consumerism. Results show that the predictors of the behaviour of boycotters and buycotters are generally different. Internal political efficacy is significant for dualcotters and buycotters whereas consumer efficacy is more predictive in the case of boycotters. The use of social networks is common to all political consumers.

KEY WORDS

Consumer behaviour, political consumerism, social networks, political ef-ficacy, citizenship norms.

*This work was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competition, the Spanish State Research Agency and one European Regional Development Fund projects: "Political Food Consumption: Citizens, Activists and Institutions (CSO2016- 76293R)".

RESUMEN

El consumo político, como medio de participación a través del mercado, está aumentando en la mayoría de las democracias occidentales. En consecuencia, las empresas se han visto obligadas a rendir cuentas ante los clientes. Este artículo analiza los factores asociados a tres tipos de consumidores políticos: los que boicotean, los que compran y los realizan ambas acciones en oposición a aquellos consumidores que no están implicados políticamente. Utilizando datos de una muestra representativa de la población española, nos centramos en el papel que la eficacia interna de los individuos juega en el consumo político. Los resultados muestran que los predictores del comportamiento de los boicoteadores y los compradores son, en general, diferentes. La eficacia política interna es significativa para los que realizan ambas acciones y los que compran, mientras que la eficacia del consumidor es más predictiva en el caso de los que realizan boicot. El uso de las redes sociales es común a todos los consumidores políticos.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Comportamiento del consumidor, consumo político, redes sociales, eficacia política, normas de ciudadanía.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades the crisis of political participation has become a recurring issue. Research carried out from different areas of political science, sociology or social psychology shows that people find alternative, emerging spaces and ways to participate beyond the so-called "conventional" ones. In fact, political participation is changing, going from the conventional forms associated with electoral processes to associationism, contact with politicians (Verba & Nie 1972; Barnes & Kaase 1979) or more current ones which express a daily commitment to social and political issues using individualized means such as political consumerism (Norris, 2002; Micheletti, 2003; Torcal, Montero & Teorell, 2006; ; Van Deth, 2014; Theocharis & Van Deth 2018a,b; Theocharis, de Moor & Van Deth 2021). In order to define those creative political actions which take place outside the limits of the traditional space "the concept of lifestyle politics has been introduced in political science" (Micheletti & Stolle 2011: 126).

Political consumerism has been defined as an "individualized collective action" (Micheletti 2003: 34) based on the decisions to "boycott" or "buycott" in which ethical, political and environmental concerns make up people's preferences.

Political consumerism has been on the rise in recent decades. According to Copeland, Boulianne, and Koc-Michalska (2020), 57% of the French pop-

ulation and 51% of the British have boycotted products for ethical, political, or environmental reasons over the last year. As far as buycotting is concerned, 59% of French people and 52% of Britons have bought for ethical, political or environmental reasons over the last 12 months. According to the European Social Survey (2018) more than 40% of the population in Sweden and Iceland, 38% in Finland, 29.3% France, and 20.6% United Kingdom have boycotted in the last 12 months. In Spain, the development of political consumerism has also been noteworthy. In 2002, 12% of the Spanish population had buycotted and 6% of the population claimed to have taken part in boycott actions (European Social Survey 2002). Sixteen years later, in 2018, these percentages have risen to 26.3% buying products and 23.2% boycotting in the last 12 months (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 2018). Data from the study "Consumocracy", carried out in 2019, state that 31.7% of the Spanish population has boycotted, and 34.3%, buycotted in the last 12 months.

The reasons that explain the popularity which political consumerism has reached worldwide are varied (Beck 1997; Bennett 1998; Micheletti & Stolle 2005; Dalton 2008; Neilson & Paxton 2010; Koss 2012; Copeland 2014a; Gil de Zuñiga, Copeland & Bimber 2014; Boulianne 2015 2021). On the one hand, the changes which took place during the second half of the 20th century must be taken into account (Micheletti & Follesdal 2007; Lekakis 2015; Castelló & Mihelj 2018; Bröckerhoff & Qassoum 2021; Rivaroli et al. 2019; Muhamad et al. 2019). These include economic globalisation, the change from materialistic to post-materialistic values (Inglehart 1997), and the development of the information society, which has made access to and diffusion of consumer-to-consumer (C2C) information much easier. In addition, there is rising consumer awareness and criticism. As Gabriel states (2015:1) "never before have consumers been so unmanageable (…) the consumer is no longer a person who merely desires, buys and uses up a commodity. Instead, the consumer is one who chooses or refuses to choose; who buys or refuses to buy" and whose actions cannot be detached from those "as social, political and moral agents" (Gabriel & Lang 1995: 4). Particularly, frustration from the traditional political channels (e.g., parties, elections) has led citizens to new ways of participation, especially by means of action from the market. As Becker and Copeland (2016) state, "people are motivated to engage in political consumption because they are disaffected with the state". This disenchantment with traditional politics appears to have been greater with the generational shift (Kyroglou & Henn 2017), and particularly with the rise of millennials and the Generation Z and their attitudes towards politics (e.g., direct action) and who have adopted social networks as the main means of expression of their political views (Andersen et al. 2021).

In Spain we encounter multiple examples of political consumerism motivated by ethical and social concerns and human, nationalistic, or ideological rights, such as the boycott of palm oil (Rejón 2017), Coca-Cola (EFE 2016), Israeli products (Agencias 2010) or Catalan brands and companies after the pro-independence support of the Catalan government (Vidal 2017). These actions, aimed at companies and governments, reveal the dissatisfaction with traditional

structures for participation to solve social problems (Micheletti 2003; Holzer & Sorensen 2003; Beck 2005). On the other hand, the purchase of products to support companies that favour sustainable development and fair trade has had considerable repercussions in Spain. According to data from Fairtrade Ibérica (2019) the sale of Fair-Trade products in Spain in 2016, amounted to 34.8 million euros and, in 2019, 130.6 million.

The main objective of this article is to uncover the predictors of political consumerism, specifically focusing on boycott and buycotting. Both actions will be studied separately as we hypothesize that boycott actions are oriented towards punishment and buycott actions towards reward.

Within this context, the aim of this article is to answer the following questions: Which factors predict political consumerism today? Are there differences between political consumers - those who boycott, those who buycott, and those who are not committed to these types of actions. Which factors explain the different types of political consumerism? In order to answer these questions, we have used the data from a specific survey carried out in Spain about people's involvement in political consumerism n=1,005 during June 2019.

The main contributions of this work to existing literature may be summarised as follows: Firstly, the two types of political consumerism – boycott and buycott – are studied separately and, in addition, it is noted that they are not mutually exclusive actions. This is in contrast to existing literature in which they were studied as a whole or one as opposed to the other. Following the typology of Copeland (2014a), we distinguish four types of consumers: boycotters, buycotters, dualcotters and nocotters. Secondly, the study also contributes to the debate regarding the role of the efficient (political) perception of individuals in political consumerism. Specfically, the concept of "efficiency" is extended to include consumer efficiency which, even though it has been considered from a theoretical point of view (Copeland & Boulianne 2022), it has not been tested empirically. Thirdly, we are contributing to the recent debate about the relationship between social media and lifestyle politics, expanding empirical evidence available until now (Theocharis, de Moor & van Deth 2021). Finally, new evidence is produced regarding whether or not there are links between traditional ways of political engagement and political consumerism. Although political consumerism has been understood as an alternative to the traditional forms of political involvement (voting, parties) and more linked to civic participation, recent studies indicate that this relationship has been altered and that political consumerism would co-exist alongside traditional means of participation.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Political consumerism is a means of taking part, in which the population express their preferences through the market. Purchasing one product (buycott) or not (boycott) is a valid personal decision which is included as a means of action in most typologies of political participation (Torcal, Montero & Teorell

2006: 22; Ekman & Amna 2012; Theocharis & Van Deth 2018a,b). In the face of the disenchantment towards traditional forms of political participation, this new public space has appeared, aimed at meeting the democratic demands of the population (Stromsnes 2009), and it even offers a chance to participate to those people who are outside the system (Stolle & Micheletti 2013; Copeland 2014b).

