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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The intent of this study is to identify leading activists (who initiate or organise activism) and persistent leading activists (who continually mobilise others) before they start engaging in these activities, with a view to including them as stakeholders in marketing research. To achieve this, the present study investigates: 1) the process of an individual evolving into a leading activist; 2) similarities between boycotters and leading activists; 3) triggers of leading activism; and 4) key factors influencing persistent leading activism.

Design/methodology/approach: A three-phase mixed method approach is employed: Phase 1 uses a qualitative approach resulting in a theoretical model. Phase 2 employs a quantitative exploratory approach. It operationalises constructs identified in Phase 1 and explores associations between them. Phase 3 employs binary logistic regression models, which identify a minimum set of predictors that can be used for the identification of the targeted groups.

Findings: Findings indicate that: 1) to date, research has not been sufficient to discriminate between boycotters and leading activists, or persistent and non-persistent leading activists. Results of this empirical study: 2) develop a theoretical model of how consumers evolve into a leading activist against certain products; 3) identify similarities between boycotters and leading activists, triggers of leading activism and key factors influencing persistency; and 4) reveal that only three predictors from the theoretical model could correctly identify 64 per cent of the leading activists and 93 per cent of the persistent leading activists.

Research limitations/implications: The present study is limited by the fact that leading activists are an extremely difficult group to identify and reach. Furthermore, binary logistic regression can only include a certain number of variables, given the available sample size. With a larger sample, more variables could have been included and may have been identified as additional predictors. Future research could test the model with a larger sample size.

Originality/value/contributions: This research: 1) provides a novel methodological approach to identify stakeholders in an easier and more economical way; 2) contributes to anti-consumption knowledge with the clarification of similarities and differences in
four varying degrees of anti-consumption behaviour that are clearly defined (boycotting, leading activism, persistent activism and non-persistent leading activism). Based on these definitions, the theoretical model developed in this study highlights the typical stages of consumers evolving into leading activists. Furthermore, key factors influencing persistent leading activism are explored. 3) The research also helps practice to target potential leading activists and potential persistent leading activists as stakeholders, with the aim of including them in the early stages of marketing research. The value of this approach lies in a better understanding of the target market, in particular when introducing controversial products or policies. In turn, this can reduce the possibility of public boycotts or scare campaigns. Listening to leading activists and persistent leading activists also holds the potential of product, service or policy improvements which benefit the community.
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Section 1  INTRODUCTION

Consumers who display boycotting and activist behaviour can cause significant harm to organisations, but remain an under-researched issue in marketing (Kozinets, Handelman and Lee 2010; Amine and Gicquel 2011; Hoffmann 2013). Boycotters and activists can be persistent in demanding change. For example, Nestlé was forced to change the ingredients of infant formula conforming to the World Health Organization guidelines, and change its marketing and promotional practices after being boycotted for seven years (Post 1985). An investigation into boycotting and activism behaviours is important because boycotting products or services is regarded not only as a risk for companies (Sallman 1996; Harland, Brenchley and Walker 2003; Zsidisin 2003; Zwolinski 2007), but also as a potential avenue for corrective feedback and a creative approach to social change (Henderson 1993). In this respect, boycotters and activists interact as stakeholders not only with organisations but also with policy makers and society. For organisations to identify these stakeholders and know how to reach them is crucial (Freeman 1984; Clarkson 1995; Donaldson and Preston 1995; Mitchell, Agle and Wood 1997; Agle, Mitchell and Sonnenfeld 1999; Jones and Wicks 1999).

Boycotters are consumers who oppose particular products or services by refraining from buying or using them to achieve certain objectives (Friedman 1985). Examples of such objectives include changes in ethical production methods, changes in product ingredients or a total ban of a product. Through these efforts, boycotters have acted as key drivers in changing our society for centuries (Friedman 1985; Witkowski 1989; Henderson 1993). Examples include changing public policies (Dreyer and Gill 2000) and changing consumers’ general consumption habits (Cherrier 2009; Iyer and Muncy 2009). Today, the relationship between those who refrain from consumption and society is still highly relevant: “individuals become not only lead actors in the film of their own life, but also agents of change in the trajectory of our society and the planet” (Lee, Cherrier and Belk 2013, p. 187). However, boycotters often do not actually initialise boycotts; rather, they follow boycott calls (Friedman 1985; Eesley and Lenox 2006; Martin and Kracher 2008) which are instigated by leading activists.

Leading activists are boycotters who initiate or organise information sessions, protests, petitions and boycotts, or actively distribute information to the public against products
or services. The behaviour of leading activists often influences consumers and motivates boycotting. Persistent leading activists are defined as current leading activists with a willingness to continue leading activism in future. Non-persistent leading activists are current leading activists who have no intention to continue leading activism in future.

Previous research indicates that boycotters and activists have various concerns about a product or issue they oppose (Smith 1987; Kozinets and Handelman 2004; West and Larue 2005; Hoffmann and Mueller 2009). Building on these findings, an individual’s greatest personal concern about a product is a precondition of boycotters, leading activists, persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists. Their resulting behaviours are referred to as having differing degrees of anti-consumption behaviour in this research (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Four degrees of anti-consumption behaviours and their interactions with public policy, society and organisations

When investigating activism and boycotting, it is recommended that theories and findings from previous research be considered carefully, because these findings relate to specific contexts (Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Hoffmann 2011; Hoffmann 2013). For this investigation, previous research from the disciplines of public relations, sociology and psychology are considered and discussed where the research closely relates to the stated definitions of boycotters, leading activists and persistent leading activists.
1.1 Background and aims

In recent decades, boycotters and activists have gained increased legal power and support (Garrett 1987). Boycotters and activists are particularly successful at changing companies’ products, production methods and services. According to King (2008), 28 per cent of companies in the United States concede to boycotter demands. So why do 72 per cent of companies in the United States not concede to boycotter demands? Reasons are that companies perceive boycotters not as powerful, legitimate or that boycotters promote non-urgent cases and that companies and activists often do not have the same interests (Mitchell et al. 1997, Freeman 1999). As a result, companies are not be willing to respond to boycotter demands and share information. A company’s strategy not to respond to boycotts leads to power and information asymmetry. Power and information asymmetry again reduces boycotters or activists possibility to gain insight into a company’s affairs. According to economic theories, asymmetric information about the intransigency of boycotters or activists and a company may further inflame arguments resulting in boycotts persisting indefinitely (Baron 2001).

However, a company’s decision not to concede to boycotters’ demands often results in a significantly reduced market value of the target company (Friedman 1985; Pruitt and Friedman 1986; Pruitt, Wei and White 1988), a negative public perception, damaged reputation, loss of the overall prestige or in increased costs (King 2008). In Australia for example, a government project valued at $AUD68 million was abandoned by the public, and later replaced with a new solution costing $AUD178 million (Brisbane Times 2013).

Managers should take boycott calls seriously. Almost every top company and top brand worldwide faced at least one boycott call (John and Klein 2003). Shaw, Newholm and Dickinson (2006) emphasize consumers’ general increasingly willingness to boycott. In 1997 over 800 products, and in some cases, whole states and countries, have been targeted by boycotts worldwide: “Pick any company of the Fortune 500 list and it’s likely that someone, somewhere, is boycotting it” (Ferguson 1997, p. 45). It is estimated that up to 27.9 per cent of the population in industrialised countries have taken part in boycotts (World Values Survey Association 2009). Therefore, boycotters and activists represent a major concern in marketing, and more research is needed to understand these behaviours (for example, Klein, Smith and John 2004; Kozinets and Handelman).
In particular, there have been calls for more research into triggers of boycotting behaviour (Hoffmann 2011) and motivations for persistent activism (Mannarini 2011; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). Additionally, there has been little research investigating leading activism, specifically how consumers evolve into leading activists, how boycotters differ from leading activists in their concerns, emotions and their reasons for boycotting. Also, what influences persistent leading activism, and whether leading activists and persistent leading activists, can be identified before they start mobilising against a product or service. The present research examines these questions by investigating:

1. the process by which individuals evolve from consumers into leading activists
2. similarities between boycotters and leading activists
3. triggers of leading activism
4. key factors influencing persistent leading activism.