Buycott and boycott consist of, respectively, the purchase or rejection of products or brands based on the social, environmental, or ethical commitment of companies. In this sense, the literature around self and collective emancipation highlights that the consumer can no longer be considered merely someone seeking to satisfy needs but, overall, now s/he seeks to produce symbols (Firat & Vankatesh 1995), which in the case of political consumerism are related to his/her social, environmental and ethical awareness and commitments.

Most empirical research into political consumerism has treated boycott and buycott together either because they consider them to be similar (Baek 2010: 1066), or in order to analyse their values in relation to other types of political participation (Neilson & Paxton 2010; Newman & Bartells 2011). By contrast, there is less research which recognises the difference between the two actions, given that buycott focuses on reward and boycott, on punishment (Friedman 1999: 3; Kam & Deitcher 2020; Hoffmann et al. 2018). Even fewer pieces of work develop and empirically study a typology of political consumers. Copeland (2014a) is one of the few studies which recognise that boycott and buycott are not mutually exclusive decisions, but, rather, there are people who carry out both actions simultaneously (dualcotters)

In order to study the determinants of political consumerism, we have used different theories, the most noteworthy of which are: the civic voluntarism model (Verba et al. 1995), the theory of citizenship norms (Dalton 2006 2008; Copeland 2014a) and the theory of lifestyle politics (Giddens 1991; Bennet 1998; Micheletti & Stolle 2011), to which social media is central. In addition, the social identity theory and the reference group theory have linked people's consumption attitudes to their political party preferences.

The civic voluntarism model (Verba et al. 1995) states that people with high levels of individual resources such as time, money, education, and civic skills tend to participate more in politics (Dalton 2008). There are also motivation factors -such as general self-confidence, interest in politics and the self-perception of political efficacy- which will affect people's political intervention (Verba et al. 1995: 272, Copeland & Boulianne 2022).

Empirical findings suggest that political consumerism (considered as a single category) is directly related to gender (specifically, being female) and with higher levels of education (Andersen & Tobiasen 2004; Micheletti & Stolle 2005; Stolle, Hooghe & Micheletti 2005; Ferrer-Fons & Fraile 2006, 2013; Forno & Ceccarini 2006; Baek 2010; Neilson & Paxton 2010; Acik 2013; Zúñiga, Copeland & Bimber 2014; Copeland 2014a; Gundelach & Kalte 2021). However, evidence is not so clear when boycotting and buycotting are studied separately and, in addition, there is a shortage of recent data. While some authors find that women and individuals with higher education are more likely to buycott (Neil-

son 2010; Yates 2011; Koos 2012; Copeland 2104a), in other cases, gender is not significant and buycotting would be associated with people with lower levels of education and income (Baek 2010). Similarly, there is no clear link between age and political consumerism. On some occasions it is young people who are more active in this type of action (Ferrer-Fons & Fraile 2006, Ferrer-Fons 2010; Marien, Hooghe & Quintelier 2010; Newman & Bartels 2011), whereas other studies show that the most active group is middle-aged (Ferrer-Fons & Fraile 2006; Nonomura 2017).

In terms of behavioural motivation, many studies claim that an interest in politics (Micheletti & Stolle 2005; Forno & Ceccarini 2006; Dalton 2008; Baeck, 2010; Neilson & Paxton 2010; Newman & Bartels 2011; Stolle & Micheletti 2013; Copeland 2014a, 2014b; Quintelier & van Deth 2014) and a feeling of political efficiency are key predictors for understanding political consumerism (Stolle & Micheletti 2013; Gil de Zuñiga, Copeland & Bimber 2014). Political efficiency is the perception which the general public has of how their actions can solve problems in the political arena. This perception can be internal, based on the personal sensation of competence when participating in politics. Alternatively, it can be external - related to the idea that the system responds to the interests of the general public. Even though it would be logical to think that a positive perception of efficiency would co-relate directly with political consumerism, there is no conclusive empirical evidence (Marien Hooghe & Quintelier 2010; Newman & Bartels 2011; Copeland 2013; de Moor 2016; Copeland & Boulianne 2022). Recently, attention has been focused on the fact that, in addition to political efficiency, we must take into account consumer efficiency, i.e., "one's ability to affect change through purchasing decisions or through the marketplace" (Copeland & Boulianne 2022: 13). As far as we know, the role of consumer efficiency in political consumerism has not been tested empirically to date.

In order to understand the different ways of taking part in the marketplace we need to know the link with citizenship norms. These norms refer to the perceptions of what it means to be a good citizen. According to Dalton (2008: 85), "citizenship norms provide a framework for understanding how and why the patterns of political involvement are changing". Furthermore, Copeland argue that "the theory of changing citizenship norms offers useful insights for advancing our understanding of the distinction between boycotting and buycotting" (2014a: 176). Despite the importance that these norms might have for explaining political consumerism, little empirical research has addressed such issues. Dalton (2006 2008) describes two types of citizenship norms: norms of duty and norms of engagement, and finds the actions of consumerism (buycott and boycott) and Internet-based political actions (such as visiting a politician's website, forwarding a political email, etc.) correlate positively with engaged citizen norms. Copeland (2014a) states that the main difference between boycotting and buycotting is that the first is conflict- and punishment-oriented, while the second is cooperative and reward-oriented; thus, there would be some positive correlation between buycotting and citizenship-engaged norms. Other studies also show

that there is a positive relation between engaged norms and buycott (Copeland 2014a; Neilson 2010; Zorell & Yang 2019).

Political consumerism -boycott and buycott- has also been studied as a type of lifestyle politics (Micheletti & Stolle 2011; Gil de Zúñiga, Copeland & Bimber 2014; Ohme, de Vreese, Albæk 2018; Copeland & Bouliane 2022). Lifestyle politics refers to the politicization of everyday options such as the attitudes, behaviour and individual decision-making which might have global repercussions (Stolle, Hooghe & Micheletti 2005; Newman & Bartels 2011; Copeland 2014; de Moor 2017; Copeland & Boulianne 2022). The already mentioned changes arising in the second half of the 20th century paved the way for a new space for politics - sub-politics (Beck 1997). This new way of doing politics "from below", which is individual and not institutionalized and based on daily decisions, is a political positioning in the face of the challenges faced by societies, such as climate change (Schlosberg & Craven 2019), world hunger, or social justice (Micheletti & Stolle 2008). Lately, social media have become central to promoting lifestyle politics (e.g., tweeting about the need of flying less -https://pledgetoflyless.co.uk/- Stolle & Micheletti 2013). People share identities, values and lifestyles on social media (Gotlieb et al. 2015; Gotlieb & Cheema 2017). Social media have become a very popular way for people to engage civically and politically thanks to their potential interactive, low-cost, and attention-grabbing nature (Anderson, Toor, Olmstead, Rainie, & Smith 2018; Theocharis & van Deth 2018a), shaping how citizens think about politics (Lane et al., 2019). Some recent academic debate focuses on whether social media could form a distinct dimension that explains political consumption independently from other conceptual models (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018a 2018b).[1] Among the first to empirically explore such issues is Theocharis et al. (2021) who find that, though social media and lifestyle politics have important characteristics in common, they appear to be independent.