The overall aim of the research is to identify predictors of leading activism and persistent leading activism. Knowledge about predictors helps to identify leading activists and persistent leading activists before they start mobilising against a product or service. This enables an organisation’s marketing researchers to target leading activists specifically for gaining insights into potential boycotters’ needs and concerns.

Considering potential boycotters’, leading activists’ and persistent leading activists’ knowledge in the early stages of product and service development could reduce the possibility of boycotts and increase the organisation’s capacity to develop products that are more in line with community desires and needs. In summary, the findings of this research are primarily relevant for companies and public authorities that are willing to share information with potential activists, are interested in potential activists’ views and have a general interest in a possible collaboration with potential activists in order to create a better value of a product or service for companies, activists, consumers and society.

The present research draws on stakeholder marketing theory to conceptualise ways of targeting leading activists’ and persistent leading activists’ needs and knowledge.
Stakeholder marketing theory criticises market orientation for being too focused on consumer needs (Bhattacharya 2010; Ferrell, Gonzalez-Padron, Hult and Maignan 2010; Gundlach and Wilkie 2010). Additionally, market orientation has neglected to address diverse stakeholders such as boycotters or activists (Smith, Drumwright and Gentile 2010; Crittenden, Crittenden, Ferrell, Ferrell and Pinney 2011). Baron (2001), Smith, Ansett and Erez (2011) and Garriga (2014) provide evidence of the success of engagement with activists. According to Gyrd-Jones and Kornum (2013), opposing stakeholders such as activists can contribute with valuable inputs and maximize the output of co-creation of products for a company. Furthermore, one of the core conditions for mutual value creation is value and culture overlap between the focal form and its stakeholders (Gyrd-Jones and Kornum, 2013). Smith et al. (2010) emphasise the importance of finding the “right stakeholder” to engage with (p. 8); however, existing research does not address precisely how to find the right stakeholder. Specifically, identifying activists as stakeholders remains an obstacle for organisations (Hall and Vredeveld 2005; Dunham, Freeman and Liedtka 2006; Roloff 2008; Izberk-Bilgin 2010).

This research suggests that potential leading activists and persistent leading activists are the right stakeholders, and are identifiable for inclusion in marketing research. Considering activists as stakeholders is consistent with previous literature (e.g. Phillips, Freeman and Wicks 2003; Fassin 2010; Hult, Mena, Ferrell and Ferrell 2011), specifically because activists have the capacity to mobilise public opinion in favour of or against an organisation’s products or policies (Clarkson 1995). However, where activists are emphasised, “they are still not specifically identified” (Crane and Ruebottom 2011, p. 79).

1.2 Method

A three-phase mixed methods approach is employed. In Phase 1, a qualitative investigation explores the process of how individuals evolve from consumers into leading activists, and the key factors influencing persistency. This investigation results in a theoretical model that illustrates similarities between boycotters and leading activists, triggers of leading activism, and from which key factors influencing persistent leading activism can be derived. Based on quantitative measures of key constructs identified in Phase 1, Phase 2 explores which of the variables could serve as predictors.
Finally, Phase 3 identifies the best predictors of leading activists and persistent leading activists. This sequential use of methods is recommended for model development and testing (Olsen 2004; Teddlie and Yu 2007; Venkatesh, Brown and Bala 2013). According to Rossiter’s (2009, 2011b) analytic qualitative research approach (Moran 1986), the sequential use of methods also serves the main relevant criterion of predictive validity in qualitative research. To ensure that mixed method research is not just reporting two distinct strands of qualitative and quantitative research, these two strands are integrated and connected to each other (Bryman 2007; Creswell and Clark 2007). Validity of the constructs developed in Phase 1 is established with Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) theory testing with the constant comparison method. However, predictive validity and reliability of the model based on qualitative findings in Phase 1 is tested in a quantitative setting in Phase 2 (Rossiter 2009; 2011b).

The thesis structure is depicted in Figure 2. Following the literature review, Phases 1, 2 and 3 are presented separately. The thesis concludes with a discussion of results and implications for future work.

### 1.3 Contribution

The research contributes to current knowledge in three ways:

1. To stakeholder theory, by extending knowledge about the identification of leading activists and persistent leading activists, and their defining characteristics.
2. To anti-consumption literature, by: a) providing evidence of similarities between boycotters and leading activists, as well as persistent and non-persistent leading activists; and by b) providing a theoretical model of the stages through which individuals progress during the transformation from consumer to boycotter and leading activist; and c) identifying the key factors typical of persistent leading activists. Understanding how this evolution works provides insight into the key factors – such as perceived injustice, unfairness and lack of choice – which trigger each step in this evolution.
3. To market research practice by providing practical guidance regarding how to gain access to individuals more likely to become leading activists and persistent leading activists prior to them undertaking boycotting behaviours. This is a new approach to gaining market insights to key individuals when introducing, for example,
controversial products, and potentially offers benefits not only to companies and regulators or governments, but also to the community as a whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 INTRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of key concepts, positioning of the study in relation to background and aims (theory, research gap), method, contributions, and thesis structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes and tools for key stakeholder identification, process of becoming a leading activist, similarities between boycotters and leading activists, triggers of leading activism, key factors influencing persistent leading activism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3 PHASE 1: MODEL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative investigation of the process of consumers evolving into leading activists, theoretical model about similarities of boycotters and leading activists, triggers initiating leading activism and key factors influencing persistency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4 PHASE 2: QUANTITATIVE EXPLORATORY STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operationalising constructs identified in Phase 1 and exploring their associations with the aim of identifying potential predictors to be considered in Phase 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 5 PHASE 3: IDENTIFYING PREDICTORS OF LEADING ACTIVISM AND PERSISTENT LEADING ACTIVISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of a set of best predictors of leading activism and persistent leading activism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 6 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions, theoretical and practical implications, recommendations for future research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Thesis structure
Section 2  LITERATURE REVIEW

The primary purpose of this section is to review existing stakeholder marketing theory and anti-consumption literature.

2.1 Stakeholder marketing theory

Stakeholder orientation has been considered to be particularly valuable in marketing (Lawrence 2008). It is based on the notion that market orientation (which focuses on consumers, competitors and indirectly on other stakeholder groups) should be extended to include contingency-based approach that also considers contextual aspects surrounding the organisation (Ferrell et al. 2010). Market orientation has been criticised for being too focused on the organisation itself, and for having an organisation’s profit maximisation as its primary objective (Bhattacharya and Korschun 2008; Smith et al. 2010; Laczniak and Murphy 2012). Consequently, market orientation has neglected to address diverse stakeholders (Smith et al. 2010; Crittenden et al. 2011), has caused a single-minded emphasis on consumers and their needs, and has failed to recognise the changed societal context that requires multiple stakeholders to be considered (Smith et al. 2010).

Gundlach and Wilkie (2010) argue that stakeholder orientation in marketing follows logically from emergent trends in our culture and economy. This includes the increasing trend of marketing initiatives that aim to maximise the benefit of all stakeholders (Maignan, Ferrell and Ferrell 2005; Laczniak and Murphy 2012), such as customers, employees, shareholder, suppliers, environment, society in general, related non-profit organisations and those who benefit from effort of non-profit organisations (Smith and Williams 2011).