People's consumption attitudes have also been linked to their political party preferences through the social identity and the reference group theories (Escalas & Bettman 2003; Greene 2004; Oyserman 2009; Oyserman & Schwarz 2017). These theories state that people's self-conception is shaped by the membership in some particular group and it would translate into consumption. Accordingly, people would express their political identity through their consumption choices. Such an approach has also been adopted by marketing researchers who consider that consumers' decisions depend "not only by what they perceive brands stand for politically but also by the subtle effects that the psychological correlates of consumers' political identity can have on their decision-making process" (Jung & Mittal, 2020, pp. 62). Put more simply, consumers would try to be congruent with their political identity and correlates (Farmer 2014; Jung et al. 2017; Ordabayeva & Fernande 2018; Junt & Mittal 2019). Nonetheless, most empirical evidence suggest that there is no significant relationship between strength of partisanship and political consumerism (Baeck 2010; Newman & Bartels 2010;

[1] We thank reviewers for noting this point.

Gil de Zuñiga, Copeland & Bimber 2014; Copeland 2014a). While such results might be explained by people's disaffection with the state, some recent lines of research suggest that political consumers also participate in other, more conventional ways such as voting (Copeland & Becker, 201: 768).

We cannot end this section without mentioning some of the criticisms which political consumerism has received. Some reckon that, in order to be a political consumer, one must have economic resources, for example, not everybody can afford to buy fair trade products because of their price and, consequently, only part of the population can take part in this type of action which limits its democratic potential (Johnston 2008; Acik 2013; Balsiger 2013; Hooghe & Goubin 2020). Criticism has also been directed at the concept of consumption as an action based on individual, choice without bearing in mind the influence of groups and the social environment, which limits the options on offer (Balsiger 2013). Moreover, in many occasions people buy products to express themselves; then, they buy what they like, what they feel suits them, rather than to complain about the market or some company's behaviour. In other cases, consumers buy ethical products, not because they really care about ethical conditions in productions, but because these products are fashionable; it might be more a symbol of status than a true commitment to social change, offering an illusion of activism without addressing the roots of inequalities and social problems (Bourdiue 2012, Baudrillard 1974, Bauman 2003). For all these reasons, several authors have raised concerns about the potential impact and efficacy of political consumerism (Omidvar & Giannakas 2015; Hooghe & Goubin 2020).

3. EMPIRICAL APPROACH

3.1. Sample

This paper uses microdata from a survey of 1,005 people carried out in Spain to investigate people's involvement in political consumerism. The reference population for the survey was people aged 18 and older. A representative random sample of the Spanish population was drawn from the registers of the electoral census. The sampling design was multistage and stratified by regions and municipalities, imposing some quotas for age and gender. The sampling error is ± 3.16%, with 95.5% confidence level. A pretest was carried out to check the validity of the questionnaire. Final field work took place between the 4th and 10th of June 2019, through telephone interviews.

Measures

Table 1 summarizes the description and main statistics of the variables used in this study.

Table 1. Description of variables and main statistics

Variables	Description	Mean	S.D.
Political Consumerism	Categorial variable. =1, dualcotters, if respondent reported both having ever boycotted and buycotted;	0.26	0.44
	=2, boycotters, if respondent reported having ever boycotted and never boycotted;	0.14	0.34
	=3, buycotters, if respondent reported having ever buycotted and never boycotted;	0.17	038
	=4, nocotters, if respondent neither reported having boycotted nor boycotted	0.43	0.49
Age: 18-29	=1, if respondent's age was between 18 and 29 years old	0.13	0.34
Age: 30-44	=1, if respondent's age was between 30 and 44 years old	0.24	0.43
Age:45-64	=1, if respondent's age was between 45 and 64 years old	0.38	0.49
Age: 65 and older	=1, if respondent's age was at least 65 years old	0.25	0.43
Education: No studies	=1, if respondent had no studies	0.11	0.31
Education: Primary	=1, if respondent's highest level of education achieved was primary education	0.23	0.42
Education: High School	=1, if respondent's highest level of education achieved was high school	0.31	0.46
Education: College/University	=1, if respondent's highest level of education achieved was college/university	0.34	0.47
Income: at most 600 €/month	=1, if respondent's income was at most 600 €/month	0.15	0.36
Income: 601 -1200 €/month	=1, if respondent's income was between 601 and 1200 €/month	0.34	0.46
Income: 1201- 1800 €/month	=1, if respondent's income was between 1201 and 1800 €/month	0.23	0.42
Income: 1801 - 2400 €/month	=1, if respondent's income was between 1801 and 2400€/month	0.11	0.31
Income: over 2400€/month	=1, if respondent's income was over 2400 €/month	0.06	0.25
Income: DK/DA	=1, if respondent did not know/answer the question about his/her income	0.11	0.31
Women	=1, if respondent was female	0.56	0.5
Efficacy	Respondent's level of agreement with: (=1, strongly disagree; =5, agree strongly)		
External Political Efficacy	"In general, I consider myself as a citizen who understand politics"	3.33	1.07
Internal Political Efficacy	"Politicians don't care much about what people like me think"	3.63	1.1
Consumer Efficacy	"As I consumer I can influence on firms' behavior"	3.35	1.06
Political Interest	Respondent' level of interest in politics: (=1, not interested; =5, very interested)	3.13	1.42

Table 1. Description of variables and main statistics (continued)

Variables	Description	Mean	S.D.
Vote 2019: PP	=1, if respondent voted PP in May 2019 Spanish election	0.09	0.29
Vote 2019: Ciudadanos	=1, if respondent voted Ciudadanos in May 2019 Spanish election	0.85	0.28
Vote 2019: PSOE	=1, if respondent voted PSOE in May 2019 Spanish election	0.19	0.39
Vote 2019: Podemos	=1, if respondent voted Podemos in May 2019 Spanish election	0.09	0.29
Vote 2019: Others	=1, if respondent voted other parties in May 2019 Spanish election	0.09	0.29
Vote 2019: No vote	=1, if respondent did not vote in May 2019 Spanish election	0.11	0.31
Vote 2019: DK/DA	=1, if respondent did not know or answer the question about vote in May 2019 Spanish election	0.34	0.47
Social Capital	Sum of respondent's answers to whether they collaborated or participated in the following groups/associations: i) political party, ii) union, iii) professional or business association, iv) church or some religious or charity association, v) sports, cultural or leisure club, vi) NGO or vii) neighbor association. Range 0-7.	1.47	1.45
Use of social online networks	Respondent's frequency of use of social online networks to: (=1, never; =5, very frequently)		
	Keep in contact with friends/family	3.84	1.53
	Stay informed on political and public issues	2.82	1.61
	Seek information about social causes	2.97	1.54
	Find people with similar interests	2.01	1.33
	Express political opinions	1.87	1.28
	Discuss about politics	1.58	1.15
Being a good citizen	Respondent's degree of importance of the next measures of being a good citizen: (=1, not important; =5, very important)		
	Always vote	4.01	1.16
	Not try to avoid tax pay	4.16	0.98
	Always obey laws and norms	4.03	1.03
	Stay informed about government's actions	3.58	1.11
	Participate in social or political associations	2.99	1.16

	Try to understand other people's different opinions
	Buy products that respect the environment or are coherent with your political or ethic (though they might be more expensive)
	Help people in your country living in worse conditions
	Help people in other countries living in worse conditions

3.2. Dependent variable.

The dependent variable of our study is political consumerism. The survey included questions to measure boycotting and buycotting. To measure boycotting, interviewees were asked: "In the last 12 months, have you stopped buying any product for ethical, political or environmental reasons? The possible replies were: "yes", "yes, and before that too", "no, but I had done before" and "no, never". To measure buycotting, the interviewees were asked: "In the last 12 months, have you bought any product for ethical, political or environmental reasons?" The possible replies were: "yes", "yes, and before that too", "no, but I had done before" and "no, never". Like in Copeland (2014), a categorical variable on the types of political consumers is created. The variable assumes four values: "dualcotters", those people who boycott and buycott; "boycotters", those who boycott but do not buycott; "buycotters", those people who buycott but do not boycott, and "nocotters", those who neither buycott nor boycott.[2]

3.3. Independent variables.

There are three types of explanatory variables in this study. The first group of variables is related to structural values, specifically to the theory of civic voluntarism (Verba et al., 1995). It explains how individual resources and attitudes such as political efficacy or interest in politics predict political involvement.

The first set of variables include respondents' socio-demographic characteristics (age, gender, education, and income), political and consumer efficacy, political interest, vote in the last general elections May 2019 and participation in associations.

Respondents were asked to report: i) their age in years; this was codified in a categorical variable with four categories - between 18 and 29 years old: M = 0.13, SD = 0.34; between 30 and 44 years old: M=0.24, SD=0.43; between 45 and 64 years old: M=0.38, SD=0.49; 65 years old and older: M=0.25, SD=0.43; ii) the highest level of education completed, also codified in a categorical variable with four categories - no studies: M=0.11, SD=0.31; primary studies: M=0.23, SD=0.42; secondary school: M=0.31, SD=0.46; college/university: M=0.34, SD=0.47; and iii) family monthly income, codified in a categorical variable with five categories - €600 or less: M=0.15, SD=0.36; between 601 and 1200€/month: M=0.32, SD=0.46; between €1201 and €1800: M=0.23, SD=0.42;

[2] Answers to boycott and buycott questions were combined in the following way to create our variable of interest: "dualcotters", people who both boycott and buycott, answers: "yes", "yes, and before that too", "no, but I had done before" to both questions; "boycotters", people who only carried out this type of action, answers: "yes", "yes, and before that too", "no, but I had done before" to boycott's question; "buycotters", people who have ever boycotted, answers: "yes", "yes, and before that too", "no, but I had done before" to buycott question; and "nocotters" people whose response has been "no, never", "don't know", "no answer" to both boycott and buycott.

between €1801 and €2400: M=0.11, SD=0.31; over €2400: M=0.06, SD=0.25; don't know/don't answer: M=0.11, SD=0.31. Gender was coded "1" for women: M=0.56, SD=0.5.

To measure internal and external political efficacy, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they, respectively, agreed with the following statements: "In general, I consider myself as a citizen who understand politics" and "Politicians don't care much about what people like me think". In both cases the scale ranged from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "agree strongly": M =3.63, SD=1.1 and M=3.33, SD=1.07, respectively. Similarly, consumer efficacy was measured by asking respondents to express their degree of agreement with the following statement: "As I consumer I can influence firms' behavior". The scale ranged from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "agree strongly": M=3.34, SD=1.06. This variable was introduced to reveal the effect of consumer external efficacy as the ability to induce changes through purchasing or marketplace decisions (Copeland & Boulianne 2022: 13).

To measure political interest, respondents were asked the following question: "In general terms, how interested are you in politics?" The scale ranged from 1 "no interested" to 5 "very interested": M=3.13, SD=1.42

Respondents were also asked to report whether they had voted in the last general elections May 2019 and, if so, which political party they had voted for. Answers were coded as a categorical variable with seven categories which corresponded to the five most voted parties PP: M=0.09, SD=0.29; Ciudadanos: M=0.85, SD=0.28; PSOE: M=0.19, SD=0.39; Podemos: M=0.09, SD=0.29; Other parties: M=0.09, SD=0.29; didn't vote: M=0.11, SD=0.31; and didn't answer/didn't know: M=0.34, SD=0.47.

Group resources or participation in groups and social and political organizations was measured by asking respondents whether they collaborated or participated in the following groups or associations: i) political party, ii) union, iii) professional or business association, iv) church or some religious or charity association, v) sports, cultural or leisure club, vi) NGO or vii) neighbours' association. Answers were combined into an additive scale, resulting in a scale of 0 to 7: M=1.47, SD=1.45. We have included "participation in associations" because it has been found to have a positive influence on political consumerism (Neilson & Paxton, 2010).

The second set of variables is related to the use of online social networks following the approach of Gil de Zúñiga, Copeland and Bimber (2014). On a scale of 1 "never" to 5 "very frequently", respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of use of online social networks to keep in contact with friends and family: M=3.84, SD=1.53, stay informed on political and public issues: M=2.82, SD=1.61, seek information about social causes: M=2.97, SD=1.54, find people with similar interests: M=2.01, SD=1.33, express political opinions: M=1.87, SD=1.28 and discuss about politics: M=1.58, SD=1.15. To develop useful measures from these items, the multivariate technique of factor analysis was used. Relying on the eigenvalue criterion, two factors were extracted using principal components analysis with varimax rotation (Table 2). The first factor, labelled

"using online social networks for information", included the following items: seeking information about social causes, keep in contact with friends and family and stay informed on political and public issues (Eigenvalue = 3.505). The second factor, labelled "using social online networks for political opinion," included the following items: discuss about politics, express political opinions and find people with similar interests (Eigenvalue = 1.059).

Table 2. Factor analysis of the use of online social networks. Rotated factor loadings matrix

Variables: Frequency of use of online social networks to	Factor 1: Information	Factor 2: Political Opinion
Seek information about social causes	**0.853**	0.297
Keep in contact with friends/family	**0.844**	0.094
Stay informed on political and public issues	**0.790**	0.361
Discuss about politics	0.127	**0.904**
Express political opinions	0.250	**0.880**
Find people with similar interests	0.412	**0.659**
Eigenvalue	3.505	1.059
% of explained variance	58.421	17.645
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure	0.804	

Notes: Extraction method: principal components analysis. Rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization. Bold figures indicate the highest correlations in each factor.

The third and final set of variables refers to citizenship norms. For it, we have considered some of the most common measures of "good citizenship" included in the literature (Dalton 2006; Copeland 2014a; Copeland & Feezell 2017); alongside with the measure "buy products that respect the environment or that are coherent with your political or ethical ideas" though they might be more expensive, which is fairly similar to Zorell & Yang's (2019) measure "choose products taking care of social and environmental aspects". On a scale 1 "not important" to 5 "very important", respondents were asked to indicate the degree of importance of the following indicators of being a good citizen, i.e., always vote: M=4.01, SD=1.16, try not to avoid paying tax: M=4.16, SD=0.98, always obey laws and norms: M=4.03, SD=1.03, stay informed about government's actions: M=3.58, SD=1.11, participate in social or political associations: M=2.99, SD=1.16, try to understand other people' opinions: M=3.87, SD=1.05, buy products that respect the environment or that are coherent with your political or ethical ideas though they might be more expensive: M=3.63, SD=1.12, help people in your country living in worse conditions: M=3.95, SD=1.01, and help people in other countries living in worse conditions: 3.82, SD=1.07. Useful measures were developed by means of factor analysis (Table 3). Two factors were

extracted using principal components analysis with varimax rotation and applying the eigenvalue criterion. The first one, labelled "engaged citizenship norms", included the following items: help people in your country living in worse conditions, help people in other countries living in worse conditions, buy products that respect the environment or that are coherent with your political or ethical ideas though they might be more expensive, try to understand other people's different opinions and participate in social or political associations (Eigenvalue = 3.860). The second one, labelled "citizenship duty norms," included the following items: always obey laws and norms, try not to avoid paying tax, always vote and stay informed about government actions (Eigenvalue = 1.098).