Identifying key stakeholders with the aim of an engagement in marketing initiatives is vital for an organisation’s success (Freeman 1984; Maignan and Ferrell 2004), because key stakeholders can contribute knowledge, material resources, offer infrastructure, grant expertise or loyalty, spread positive word of mouth or a positive corporate image (Waddle 2000; Kapstein and van Tulder 2003; Maignan and Ferrell 2004). Additionally, key stakeholders can serve as catalysts for innovation and value creation for the firm as well as for society (Gonzalez-Padron and Nason 2009; Nidumolu, Prahalad and Rangaswami 2009; Smith et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2011).
A stakeholder is “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organisation’s objectives” (Freeman 1984, p. 46). Consequently, stakeholder marketing goes beyond considering targeted consumers as the “typical” stakeholder of an organisation (Bhattacharya and Korschun 2008; Bhattacharya, Korschun and Sen 2009; Bhattacharya 2010; Chakravorti 2010; Ferrell et al. 2010; Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, Parmar and de Colle 2010; Gundlach and Wilkie 2010; Maignan, Gonzalez-Padron, Hult and Ferrell 2011; Mainardes, Alves and Raposo 2011; Smith et al. 2011).

The question of who an organisation’s stakeholders are is fundamental to the stakeholder literature, and has been explored since the inception of the stakeholder discussion (Donaldson and Preston 1995; Parmar, Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, Purnell and de Colle 2010), resulting in a rich body of knowledge (for example, Savage, Nix, Whitehead and Blair 1991; Mitchell et al. 1997; Ingenbleek and Immink 2010; Leech, Dellinger, Brannagan and Tanaka 2010; Myllykangas, Kujala and Lehtimaeki 2010).

Many attributes of stakeholders have been postulated in the literature, some more prominently than others; for example, the attribute of a stakeholder’s power, which refers to a stakeholder’s ability to influence an organisation to do something it would not otherwise do (Freeman 1984; Mitchell et al. 1997; Agle et al. 1999; Maignan and Ferrell 2004; Ingenbleek and Immink 2010; Leech et al. 2010). Attributes can also include a stakeholder’s claim and ability to influence an organisation through cooperation or a threat (Savage et al. 1991). Other stakeholder attributes include the willingness to engage with the organisation, as suggested by AccountAbility, the United Nations Environment Programme Stakeholder Research Associates (2005); or the attribute of salience (Agle et al. 1999; Smith et al. 2010; Neville, Bell and Whitwell 2011). Although no unified guidance exists regarding which attributes should be used to select key stakeholders, many theories suggest two consecutive steps: first, to investigate individuals who can be considered a stakeholder to an organisation or issue at hand; and second, to prioritise the identified stakeholders.

As to the “how” of identifying key stakeholders, many researchers call for more methods and tools (for example, Bhattacharya and Korschun 2008; Mish and Scammon 2010; Parmar et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2011). Much of the stakeholder literature focuses on categorising pre-identified stakeholders, presuming that
stakeholders are self-evident and self-construed (Reed, Graves, Dandy, Posthumus, Hubacek, Morris, Prell, Quinn and Stringer 2009). Little guidance is still provided to proactively identify stakeholders (Crane and Ruebottom 2011). Several studies indicate that organisations often fail to approach stakeholders systematically (Harvey and Schaefer 2001; Dunham et al. 2006; Phillips, Berman, Elms and Johnson-Cramer 2010; Mainardes et al. 2011; Neville et al. 2011). Rather, stakeholder groups seem to be identified by managers’ intuition, or by the stance that stakeholders themselves display towards the organisation (Harvey and Schaefer 2001). The following section reviews literature describing processes and tools for key stakeholder identification.

2.1.1 Processes and tools for key stakeholder identification

Although several authors attempt to explain how they identified stakeholders in their research (for example, Gomes, Liddle and de Oliveira Miranda Gomes 2010; Ingenbleek and Immink 2010; Smith et al. 2010), only a limited number of articles provide specific guidelines for doing so (for example, Vos and Achterkamp 2006; Kivits 2011).

The identification processes used are predominantly based on Mitchell et al.’s (1997) three stakeholder attributes: 1) a stakeholder’s potential power to influence the organisation; 2) a stakeholder’s legitimacy, which refers to a stake in or a claim on the firm. A claim can be based on a legal right, but also on a moral right or interest in the harms and benefits generated by an organisation’s actions. The third attribute refers to 3) the urgency of the issue itself. Urgency exists when a relationship or claim is time sensitive and important or critical to the stakeholder. According to these definitions of attributes, stakeholders are first identified and then prioritised. Specifically, the process follows a deductive approach by first considering the entire pool of relevant stakeholders according to their attributes (for example, Bryson 2004; Maignan and Ferrell 2004; Smith et al. 2010), and then prioritising these according to certain attributes relevant for a contingency-based approach. Furthermore, all authors stress the need for an iterative approach that involves adjusting results according to information obtained.

Typical tools used for stakeholder identification are brainstorming, interviews, focus groups, snowballing, top-down or bottom-up categorisations according to the attributes,
media coverage, reports or the history of the organisation with the stakeholder (for example, Bryson 2004; AccountAbility the United Nations Environment Programme Stakeholder Research Associates 2005; Vos and Achterkamp 2006; Reed et al. 2009; Kivits 2011).

Bryson (2004) describes a comprehensive deductive approach for stakeholder identification involving five steps:

1. In Step 1, typically, a small group of people in the organisation initiates the process of key stakeholder identification, with the starting point of a preliminary stakeholder analysis. Tools such as brainstorming are widely used, and a separate flip chart sheet for each stakeholder is prepared. Everyone in the group lists the stakeholder’s expectations or criteria the stakeholder would use to judge the organisation’s performance on the flip chart sheet. Then the stakeholders are prioritised by the stakeholder’s judgement of how well the organisation is doing from the stakeholder’s point of view. Finally, stakeholders’ longer-term issues are identified and recorded, but also what can be done quickly to satisfy each stakeholder.

2. Following this, grids as suggested by Eden and Ackermann (1998) are used to map each stakeholder’s relationship to the organisation. The power-interest grid arranges stakeholders on a two-by-two matrix, where the dimensions are the stakeholder’s interest in the organisation or issue at hand, and the stakeholder’s power to affect the organisation’s or issue’s future. The stakeholder influence diagrams indicate how stakeholders influence one another on the power-interest grid. Finally, the participation planning matrix (Bryson 2004) identifies which tasks stakeholders can be involved in, and prompts planners to think about how to respond to, or engage different stakeholders in various ways over time. The levels of participation range from simply informing stakeholders through to empowerment, in which they are given final decision-making authority. Inputs can be gathered through interviews, questionnaires, focus groups or targeted information-gathering techniques. The result of stage one is a long list of potential stakeholders.

3. In Step 2, a larger group of stakeholders can be assembled in a meeting, which can mark the beginning of the stakeholder integration. In this meeting the list of potential stakeholders is brainstormed, and the grids used in Step 1 might be applied again.
4. In Step 3, the group should revise who has, and who has not been included, and discuss the positive and negative consequences of involving or excluding other stakeholders. Additionally, the group should consider actual or potential stakeholder power, legitimacy and attention-getting capacity, as suggested by Mitchell et al. (1997). The group should also consider in what ways stakeholders can be involved in the organisation.

5. In Step 4, the full group, including new stakeholders, is assembled. Previous analyses may need to be repeated, in order to provide everyone with the same information.