Table 3. Factor analysis of what means to be a good citizen. Rotated factor loadings matrix

Variables: What does it mean to be a good citizen to you	Factor 1: Social/ Civic	Factor 2 Normative
Help people in your country living in worse conditions	**0.795**	0.212
Help people in other countries living in worse conditions	**0.787**	0.153
Buy products that respect the environment or are coherent with your political or ethical ideas (though they might be more expensive)	**0.674**	0.175
Try to understand other people's different opinions	**0.567**	0.382
Participate in social or political associations	**0.505**	0.179
Always obey laws and norms	0.081	**0.815**
Not try to avoid tax pay	0.229	**0.783**
Always vote	0.290	**0.694**
Stay informed about government's actions	0.360	**0.606**
Eigenvalue	3.860	1.098
% of explained variance	42.894	12.205
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure	0.849	

Notes: Extraction method: principal components analysis. Rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization. Bold figures indicate the highest correlations in each factor.

3.4. Research design

To identify the characteristics of the different types of political consumers, a multinomial probit regression has been estimated. In this regression, the dependent variable considers the four derived categories of political consumers: dualcotters, boycotter, buycotters and nocotters, taking this latter type as reference,

i.e., individuals who are not political consumers, neither have they boycotted nor buycotted.

As covariates, three groups of variables are considered: the first group refer to variables related to the theory of civic voluntarism (Verba, Scholzman & Brady 1995), including respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, political and consumer efficacy, political interest, vote in the last general elections May 2019 and participation in associations; the second group takes into account the use of online social networks as regards information and political opinions; and the third and last group refers to measures of good citizenship and distinguishes between social/civic norms and normative rules.

The mutinomial regression model is estimated using the full sample (n=1,005) and applies sampling weights to support inferences for the full Spanish population.

3.5. Results

Table 4 shows the results from the estimations. The first thing to note is that socio-demographic features differentiate little between political consumers and those who are not. Only the estimated coefficients of women and age "between 45 and 64 years old" are statistically significant and positive for those who both boycott and buycott.

Table 4. Multinomial Probit Estimates on Dualcotting, Boycotting and Buycotting with reference to those who neither boycott or buycott

VARIABLES	Dualcott	Boycott Only	Buycott Only
Women	0.343**	0.015	0.228
	(0.142)	(0.153)	(0.147)
Age: 30-44	0.154	0.045	0.112
	(0.234)	(0.253)	(0.246)
Age:45-64	0.410*	0.025	0.233
	(0.230)	(0.250)	(0.240)
Age: 65 and older	-0.024	0.122	-0.026
	(0.266)	(0.284)	(0.277)
Income: 601 -1200 €/month	-0.232	0.009	-0.024
	(0.216)	(0.237)	(0.212)
Income: 1201- 1800 €/month	0.030	0.232	-0.089
	(0.231)	(0.255)	(0.239)
Income: 1801 - 2400 €/month	0.014	0.182	0.107
	(0.280)	(0.311)	(0.291)
Income: over 2400€/month	-0.335	0.081	0.027
	(0.343)	(0.375)	(0.359)

VARIABLES	Dualcott	Boycott Only	Buycott Only
Income: DK/DA	0.057	-0.105	0.030
	(0.269)	(0.304)	(0.271)
Education: Primary	0.534*	0.481	0.336
	(0.294)	(0.307)	(0.261)
Education: High School	0.501*	0.542*	0.120
	(0.294)	(0.310)	(0.268)
Education: College/University	0.765**	0.641**	0.104
	(0.303)	(0.322)	(0.282)
Social Capital	0.055	-0.011	0.020
	(0.049)	(0.055)	(0.052)
Consumer efficacy	0.092	0.090	0.200***
	(0.064)	(0.070)	(0.069)
External Political Efficacy	0.099	0.040	-0.058
	(0.063)	(0.067)	(0.063)
Internal Political Efficacy	0.236***	0.137*	0.119
	(0.076)	(0.080)	(0.077)
Political Interest	0.117**	0.014	0.061
	(0.059)	(0.062)	(0.060)
Vote 2019: Ciudadanos	0.358	-0.037	-0.308
	(0.320)	(0.347)	(0.328)
Vote 2019: PSOE	0.284	0.102	-0.207
	(0.278)	(0.294)	(0.270)
Vote 2019: Podemos	0.916***	0.107	0.381
	(0.329)	(0.376)	(0.331)
Vote 2019: Others	0.186	-0.068	-0.441
	(0.320)	(0.341)	(0.334)
Vote 2019: No vote	0.077	0.054	0.120
	(0.327)	(0.333)	(0.303)
Vote 2019: DK/DA	0.423	0.310	0.073

Table 4. Multinomial Probit Estimates on Dualcotting, Boycotting and Buycotting with reference to those who neither boycott or boycott (continued)

VARIABLES	Dualcott	Boycott Only	Buycott Only
	(0.263)	(0.271)	(0.250)
Social online Networks: Information	0.294***	0.320***	0.223***
	(0.079)	(0.088)	(0.081)
Social online Networks: Political Opinion	0.262***	0.201***	0.099
	(0.070)	(0.076)	(0.077)
Good Citizen: Social	0.315***	0.063	0.183**
	(0.073)	(0.077)	(0.076)
Good Citizen: Normative	-0.048	-0.036	0.017
	(0.072)	(0.077)	(0.075)
Constant	-3.548***	-2.508***	-2.068***
	(0.598)	(0.610)	(0.580)
Pseudo-R^2=0.1			
Wald chi2(81) = 222.38***			
Observations=1,005			

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; DK/DA refers to don't know/don't answer; *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1.

As regards education, all its categories are statistically significant for those who both boycott and buycott, while just two of them, high school and college/university, are statistically significant for those boycotting only.

Income is not statistically significant in any case and neither is participation in associations.

Concerning consumer and political efficacy, some differences are observed. External political efficacy is not statistically significant for any type of political consumer; whereas internal political efficacy is statistically highly significant for those who both boycott and buycott, being also statistically significant but with less strength for those only boycotting. Meanwhile, consumer efficacy is found to be statistically highly significant for buycotting.

As regards political interest, it appears to matter only for those who both boycott and buycott.

Concerning respondents' behavior in the last general election May 2019, estimates clearly show a high and statistically significant positive association between voters of Podemos and those who both boycott and buycott. No other relationship is identified for the rest of political parties and type of political consumers.

As for the use of online social networks, estimates suggest that this is one of the most important elements that distinguish political consumers from those who

are not. The first extracted factor, related to the use of online social networks for information, is found to be statistically highly significant and positive for all types of political consumers. The second extracted factor, related to the use of online social networks for political opinion, is also statistically highly significant and positive for political consumerism, except for those who only boycott.

In what refers to being a good citizen, the two extracted factors show different results in relation to political consumers. The first factor, the civic/social engaged citizenship norms is statistically significant for those who both boycott and buycott as well as for those who only buycott. However, the second factor, the normative citizen duty norms is not statistically significant for any type of political consumers.

Overall, results indicate that those who both boycott and buycott, compared to those who do not carry out any of these actions, are more likely to be women, between 45 and 64 years old, with higher education, higher feeling of internal political efficacy, higher political interest, who voted Podemos in the last general May 2019 election, with higher use of social networks for both information and political opinion and who attach more importance to the social/civic aspects of being a good citizen.

Compared to those who are not political consumers, boycotters are more likely to be higher educated, with a greater sense of internal political efficacy, and a higher use of social networks for both information and political opinion.