6. In Step 5, after the full group has met, it should be possible to finalise stakeholders’ roles for the organisation. Stakeholders are included when there are good and prudent reasons for it, but not if their involvement is impractical, unnecessary or imprudent.

Byron’s (2004) example of a stakeholder identification process is similar to Maignan and Ferrell’s (2004) suggestions about how to identify stakeholders. The authors also suggest using the stakeholders’ attribute of having power over an organisation to prioritise key stakeholders. Additionally, it is suggested that aggregated power of several stakeholders with ties to each other should be considered. However, Bryson (2004) does not explicitly mention whether the focus in Step 1 is on individual stakeholders; Maignan and Ferrell (2004) propose considering individual stakeholders as well as stakeholder communities. These communities can be formally organised, but can also encompass individuals who share common beliefs and who interact only loosely with one another.

In order to identify members of the community as stakeholders, Crane and Ruebottom (2011) suggest a generic list of potential social identity-based markers. The idea of employing social identity markers is based on Handelman’s suggestion (2006) that members of a community represent a range of conflicting societal and economic interests. Therefore, community members are regarded as having different social identities. Social identity markers for members of the community are age based (for example, children, seniors); racial, national or ethnic based; gender or sexuality based; ability based (for example, sensory impaired, mental health issues); political or issue based; location based; role based (for example, parents, grandparents, students); or refer to other social groups. These markers are part of a grid, cross-mapped with traditional
stakeholders’ economic roles. Traditional stakeholders’ economic roles include investors, customers, employees, competitors, suppliers, governments, media or non-government organisations (NGOs). These groups are considered if they are powerful, vulnerable, important or critical to the aims of the firm, depending on the issue at hand (p. 84), which again incorporates attributes suggested by Mitchell et al. (1997).

Chakravorti (2010) suggests using social networks and collaborative filtering, so-called “crowd sourcing”, to identify and prioritise stakeholders in their communities. Therefore, web-based processes use online tools to identify stakeholders and the relationships with an organisation (Chakravorti 2010). Through this process companies connect with a diverse body of stakeholders via social media technologies such as Twitter, Facebook, blogs or webpages. The *Journal of Business Research* (66, 2013) published a special issue on multi-stakeholder virtual dialogue (Kornum and Muhlbacher 2013). For example, Korschun and Du (2013) describe how companies enter into virtual corporate responsibility dialogues using social media. Social media technologies allow stakeholders to design and implement activities for an organisation, and in so doing, co-create products. Even opposing stakeholders can contribute (Gyrd-Jones and Kornum 2013). However, organisations do not necessarily select stakeholders they would like to cooperate with; instead, stakeholders self-select to participate.

However, three main drawbacks of existing approaches exist: 1) they can be time-consuming and complex; 2) the identification of key stakeholders depends on the quality of the communication skills of decision makers, and relies on trial and error (as described in Ozanne, Corus and Saatcioglu 2009). As several studies show (for example, Harvey and Schaefer 2001), particularly when using web-based tools (for example, Chakravorti 2010; Driessen, Kok and Hillebrand 2013; Gyrd-Jones and Kornum 2013; Korschun and Du 2013), organisations do not necessarily identify key stakeholders themselves, but depend on managers’ intuition, stakeholders’ self-selection or the willingness of each stakeholder to share their ideas with an organisation. Finally, 3) few guidelines exist for when to use stakeholder identification tools. For an organisation or public authority to employ tools to identify potential stakeholders for marketing research in the early stages of product or policy developments would be beneficial.
Therefore, it is suggested that potential leading activists and persistent leading activists be identified as key stakeholders by including predictor variables in market research surveys. Previous research has shown that engaging with activists can be fruitful for an organisation (Argenti 2004; Handelman, Cunningham and Bourassa 2010; Ingenbleek and Immink 2010; Mish and Scammon 2010; Smith et al. 2011). Anti-consumption literature is regarded as a potential source for predictor variables for leading activism and persistent leading activism.

2.2 Anti-consumption literature

Anti-consumption can be understood as consumer resistance (Penaloza and Price 1993; Cherrier 2009; Portwood-Stacer 2012). It focuses on phenomena that are against acquisition and use, and dispossession of certain products, goods, ideas, services, brands or experiences (Lee et al. 2011). The study of the phenomenon of anti-consumption is regarded as a chance “to learn about ourselves, our products, our practices, and our society” (Lee, Fernandez and Hyman 2009, p. 145). However, anti-consumption encompasses a range of definitions and conceptualisations (Kozinets et al. 2010; Galvagno 2011; Lee et al. 2011). Chatzidakis and Lee (2012) argue that there is a need for research into a “variety of meso, macro and supranational levels through which various actors (for example, businesses, governments, or nongovernmental organisations) mobilise anti-consumption discourse” (p. 4). The present research follows the suggestion of considering macro levels initiating anti-consumption discourses. Leading activists and persistent leading activists are considered to be an organisation’s key stakeholders on a macro level, who mobilise anti-consumption discourses in society and influence public policies, production methods and products or services.

Therefore, the focus of this research is on four anti-consumption behaviours; that is, boycotting, leading activism, persistent leading activism and non-persistent leading activism. Of specific interest are: 1) the process by which consumers evolve into leading activists; 2) similarities between boycotters and leading activists; 3) triggers of leading activism; and 4) key factors influencing persistent leading activism.
2.2.1 The process by which consumers evolve into leading activists

Scant research exists in social science about the process by which individuals evolve into activists or leading activists. Many scholars agree that an initial search for information about an issue plays an important role in the process of evolving into an activist (Grunig 1982; Grunig 1989; Aronson 1993). This process often consists of four distinct stages, which are described in detail by Kieffer (1984) and Aronson (1993).

Kieffer’s model on becoming a leading activist (1984) has been developed on the basis of qualitative work with 15 community activists in continuing leadership roles in grassroots organisations. The aspect of investigating continued leadership roles indicates the presence of persistent leading activism, as defined in this research. Kieffer (1984) describes four stages by which activists are moved from having a feeling of powerlessness towards participation. In the first stage, referred to as the “era of entry” (p. 18), people are beginning to believe that they have the right to speak out. One reason for speaking out can be a direct threat to individual interests. This threat is a necessary precondition to becoming empowered. In the second stage, the “era of advancement” (p. 20), potential activists focus on an analytic understanding of the environment as well as on the interconnectedness of social, political and economic factors. Peers play an important role. They help one another to develop basic activism skills such as organising meetings, and collectively solve problems. Mentors serve to identify and nurture potential capabilities in future activists. In the third stage, the so called “era of incorporation” (p. 22), people prepare their strategic skills and develop leadership capabilities by confronting institutional barriers to change. Moreover, they address conflicting demands of having multiple roles, such as the conflict between time spent with family and political activities. In the fourth stage, the “era of commitment” (p. 24), people continue activism and integrate their skills into other parts of their life. For example, they apply the skill to organise meetings on issues that are personally meaningful for them. Additionally, activists often become interested in helping others develop their own knowledge, expertise and sense of empowerment. Kieffer’s model has been widely tested and validated; however, a better understanding of the “era of commitment” and what might occur beyond it, is needed (Kaminski, Kaufman, Graubarth and Robins 2000).
Aronson (1993) investigated *career activists* from a hazardous waste movement, who are defined as being ordinary citizens who pursued a career as activists after the initial issue was resolved, indicating the investigation of persistent leading activism. However, the definition of persistent leading activism in this research relates to an ongoing issue, which differs from Aronson’s (1993) investigation of persistency of career activists.