Finally, buycotters are more likely to have a higher feeling of consumer efficacy than non-political consumers, with a greater use of online social networks for information and who attach more importance to the social/civic aspects of being a good citizen.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Participating in political consumerism is one means of action which is becoming more and more popular. In the particular case of Spain, in the last two decades, it has gone from being a minority means of action to being practised by almost one third of the population, according to data from "Consumocracy", a specific survey carried out in Spain about political consumerism and which has served as a basis for the writing of this article.

Our research had, as its primary aim, to discover the predictors of political consumerism and, in particular, of boycotting and buycotting. The interest in studying both actions separately is due to the fact that some studies state that they are different, given that one is punishment-orientated and the other, reward-orientated. In order to test this hypothesis, we used the typology set out by Copeland (2014a): dualcotters, boycotters, buycotters and nocotters.

From the results, some important conclusions could be reached, answering the questions set. Firstly, findings only partially support the importance of factors predicted by the civic voluntarism model. Specifically, results suggest that resources such as income and social capital exert no influence on political con-

sumerism actions. The non-significance of income is a very interesting finding since one of the reasons traditionally argued to explain buycotting is that ethical products (fair trade, environmental friendly...) tend to be much more expensive than other products. In addition, gender, age and education have a very limited effect (only statistically significant at 5 and 10% levels, none at the 1%) and on particular actions: being a woman and middle-age on dualcotting; and education on dualcotting and boycotting.

In contrast, attitudinal factors appear to be more important predictors of political consumerism. In this sense, results support previous evidence on the role of political interest and internal efficacy to explain consumerism (Norris, 1999; Micheletti & Stolle, 2005; Stole et al., 2005; Dalton, 2008; Newman & Bartels, 2011; Stolle & Micheletti, 2013; Copeland, 2014a; Quintelier & van Deth, 2014). Furthermore, we find that consumer efficacy, i.e., individuals' self-perceived abilities to promote changes in companies through purchase decisions, is key to explaining boycotting behavior. This a novel result since the role of this type of efficacy on political consumerism has only been suggested theoretically but it has not been previously tested empirically. As Copeland and Boulianne (2022) argue, findings reveal that external consumer efficacy is decisive in positive purchasing buycotting decisions: "As consumer I can influence on firms' behavior".

Another conclusion has to do with the relationship between citizenship norms and political consumerism. Results indicate that dualcotters and buycotters identify with engaged (social) norms but not duty (normative) norms. Such finding complements and supports the scarce empirical evidence of the importance of norms for political consumers (Dalton 2006 2008; Copeland 2014a).

In addition, we ascertain that social networks are key resources for political consumerism. In particular, we find that seeking for information through networks is crucial for any type of political consumerism, either boycotting and boycotting, only boycotting or only boycotting; giving political opinion on social networks is associated with dualcotting and boycotting. Accordingly, social media appear to be the fertile environment from which political consumers get most information and where they express their political opinions most readily. Though our data and analysis do not allow us to identify whether social media are an independent dimension from lifestyle politics, they do support the idea that political consumerism cannot be studied apart from the online activities (Boulianne 2015; Gil de Zúñiga et al. 2014).

Finally, results indicate some connection between traditional forms of political participation, i.e., vote, and political consumerism. While it has been generally argued that the rise of political consumerism can be explained by people's disenchantment with traditional politics, here we find that political consumers have clearly participated in the last general elections. It is worth highlighting that this participation is associated with a particular political party, Unidas Podemos, which is an inter-class left party which represents this new space called "new politics". This finding will support, on the one hand, the idea that people express their political ideas through their consumption decisions, and other hand, that

political consumerism is a form of action which more people from the political left and post-materialists use (Copeland 2014b).

Overall, this piece of work shows that the more intense users of political consumerism, i.e., dualcotters, those who both boycott and buycott, have some particular features that distinguish them from other types of political consumers, those who only boycott and those who only buycott. For dualcotting, resources matter, at least to some extent, as well as attitudinal factors (internal political efficacy and interest), vote, social networks and norms. By contrast, buycotting appears to be shaped by the very particular factor of consumer efficacy. This is a new finding in the literature which open doors to future research into political consumerism, at the same time introducing new questions about the effects which political consumerism might have on companies. Furthermore, our work highlights the relevance of social networks as a main predictor of political consumerism actions and the need to extend the evidence on whether they constitute a single dimension apart from lifestyle politics.

We don't want to conclude this work without pointing out that employing a qualitative approach would be beneficial for thoroughly examining the reasons and motivations underlying consumer behavior. The use of both methodologies promotes a more holistic understanding of the studied phenomenon.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACIK, N. (2013): "Reducing the participation gap in civic engagement: Political consumerism in Europe". European Sociological Review, 29, pp. 1309–1322. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jct016.

AGENCIAS (2010): "Israel empieza a preocuparse por el boicot económico palestino", El Economista, disponible en https://www.eleconomista.es/global/noticias/2284100/07/10/Israel-empieza-a-preocuparse-por-el-boicot-economico-palestino.html accessed 23-1- 2021)

ANDERSEN, G.J., & TOBIASEN, M. (2004): "Who Are These Political Consumers Anyway? Survey Evidence from Denmark". In M. Micheletti, M., A. Føllesdal & B. Stolle (Eds), Politics, Products, and Markets: Exploring Political Consumerism, Past and Present (pp. 203-221), Transaction Publishers.

ANDERSEN, K., OHME, J., BJARNØE, C., BORDACCONI, M., ALBÆK, E., & de VREESE, C. (2021): Generational Gaps in Political Media Use and Civic Engagement, Routledge Studies in Media, Communication and Politics.

ANDERSON, M., TOOR, S., OLMSTEAD, K., RAINIE, L., & SMITH A. (2018): Activism in the Social Media Age, Pew Research Center.

BAEK, Y. (2010): "To buy or not to buy: Who are political consumers? What do they think and how do they participate?", Political Studies, 58, 1065-1086. https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1467-9248.2010.00832.x

BALSIGER, P. (2013): Embedding "political consumerism": A conceptual critique, EUI MWP, 2013/08 - http://hdl.handle.net/1814/27318 (accessed 5-5- 2020)

BARNES, S. & KAASE, M. (1979): Political action: mass participation in five western democracies. Sage.