The process of transformation from an ordinary citizen to a career activist occurs in four stages, each including several steps. The first stage of transformation is called the “pre-transformation stage” (p. 75). It consists of a perceived health threat, and the adoption of an initial action to protect the family’s health. The second step of the “transitional stage” consists of developing a new understanding of “the system”, which refers to how governments deal with an issue (p. 75). Unexpected responses by governmental officials to a request for help initiate the new understanding of “the system”, which obviously fails to help. Additionally, this stage typically involves an intensive study of the problem, collecting of information as well as putting more pressure on the government.

The third stage is called the “transformation from private to public action” (p. 75). This stage consists of direct action in community politics, such as grassroots organisations working together with neighbours and friends. The individual already acts as an activist. In this stage the individual is overwhelmed by problems. These problems include the perceived force from governments against them. Social support helps to overcome these problems. In the fourth stage of “self-identification as a career activist” (p. 76) the individual resolves the initial battle with problems, and identifies as a career activist. This identification is based on a new conception of oneself, of citizenship, of government and the issue itself. Career activists also believe in the necessity of citizen action for community protection.

The description of the four stages in both processes reveals that inadequate government response to concerns influences citizens becoming activists. Before starting activism, individuals believe that the government will help solve the problem. Shortcomings in previous research are: 1) the lack of investigation of *consumers’* transformation into leading activists, and 2) the application in a marketing context, which could help reveal similarities and differences between boycotters and leading activists.
2.2.2 Similarities between boycotters and leading activists, and triggers of leading activism

Much research has sought to understand the motivation of boycotters (Sen, Gurhan-Canli and Morwitz 2001; Klein, John and Smith 2002; Duncan and Stewart 2007; Mattina 2008), developed concepts and models of boycotting behaviour (McCarthy and Zlad 1977; Penaloza and Price 1993; Klein et al. 2002; Klein et al. 2004) or investigated consumer activism (Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Littler 2005; Smith 2005). Several studies emphasise the importance of investigating leading activism (Jasper 2007; Jasper 2010; Brown 2011). From the stance of comparing boycotters and leading activists, the previous literature fails to uncover similarities and differences between the two groups of anti-consumers. Reviewing individual studies focusing on boycotting or activism, several similarities and some differences between the two groups can be revealed.

Negative emotions, such as disappointment, anger or outrage, were found to be triggers of boycotting behaviour (Hoffmann 2011; Lindenmeier, Schleer and Pricl 2012). Specifically, anger has been referred to as a motivator for boycotting by several researchers (Nerb and Spada 2001; Klein et al. 2004; Ettenson and Klein 2005). However, anger is also regarded as a motivator for activism (Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Cameron and Nickerson 2009). Anger has also been found to be an important motivational force in collective protest participation (Van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer and Leach 2004; Leach, Iyer and Pedersen 2006; Stuermer and Simon 2009). These findings indicate that emotions could motivate boycotters and leading activists alike.

Perceived efficacy has also been identified as an important motivator of movement participation (Brunsting and Postmes 2002; Stuermer and Simon 2004; Lubell, Vedlitz, Zahran and Alston 2006; Klandermans, van der Toorn and van Stekelenburg 2008; van Stekelenburg, Klandermans and van Dijk 2009). In the marketing literature, perceived efficacy is often referred to as a belief in being able to make a difference, and has also been shown to influence boycott decisions (Klein et al. 2004; Gupta and Ogden 2009; Hoffmann and Mueller 2009). Again, whether perceived efficacy discriminates between boycotters and leading activists is not known.

Perceptions of risks or safety concerns about a product have been found to be relevant for activists, consumers or boycotters. For example, previous studies have underlined
activists’ safety concerns about genetically modified food (West and Larue 2005; Witkowski 2005; Costa-Font, Gil and Traill 2008) and nanoparticles (Satterfield, Kandlikar, Beaudrie and Conti 2009); identified consumers’ perceptions of risks regarding recycled water (Marks 2006; Dolnicar and Schaefer 2009; Hurlimann, Dolnicar and Meyer 2009; Hurlimann and Dolnicar 2010); and indicated concerns as reason for boycotting behaviours (Klein et al. 2004; Maignan and Ferrell 2004; Hoffmann and Mueller 2009; Kaplan and Kaplan 2011; Shaw and Riach 2011). In a comparison between boycotters and leading activists, the two groups might perceive similar concerns.

Another example of a common characteristic of boycotters and activists is the perception of injustice. Injustice can be traced back to Klandermans’ (1997) model of participation in collective action, but is also seen as a strong indicator for activism (van Zomeren, Postmes and Spears 2008; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). Shaw et al. (2006) reveal that individuals can act simultaneously as consumers, citizens and activists to address perceived injustice. The desire to make a change is also a well-known motivation for boycott participation (Klein et al. 2002; Klein et al. 2004; Hoffmann 2011) and collective action (Klandermans 1984; Stuermer, Simon, Loewy and Joerger 2003; van Zomeren et al. 2008). However, activists also express their desire to educate others (Kozinet and Handelman 2004; Albinsson and Yasanthi Perera 2012). In the context of boycotting, the desire to educate others has not been explored. It is therefore a possible indicator that differentiates activists, in particular leading activists, from boycotters.

A sense of community has also been found to be a typical driver for participation in activism (Mannarini, Roccato, Fedi and Rovere 2009; Albinsson and Yasanthi Perera 2012); whereas Kozinet and Handelman (1998) describe boycotting to be a personal, rather than communal, act. However, there is little known about differences between boycotters and leading activists, also referred to as triggers of leading activism. These triggers are yet to be explored in detail.

### 2.2.3 Key factors influencing persistent leading activism

Research on persistent leading activism has started to emerge recently (Mannarini 2011; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). Earlier research by Kagan, Castile and Stewart (2005) and
Kagan (2006; 2007) investigated persistent community activism. They found that participation requires internal and external resources, which include friendships, emotional sustainability and support of the local community. Community support in terms of encouragement by the community and gratitude for persistent activists’ commitment was found to play an important role in pursuing activism (Ward and Ostrom 2006; Mannarini et al. 2009).

Additionally, affective commitment, in the sense of belonging to a movement or community, as well as a self-definition of “activist”; an obligation characterised as sense of duty and obligation toward others; and personal or collective costs/benefits of being an activist have also been found to influence persistency (Mannarini and Fedi 2012). Positive feelings, and specifically being globally satisfied with the experience, strengthen the willingness to undertake future participation in civic engagement (Mannarini, Fedi and Trippetti 2010).

Previous research has also shown that the development across the life span has important implications for activist engagement (Stewart and McDermott 2004), in particular, that previous activism engagement predicts later engagement (Braungart and Braungart 1991; Cole and Stewart 1996). Furthermore, individuals engaging in activism as young adults are more likely to be activists later on (Braungart and Braungart 1991; Cole and Stewart 1996; Agronick and Duncan 1998). Parenting styles are also considered to have some influence on likelihood of activism engagement (Haan, Smith and Block 1968; Block, Haan and Smith 1969).

Finally, perceived efficacy, which concerns people’s beliefs in their abilities to perform specific behaviours, is an important predictor for persistence, as well as how people think, feel, motivate themselves and act (van der Bijl and Shortridge-Baggett 2001). Perceived efficacy is often referred to as collective efficacy in the social movement literature. It refers to the feeling of being able to influence politics or organisation behaviour through collective action, and is understood to represent a significant factor motivating persistent mobilisation (Mannarini et al. 2009; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). However, according to Mannarini and Fedi (2012), very little is known about the factors promoting the sustainability and persistence of personal and collective engagement over time. The present research particularly investigates the key factors influencing persistent leading activism.
2.3 Summary

Stakeholder marketing theory suggests broadening the focus beyond consumers, and instead considering other stakeholders such as activists. However, identifying and targeting activists before a product is introduced into the market might be difficult. Relying on stakeholder identification literature holds limited value, because there is little guidance on how to identify specific stakeholders and when to use the tools for identification. The existing literature criticises stakeholder identification processes and tools as: 1) time consuming and complex; the identification of stakeholders is often 2) based on a manager’s intuition, 3) refers to individual stakeholders’ self-selection, or to 4) luck, that is, meeting the right stakeholders at the right time. A recently emerging and potentially more promising identification process includes the use of web 2.0 tools. Using these tools allows for easier targeting of community members as stakeholders (for example, Chakravorti 2010; Crane and Ruebottom 2011; Driessen et al. 2013). However, the self-selection of stakeholders remains a disadvantage.

Considering anti-consumption literature as a potential source for indicators of how to identify leading activists and persistent leading activists as stakeholders provides some insight, but has not been concerted enough to build a theoretical framework. Existing research has typically focused on the motivators of boycotting and activism separately, but has not explored the links between these two behaviours. Moreover, activists are typically not defined as leading activists, who initiate actions and mobilise others. However, when comparing previous research, results point to more similarities than differences between boycotters and leading activists. Research on the process of an individual evolving into a leading activist, as well as research on persistent activism, remains scarce.

These research gaps are important for several reasons: 1) investigating the process by which an individual evolves from a consumer into a leading activist holds the potential to identify triggers of leading activism. Specifically: 2) a comparison of boycotters and leading activists could enable better targeting of leading activists for marketing research purposes. 3) Key factors influencing persistent leading activism could also help to identify persistent leading activists. This would: 4) be beneficial for an organisation or public authority to identify potential leading activists and persistent leading activists as stakeholders for marketing research in the early stages of product or policy
developments. It would also 5) benefit the community if products or policies are developed that are more in line with community desires and needs.

To target leading activists and persistent leading activists as stakeholders, this research employs three phases.

Phase 1 develops a theoretical model of similarities between boycotters and leading activists, triggers of leading activism, and key factors influencing persistent leading activism.

Phase 2 explores and operationalises associations of the theoretical model in a quantitative setting.

Phase 3 identifies predictors of leading activism and persistent leading activism.
Section 3  Phase 1: Model Development

3.1 Purpose

Phase 1 aims to: 1) develop a model of an individual’s transition from a consumer to a leading activist, and to identify: 2) similarities between boycotters and leading activists; 3) triggers of leading activism; and 4) key factors influencing persistent leading activism.

Knowledge about the transition from consumers to leading activists, as described in the theoretical model, can help organisations identify potential leading activists and persistent leading activists before they cause any harm to the organisation, and include them as stakeholders in product development processes. Specifically, the identification of triggers of leading activism and key factors influencing persistency is highly relevant in this process, providing an opportunity for organisations to gain valuable insights into a target market before introducing a new product. Such insights have the potential to lead to product improvements that are more in line with community attitudes and needs.

In Phase 1 a qualitative investigation using grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glaser 1978; 2000; 2001; Locke 2001) is undertaken, and findings are compared against prior literature. This is consistent with Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) recommendation to establish similarities and convergences with the literature after the core of the model has been developed. Rossiter’s (2009, 2011b) analytic qualitative research is a school of thought closely related to grounded theory. The aim is first to achieve an insight into a phenomenon and develop a theory for testing in the next step using quantitative methods. This is also supported by the mixed method approach. Specifically important for this research is that existing theoretical models and constructs are insufficient because they do not explain the evolution from consumers to leading activists or persistent leading activists. Moreover, previous research has not sufficiently employed the newly proposed definitions of leading activists and persistent leading activists. Therefore, previous results do not differentiate between boycotters, leading activists or persistent leading activists and do not indicate which constructs characterise each different level of anti-consumer behaviour.

The application of grounded theory has proven to be useful for systematically gathering and analysing data (Goulding 2002; Goulding 2005), and has been recommended for
developing theories in business and marketing (Goulding 2002; Goulding 2005; Gummesson 2005). An inductive approach is used.

Theoretical sampling, constant comparison and theoretical saturation are the core components of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Although the application of grounded theory is an iterative process characterised by data collection, analysis, interpretation and comparison to existing literature, which can take place simultaneously (for example, Glaser and Strauss 1967; Gummesson 2005; Suddaby 2006; Rossiter 2009), each of these tasks are discussed separately below.

### 3.2 Method

#### 3.2.1 Research design

For the purpose of obtaining insights into phenomena, qualitative research is recommended as an appropriate procedure (for example, Glaser and Strauss 1967; Moran 1986; Calder 1994; Cohen 1999; Varki, Cooil and Rust 2000; Nancarrow, Barker and Wright 2001; Rossiter 2009; Bhattacherjee 2012). This is particularly the case when behaviours (Moran 1986; Cohen 1999; Rossiter 2009), affects or cognitions (Cohen 1999) are the domain of interest, as is the case in the present study.

Valuable insights can be gained about phenomena when examined in specific contexts (Arnould 2001; Kozinets 2002). The importance of investigating context specifically regarding stakeholder marketing, has been highlighted by Hult et al. (2011). Considering the relevance of a specific context for stakeholder marketing, the present study will focus on “no-choice products” in Australia. No-choice products either: 1) have conspicuous labelling that makes it difficult for consumers to make informed choices; or 2) are imposed on the public by authorities, making it difficult for individuals not to consume them (giving them no choice). Prominent examples are genetically modified ingredients, colours and flavours added to food, or the introduction of recycled water into household tap water sources.

To increase the generalisability of results, four different no-choice products are studied: recycled water, products containing food additives, genetically modified crops and products containing nanoparticles. All four no-choice products are important and socially sensitive issues in society, as discussed in the following sections.
3.2.1.1 Recycled water

A global comparison of water availability shows that Australia possesses five per cent of the world’s water resources (United Nations World Water Development Report 2003) and has the fourth-highest water consumption per person per day worldwide (Rattay, Egger and Eybl 2006). Humans need water to drink, cook, clean, for irrigation and to manufacture products. Water is typically a monopoly commodity, with individuals having little or no choice regarding who provides it or what type is provided. Following a recent drought in Australia, governments at all levels considered a range of options to secure Australia’s future water supply, including water recycling and desalination. Public concerns and opposition to recycled and desalinated water increased, leading to planned projects not going ahead (for example, plans for the introduction of recycled water into the town supplies in Goulburn, New South Wales (2003); Toowoomba, Queensland (2006); and Sydney, New South Wales (2007)) (Hurlimann and Dolnicar 2009; Hurlimann and Dolnicar 2010). Public support could not be achieved through advertising or the endorsement of opinion leaders and celebrities. In one case, a government project valued at $AUD68 million was abandoned, later replaced with a new solution costing $AUD178 million (Brisbane Times 2013).

Consumers are unable to opt out of using water from augmented sources once they are added to public supplies. Opting out is either impossible because there is not enough rain to use rainwater instead, or, if opting out is possible at all, it can require major efforts. These major efforts can be financial; for example, installing rainwater tanks and new piping to avoid using public supplies, or complying with complex government policies dictating what alternative supplies can be used and how much can be used (for example, South Australian Government Policy (2005) or Beaudesert Shire Council Policy (2007)). However, because water is essential for human survival there is a need to manage successfully periods of water scarcity as well as to avoid boycotting of government water projects.