BAUDRILLARD, J. (1974). La Sociedad del consumo. SIGLO XXI

BAUMAN, Z (2003): La modernidad líquida. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
BECK, U. (1997): "Subpolitics: Ecology and the Disintegration of Institutional Power", Organization & Environment, 10, 52-65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0921810697101008.
BECK, U. (2005): Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy, Polity Press, Cambridge.
BECKER, A., & COPELAND, L. (2016): "Networked Publics: How connective social media use facilitates political consumerism among LGBT Americans", Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 13, 22-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2015.1131655.
BENNETT, L. (1998): "The uncivic culture: Communication, identity and the rise of lifestyle politics", Political Science and Politics, 31, 741–61. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096500053270
BOULIANNE, S. (2015): "Social media use and participation: a meta-analysis of current research", Information, Communication & Society, 18, 524-538, https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542.
BOULIANNE, S. (2021): "Socially mediated political consumerism", Information, Communication & Society. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.2020872.
BOURDIEU, P. (2012): La distinción. Criterio y bases sociales del gusto. Taurrus.
BRÖCKERHOFF A., & QASSOUM M. (2021): "Consumer boycott amid conflict: The situated agency of political consumers in the occupied Palestinian territory". Journal of Consumer Culture, 21, 892-912. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540519882483.
CASTELLÓ E., & MIHELJ S. (2018): "Selling and consuming the nation: Understanding consumer nationalism", Journal of Consumer Culture, 18, 558-576. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540517690570.
COPELAND, L. (2013): "Political Consumerism: Boycotting, Buycottting, and the Expansion of Political Participation in the United States", Paper prepared for the Ninth Annual California Graduate Student Conference, Center for the Study of Democracy at the University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California, 18 May 2013. http://www.democracy.uci.edu/files/docs/conferences/2013/lauren_copeland_political_consumerism_and_political_participation.pdf (accessed 27-1-2021)
COPELAND, L. (2014a): "Conceptualizing Political Consumerism: How citizenship norms differentiate boycotting from boycotting", Political Studies, 62, 172–186. https://doi.org/10.1111%2F1467-9248.12067
COPELAND, L. (2014b): "Value Change and Political Action: Postmaterialism, political consumerism, and political participation", American Politics Research, 42, 257–282. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1532673X13494235
COPELAND, L., & BECKER, A. (2019): "Voting at the Ballot Box and in the Marketplace During the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election", International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 3, 767–778. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edy028.
COPELAND, L., & BOULIANNE, S. (2022): Political consumerism: A meta-analysis. International Political Science Review, 43, 3-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120905048
COPELAND, L., BOULIANNE, S., & KOC-MICHALSKA, K. (2020): "Political consumption in comparative perspective", Mobilizing Global Citizens: Political Consumption in Comparative Perspective (PCCP) Project: https://es.calameo.com/read/0061458915d909dce087a (accessed 27-1-2021)

COPELAND L., & FEEZELL J. (2017): "The Influence of Citizenship Norms and Media Use on Different Modes of Political Participation in the US", Political Studies, 65, 805-823. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321717720374.

DALTON, R. (2006): "Citizenship Norms and Political Participation in America: The Good News Is ... the Bad News Is Wrong", CDACS Occasional Paper 2006-01. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.495.4400&rep=rep1&type=pdf (accessed 2-12- 2021)

DALTON, R. (2008): "Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation", Political Studies, 56, 76–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x

EKMAN, J., & AMNA, E. (2012): "Political Participation and Civic Engagement: Towards a New Tipology", Human Affairs, 22, 283-300. https://doi.org/10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1

EFE (2016): Podemos apoya boicot a Coca-Cola y acusa a la empresa de intimidar a los trabajadores. Público. https://www.publico.es/economia/apoya-boicot-coca-cola-y.html (accessed 23-1-2021)

ESCALAS, J.E., & BETTMAN, J.R. (2003): "You Are What They Eat: The Influence of Reference Groups on Consumer Connections to Brands" Journal of Consumer Psychology, 13, 339-348. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1303_14

FAIRTRADE IBÉRICA (2019): XV Aniversario Fairtrade Ibérica15 años dando poder. 10.: https://fairtrade.es/mm/file/Fairtrade%20Iberica_Publicacion%20especial%20XV%20Aniversario_Web(1).pdf (accessed 23-12021)

FARMER, A. (2014): Political Ideology and Consumer Preferences. Theses and Dissertations--Marketing and Supply Chain. 2.https://uknowledge.uky.edu/marketing_etds/2.

FERRER-FONS, M. (2010): "El estudio del consumo político en Europa: ¿una forma de acción política de la ciudadanía del siglo XXI?". In M. Torcal (Ed.) La ciudadanía europea en el siglo XXI. Estudio comparado de sus actitudes, opinión pública y comportamientos políticos, pp. 237-264, Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

FERRER-FONS, M., & FRAILE, M. (2006): "Exploring the social determinants of political onsumerism in Western Europe. (Working Paper 57/2006), Departamento de Ciencia Política. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

FERRER-FONS, M., & FRAILE, M. (2013): "Political Consumerism and the Decline of Class Politics in Western Europe", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 54, 467-489. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0020715213516476

FIRAT, A. F., & VENKATESH, A. (1995): "Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption", Journal of Consumer Research, 22, 239–267. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2489612.

FORNO, F., & CECCARINI, L. (2006): "From the Street to the Shops: The Rise of New Forms of Political Actions in Italy", South European Society and Politics, 11, 197-222. https://doi.org/10.1080/13608740600645501

FRIEDMAN, M. (1999): Consumer Boycotts: Effecting Change through the Marketplace and the Media, Routledge.

GABRIEL, Y., & LANG, T. (1995): The Unmanageable Consumer. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446213049.

GIDDENS, A. (1991): Modernity and Self-identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age, Stanford University Press.

GIL DE ZÚÑIGA, H., COPELAND, L., & BIMBER, B. (2014): "Political Consumerism: Civic Engagement and the Social Media Connection", New Media & Society, 16, 488-506. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444813487960

GOTLIEB, M. R., KYOUNG, K., GABAY, I., RIDDLE, K., & SHAH, D. V. (2015): "Socialization of lifestyle and conventional politics among early and late adolescents", Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 41, 60-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2015.06.004

GOTLIEB, M.R., & CHEEMA, S. (2017): "From consumer to producer: motivations, internet use, and political consumerism", Information, Communication & Society, 20, 570-586. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1202301.

GREENE, S. (2004): "Social Identity Theory and Party Identification", Social Science Quarterly, 85, 136–153. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42955932.

GUNDELACH, B., & KALTE, D. (2021): "Explaining the Reversed Gender Gap in Political Consumerism: Personality Traits as Significant Mediators", Swiss Political Science Review, 27, 41-60. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12429.

HOOGHE M., & GOUBIN S. (2022): "The democratic potential of political consumerism: The effect of visibility bias and social stratification", International Political Science Review. 43, 19-35. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120935931.

HOFFMANN, S., BALDERJAHNB, I., SEEGEBARTHC, B., MAID, R., & PEYERB, M. (2018): "Under Which Conditions Are Consumers Ready to Boycott or Buycott? The Roles of Hedonism and Simplicity", Ecological Economics, 147, 167-178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.01.004.

HOLZER, B,. & SØRENSEN M.P. (2003): "Rethinking Subpolitics: Beyond the`Iron Cage' of Modern Politics? Theory", Culture & Society, 20, 79-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276403020002005.

INGLEHART, R. (1997). Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies. Princeton University Press.

JOHNSTON, J. (2008): "The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market", Theory and Society, 37, 229–270. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-007-9058-5

JUNG, K., GARBARINO, E., BRILEY, D., & WYNHAUSEN, J. (2017): Blue and Red Voices: Effects of Political Ideology on Consumers' Complaining and Disputing Behavior, Journal of Consumer Research, 44, 477–499. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx037.

JUNG, J., & MITTAL, V. (2020): "Political Identity and the Consumer Journey: A Research Review", Journal of Retailing, 96, 55-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2019.09.003.

KAM, C., & DEICHERT, M. (2020): "Boycotting, Buycotting, and the Psychology of Political Consumerism", The Journal of Politics, 82, 72-88. https://doi.org/10.1086/705922.

KAM, C. D., & PALMER, C. (2008): "Reconsidering the effects of education on political participation", Journal of Politics, 70, 612–631. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022381608080651

KELM, O., & DOHLE, M. (2018): "Information, Communication and Political Consumerism: How (online) information and (online) communication influence boycotts and buycotts", New Media & Society, 20, 1523–1542. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817699842.

KYROGLOU, G., & HENN, M. (2017): "Political Consumerism as a Neoliberal Response to Youth Political Disengagement", Societies, 7, 34. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc7040034

KITSCHELT, H. (1993): "Class structure and social democratic party strategic", British Journal of Political Science, 23, 299-337. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400006633.

KITSCHELT, H. (1994): The transformation of European social democracy. Cambridge University Press.