3.2.1.2 Products containing food additives

Food additives are substances added to a food, usually to preserve or improve its quality and appearance (Turner and Kemp 2012). Food additives are defined, approved and regulated by official regulatory authorities, resulting in a variety of country-specific
regulations (Abraham and Millstone 1989). In Australia, the government agency administering food standards, Food Standards Australia New Zealand (2013), defines a food additive as “any substance not normally consumed as a food in itself and not normally used as an ingredient of food, but which is intentionally added to a food”. The Victorian Government Australia (2013) provides a simpler definition:

Food additives are chemicals added to foods to keep them fresh or to enhance their colour, flavour or texture. They may include food colourings (such as tartrazine or cochineal), flavour enhancers (such as MSG) or a range of preservatives.

As of July 2012, 330 kinds of food additives were registered in domestic Australian products (Food Standards Australia New Zealand 2012). In Australia, food additives must be labelled, yet flavours containing novel DNA or protein in a concentration of no more than 0.1% are exempt from labelling. Some of these food additives are allowed in Australia, but are banned in Europe or the US because there is controversy associated with the risks and benefits of food additives. Certain food additives have been linked to increased hyperactivity in children (Feingold 1975; McCann, Barrett, Cooper, Crumpler, Dalen, Grimshaw, Kitchin, Lok, Porteous, Prince, Sangua-Barke, O'Warner and Stevenson 2007; Weiss 2012), others to digestive disorders such as hives or diarrhoea, and respiratory problems such as asthma (Turner and Kemp 2012; Victorian Government Australia 2013).

In Australia, opponents of food additives believe that consumers have no choice because of: 1) a labelling loophole which allows companies to circumvent policies; 2) confusion caused by producers frequently changing food additives’ names; and 3) a belief that there is too little information provided about the health risks of food additives. These concerns are not new to the scientific community. According to Abraham and Millstone (1989), for example, scientific uncertainty about toxicology of food additives dates back to 1954. In the US, after a commentary by the editors of the journal Nature (Nature 2010), the food additive safety issue came to the fore again in 2010 (Maffini, Alger, Olson and Neltner 2013). While activists’ claims have been ignored for years by US regulatory authorities, an article in Nature did receive significant attention. As a result, there are calls for modernising food additives safety assessments, in particular toxicology test guidelines and tools used to predict health
outcomes in the US (Maffini et al. 2013). Furthermore, the conflict of interest associated with manufacturers’ decisions regarding which additives to add, the lack of a reassessment strategy of food safety and the lack of a definition of harm by the US Food and Drug Administration are still being debated (Maffini et al. 2013).

3.2.1.3 Genetically modified crops

Genetically modified organisms have been introduced in agriculture and on the market of consumer goods in the last 10–20 years, initially in the US, but also increasingly in developing countries (Vergragt and Brown 2008). Since then, scientific controversy and public objections have been abundant, particularly in Europe (for example, Dreyer and Gill 2000; Costa-Font et al. 2008; Vergragt and Brown 2008). Public policies regarding genetically modified organisms vary from country to country.

Using genetic engineering, DNA of living organisms can be modified (Singer and Soll 1973). Genetically modified (GM) crops contain novel DNA or proteins which have been modified by using biotechnology (Victorian Government Australia 2012; Food Standards Australia New Zealand 2013). For example, wheat, canola and maize have been modified and are allowed to grow in Australia (Victorian Government Australia 2012).

International agreements and scientists recognise the risks posed by GM crops to humans and the environment (European Network of Scientists for Social and Environmental Responsibility 2013). GM crops have been found to have adverse effects on non-target organisms such as animals or pests, which are typically neglected in regulatory assessments. Other negative environmental impacts include increased herbicide use and the rapid spread of herbicide-resistant weeds. Health risks for humans and animals were identified when exposed to the herbicide used on the majority of GM crops (European Network of Scientists for Social and Environmental Responsibility 2013): residents and doctors noted high rates of birth defects, stillbirths, miscarriages and cancer in humans (Robinson 2010) as well as infertility after the exposure to the herbicide glyphosate (Hanke and Jurewicz 2004; Robinson 2010).

GM crops are regarded as a no-choice product because of the possibility of cross-pollination between them and non-GM crops. Cross-pollination can occur because of wind direction and speed, insects or the various lengths of a crop’s flowering period.
Consequently, farmers avoiding GM-crops may have fields of non-GM crops contaminated. For example, a West Australian organic farmer lost his organic certification when a neighbouring GM canola crop contaminated his farm through cross-pollination. In Mexico, crossbreeds of GM maize originally grown in the US were found. In the US, long-grain rice supply had become contaminated by experimental GM rice varieties unapproved for human consumption through cross-pollination (gmeducation.org 2013). According to Levett (2008), GM is a one-way decision, like the introduction of rabbits or cane toads to Australia; once it is made, it cannot be reversed.

3.2.1.4 Products containing nanoparticles

Nanotechnology involves human-designed materials or machines at extremely small sizes (atomic or molecular level) that have unique chemical, physical, electrical, or other properties (Currall, King, Lane, Madera and Turner 2006, p. 154).

The size measure of particles is generally used to define materials as nano-sized (Jacobs, van de Poel and Osseweijer 2010), or so-called nanoparticles.

Over 300 products containing nanoparticles have entered the marketplace worldwide (Nanotechproject 2006). Examples are drug delivery systems, cosmetics, paint, clothes and cleaners. These products were worth over $US32 billion in 2005, according to Lux Research (2014), and are projected to be associated with $US2.6 trillion worth of manufactured goods by the year 2014 (Holman and Lackner 2006).

Public familiarity with products containing nanoparticles is very low (Kahan, Braman, Slovic, Gastil and Cohan 2009; Satterfield et al. 2009; Scheufele, Corley, Shih, Dalrymple and Ho 2009). According to Satterfield et al. (2009), there is awareness among scientists and technocrats that the public, particularly in the “risk societies” of the industrialised world, is unlikely to unquestioningly embrace the technology. It is feared that nanoparticles may trigger an adverse public response along the lines of genetically modified foods and crops. The experience with public boycotts against genetically modified foods has led to a more cautious approach to the introduction of nanotechnology into the public sphere (Ebbesen 2008) and to research funding for
public acceptance studies (for example, Currall et al. 2006; Scheufele, Corley, Dunwoody, Shih, Hillback and Guston 2007; Currall 2009; Kahan et al. 2009).

In Australia, there has been a heated debate about the risks and benefits of nanoparticles in sunscreen. Activist groups demand precautionary measures, including a total moratorium on nanotechnology (Friends of the Earth 2009), and consumer organisations have called for labelling policies regarding nanoparticles in sunscreen (Armitage 2013). In sunscreen, titanium dioxide nanoparticles are used as an alternative to existing chemical UV absorbers, which can cause allergic reactions on sensitive skin (Jacobs et al. 2010). Jacobs et al. (2010) argue that marketing of nanoparticles in sunscreen is an ethically undesirable societal experiment because of the absence of alternatives, controllability, limited informed consent and continuing evaluation. The International Agency of Research on Cancer (IARC) classified titanium dioxide as a possible human carcinogen (IARC 2006).

While the Cancer Council Australia – the national non-government cancer control organisation advising the Australian Government – is in favour of and promotes nanoparticles in sunscreen (Cancer Council Australia 2013), many consumers, scientists and non-governmental organisation have expressed concerns. These concerns relate mainly to the size of nanoparticles, which may penetrate human skin and enter the body, may get inside living cells, or may interact directly with biomolecules and alter penetrated cells’ proteins or DNA (Mortensen, Oberdorster, Pentland and DeLouise 2008; Armitage 2013; CSIRO 2013). Interestingly, in 2006, the Therapeutic Goods Administration Australia stated that there is evidence for nanoparticles damaging cells, but recalled this in 2013 with the following statement: “on current evidence, neither TiO₂ [titanium dioxide] nor ZnO [zinc oxide] nanoparticles are likely to cause harm when used as ingredients in sunscreens” (Australian Government Department of Health / Therapeutic Goods Administration 2013a).