KOIVULA, A., KUKKONEN, I., SIVONEN, J., & RÄSÄNEN, P. (2020): "Is There Room for Ethical Consumers on the Finnish Political Spectrum?" Journal of Consumer Policy 43, 255–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-019-09414-3

KOOS, S. (2012): "What drives political consumption in Europe? A multi-level analysis on individual characteristics, opportunity structures and globalization", Acta Sociologica, 55, 37-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699311431594.

LANE, D., SLGI, S. L., LIANG, F., KIM, D., SHEN, L., WEEKS, B., & KWAK, N. (2019): "Social Media Expression and the Political Self", Journal of Communication, 69, 49–72, https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy064

LEKAKIS, E. (2015): "Economic nationalism and the cultural politics of consumption under austerity: The rise of ethnocentric consumption in Greece", Journal of Consumer Culture, 17, 286-302. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540515586872.

MARIEN, S., HOOGHE, M., & QUINTELIER, E. (2010): "Inequalities in Non-institutionalized Forms of Political Participation: A Multi-level Analysis of 25 Countries", Political Studies, 58, 187-213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2009.00801.x.

MICHELETTI, M. (2003): Political Virtue and Shopping. Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action. Palgrave.

MICHELETTI, M., & STOLLE, D. (2005): "Swedish political consumers: Who they are and why they use the market as an arena for politics". In M. Boström, A. Föllesdal, M. Klintman, M. Micheletti, M. Sörensen (Eds.) Political Consumerism: Its Motivations, Power, and Conditions in the Nordic Countries and Elsewhere (pp.145-154). TemaNord.

MICHELETTI, M., & FOLLESDAL, A. (2007): "Shopping for Human Rights. An Introduction to the Special Issue", Journal of Consumer Policy, 30, 167–175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-007-9039-0.

MICHELETTI, M. & STOLLE, D. (2008): "Fashioning Social Justice Through Political, Consumerism, Capitalism, and the Internet". Cultural Studies, 22, 749-769. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380802246009.

MICHELETTI, M., & STOLLE, D. (2011): "Vegetarianism–A lifestyle politics?" In M. Micheletti & A.S. McFarland (Eds.) Creative Participation Responsibility-Taking in the Political World (pp. 125-145). Paradigm.

MICHELETTI, M. & MCFARLAND, A. (eds.). (2011): Creative Participation: Responsibility-Taking in the Political World. Paradigm Publishers.

de MOOR, J. (2016): "External efficacy and political participation revisited: The role of perceived output structures for state-and non-state-oriented action forms", Parliamentary Affairs, 69, 642-662. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsv055.

de MOOR, J. (2017): "Lifestyle politics and the concept of political participation", Acta Politica, 52, 179–197. https://doi.org/10.1057/ap.2015.27.

MUHAMAD, N., KHAMARUDIN, M., & FAUZI, W. (2019): "The role of religious motivation in an international consumer boycott", British Food Journal, 121, 199–217. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-02-2018-0118.

NEILSON, L. (2010): "Boycott or Buycott? Understanding Political Consumerism". Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 9, 214-227. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.313.

NEILSON, L., & PAXTON, P. (2010): "Social capital and political consumerism: A multilevel analysis", Social Problems, 57, 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2010.57.1.5.

NEWMAN, B., & BARTELS, B. (2011): "Politics at the Checkout Line: Explaining Political Consumerism in the United States", Political Research Quarterly, 64, 803–817. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23056348.

NONOMURA, R. (2017): "Political consumerism and the participation gap: are boycotting and 'buycotting' youth-based activities?", Journal of Youth Studies, 20, 234-251, https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2016.1206861.

NORRIS, P. (2002): Democratic Phoenix. Reinveinting Political Activism. Cambridge University Press.

OHME, J., DE VREESE, C.H., & ALBÆK, E. (2018): "From theory to practice: how to apply van Deth's conceptual map in empirical political participation research", Acta Política, 53, 367–390. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41269-017-0056-y.

OMIDVAR, V., & GIANNAKAS, K. (2015): "The effects of fair trade on coffee growers: a framework and analysis", Agricultural Economics, 46, 29-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12196.

ORDABAYEVA, N., & FERNANDES, D. (2018): "Better or Different? How Political Ideology Shapes Preferences for Differentiation in the Social Hierarchy", Journal of Consumer Research, 45, 227–250, https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy004.

OYSERMAN, D. (2009): "Identity-Based Motivation: Implications for Action-Readiness, Procedural-Readiness, and Consumer Behavior", Journal of Consumer Psychology, 19, 250–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.05.008

OYSERMAN, D., & SCHWARZ, N. (2017): "Conservatism as a Situated Identity: Implications for Consumer Behavior", Journal of Consumer Psychology, 27, 532–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2017.08.003

QUINTELIER, E., & VAN DETH, J. W. (2014): "Supporting Democracy: Political Participation and Political Attitudes. Exploring Causality Using Panel Data", Political Studies, 62, 153–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12097.

REJÓN, R. (2017): "Los supermercados empiezan a vetar el aceite de palma por el daño al medio ambiente y la salud", El Diario. https://www.eldiario.es/sociedad/aceite-palma-supermercados_1_3484409.html (accessed January, 23, 2021)

RIVAROLI, S., RUGGERI, A., & SPADONI, R. (2019): "Food 'buycott' as an ethical choice against mafia in Italy", Journal of Social Marketing, 9, 490–506. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSOCM-11-2018-0139.

SCHLOSBERG, D., & CRAVEN, L. (2019): Sustainable materialism: Environmental movements and the politics of everyday life. Oxford University Press.

STOLLE, D., HOOGHE, M., & MICHELETTI, M. (2005): "Politics in the Supermarket: Political Consumerism as a Form of Political Participation", International Political Science Review, 26, 254-255. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30039032.

STOLLE, D. & MICHELETTI, M. (2013): Political Consumerism. Global Responsibility in Action. Cambridge University Press.

STRØMSNES, K. (2009): "Political Consumerism: A Substitute for or Supplement to Conventional Political Participation?", Journal of Civil Society, 5, 3030-3031. https://doi.org/10.1080/17448680903351834.

THEOCHARIS, Y., DE MOOR, J., & VAN DETH, J. (2021): "Digitally Networked Participation and Lifestyle Politics as New Modes of Political Participation" Policy & Internet, 30-53 https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.231.

THEOCHARIS, Y., & J.W. VAN DETH. (2018a): Political Participation in a Changing World: Conceptual and Empirical Challenges in the Study of Citizen Engagement. Routledge.

THEOCHARIS, Y. & VAN DETH, J. (2018B): "The continuous expansion of citizen participation: A new taxonomy. European", Political Science Review, 10, 139-163. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773916000230.

TORCAL, M., MONTERO, R., & TEORELL, J. (2006): La participación política en España. Revista de Estudios Políticos, 132, 7-41.

VERBA, S., & NIE, N. (1972): Participation in America: political democracy and social equality. Harper & Row.

VERBA. S., SCHLOZMAN, K.L. & BRADY, H. (1995): Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics. Cambridge University Press.

VIDAL, M. (2017): "Las empresas, hartas de las campañas de boicot por el 'procés'", El Español (Crónica política). https://cronicaglobal.elespanol.com/politica/empresas-boicot-proces_88307_102.html (2-1-2021)

YATES, L. (2011): "Critical Consumption. Boycotting and buycotting in Europe", European Societies, 13, 191-217. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2010.514352.

ZORELL, C.V., & YANG, M. (2019): "Real-World Sustainable Citizenship between Political Consumerism and Material Practices", Social Sciences, 8, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8110311.