According to the Australian Government Department of Health / Therapeutic Goods Administration Australia (2013b), sunscreen labels are not required to declare the particle size of the active ingredients. This means that even reading the product label, consumers do not know whether titanium dioxides or zinc oxides are included as nanoparticles. Consequently, nanoparticles in sunscreen are classified as a no-choice product.
3.2.2 Sample

The focus of this research was on leading activists against no-choice products. Purposive sampling techniques were used (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Tashakkori and Teddlie 2003). According to Teddlie and Yu (2007), a purposive sample includes participants who are typical of a particular population (in this case leading activists against no-choice products). In particular, extreme or deviant cases of achieving success as a leading activist were considered. Such extreme case sampling is expected to yield particularly valuable information about a topic of interest (Teddlie and Yu 2007). To achieve comparability across different types of cases (Teddlie and Yu 2007), four different types of no-choice products were investigated.

The purposive sampling criterion was that a participant must be the organiser or initiator of boycotts, protests, petitions, or information sessions, or must actively distribute information to the public against a no-choice product (this criterion is consistent with the definition of a leading activist). Participants in this study have typically engaged in one or more of the following behaviours against a no-choice product:

1) been leading activists for between three and 30 years
2) run websites
3) written books
4) developed consumer guides or apps for shopping choices
5) reached more than 9,000 members with 52 email support groups per month
6) sent monthly newsletters to approximately 15,000 people
7) arranged speeches and media events which were broadcasted nationwide
8) have lobbied elected representatives and regulators.

The sample included six men and 15 women, varying in age from 28 to 78 years and living in all states of Australia. All were current leading activists on a grassroots basis (community based); only three participants were also active in NGOs. Consistent with the principles of theoretical sampling (Glaser and Strauss 1967), sampling was undertaken in advance of and parallel to the analysis. In total, 21 phone interviews were conducted; six related to genetically modified crops and five related to each of the following: recycled water, food additives and nanoparticles. This sample size was
chosen with respect to covering all no-choice product categories of interest and achieving theoretical saturation (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glaser 1978).

Saturation is a term used to describe the point when you have heard the range of ideas and aren’t getting new information. If you were still getting new information…, you would conduct more (Krueger and Casey 2000, p. 26).

After 21 interviews the same ideas were emerging, so the point of theoretical saturation had been reached.

3.2.3 Data collection

The process of data collection was guided by theoretical saturation (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glaser 1978), and data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously. When theoretical saturation was reached for one no-choice product, the next no-choice product was investigated. If new insights emerged from investigating the next no-choice product, additional data with respect to the previous no-choice product was collected. Therefore, theoretical saturation indicated when to investigate the next no-choice product.

The results from these interviews were incorporated into the developing model, and amendments were made until theoretical saturation was reached. This iterative process of collecting new data and refining the model continued for the additional no-choice products until the final generic model emerged.

When using a purposive sample, a snowball sampling method is often required (Teddlie and Yu 2007), where a number of participants were initially identified who match the selection criteria (as described in Section 3.2.2). After participating in an interview, these participants were asked to recommend other leading activists who might be willing to participate. Although this method is criticised for its lack of representativeness, it enables access to hard-to-reach populations (Bhattacherjee 2012) such as leading activists.

Initially, potential participants were identified through a scan of blogs, newsgroups and webpages that were set up in opposition to no-choice products. Where these webpages provided contact details, potential participants were contacted via phone or email. The
initial contact was followed by a letter explaining the research project and an invitation to participate in an interview. After giving consent for the interview to be recorded and data used for the intended purposes, semi-structured individual depth interviews were conducted over the phone. At the beginning, data from the individual semi-structured depth interviews were used to define the constructs. Subsequently, semi-structured interviews followed, with the aim of verifying emerging constructs. At the conclusion of the interview, participants were asked if they could recommend other leading activists who might be willing to participate.

Interviews were conducted between 8 June and 3 August 2010 and took 45–70 minutes. Notes were taken during the interviews and interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. No monetary incentive was offered for participation and anonymity was assured. Approval was obtained through the University of Wollongong Human Research Ethics Committee (#HE10/156).

The use of semi-structured depth interviews as data collection method was considered appropriate, given the goal of obtaining rich data through detailed and frank conversations (Calder 1994; Palmerino 1999). Individual depth interviews are recommended when the focus of research is on “developmental history” (Rossiter 2009, p. 13); for example, on how consumers arrived at their current state of knowledge and attitudes, which is the case in this study.

All interviews commenced with a general question about concerns regarding no-choice products, also referred to as the “grand tour question” (Spradley 1979; McCracken 1988). Beginning the interview in such an open-ended manner (Thompson, Locander and Pollio 1989) ensured that the interview was informal and participants could speak freely about any issue relevant to this investigation, including their experiences and actions. The questions do not relate to any existing theoretical constructs. Six general questions guided the interview:

1) What are your concerns regarding X [no-choice product for which they are a leading activist]?
2) How have you expressed your concerns?
3) What is your story – how did you become an activist?
4) What could have stopped you from fighting?
5) What did you fight in the past and what are you fighting at the moment?

6) How would you describe people who are against, and who are for X?

After seven interviews, the topic of persistent leading activism had clearly emerged. Consequently, questions about “What keeps you going?” and “How would you describe an ‘activist personality’?” were included for subsequent interviews. Questions were provided in multiple modalities (Rossiter 2009), depending on the preferences of individual participants. This means that questions were, for example, provided in the form of a subjunctive or as an assumption, and if necessary, expressive interview techniques or third-person techniques (Walker 1985) were used. All participants were asked the guiding questions, not in a set order, but often reactively and interactively in the conversation, as suggested by Rossiter (2009). However, if more information about particular concepts of the emerging model was needed, open-ended or probing questions were added.

3.3 Analysis

Analysis of the interviews followed the constant comparison method (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glaser 1978), and more specifically Glaser’s (2001) descriptions on conceptualisation of data. The constant comparative method prescribes that data collection and analysis occur simultaneously until theoretical saturation has been reached. In this instance theoretical saturation was reached after 17 interviews. The model’s emerging concepts were tentatively tested during analysis, as suggested by Glaser (2001), Gummersson (2005) or Rossiter (2009), which ensures the concept’s validation. However, the final four interviews were explicitly used to improve the model’s validity.

According to the grounded theory approach, it is essential to first

ignore the literature of theory and fact on the area under study, in order to assure that the emergence of categories will not be contaminated by concepts more suited to different areas. Similarities and convergences with the literature can be established after the analytic core of categories has emerged (Glaser and Strauss 1967, p. 37).
The notion of “ignoring” the literature of theory and fact on the area under study should be clarified. Grounded theory searches for the core processes and constructs in a specific area which can only be discovered if the researcher is able to avoid pre-existing assumptions affecting the research output. Therefore, it is postulated that it is important that the researcher investigate the general problem, without the use of a preconceived conceptual framework (Glaser 1998). The questions in this research on page 31 reflect this approach. Glaser (1998) also explains the avoidance of pre-existing assumptions in terms of the researcher having no preconceived view of what problems may be encountered or how participants may answer the questions. Consequently, to “ignore” previous literature is not to neglect it – rather previous literature is “weaved into” after the core constructs have emerged (Glaser 1998, p. 207). The way in which previous literature is weaved into the constructs is explained in the Results section of this chapter. Existing understanding of the topic area is presented in the Literature Review section. “Ignoring” in this context allows for curiosity during data collection and data analysis to ensure new insights are captured.

Validity means that a theory or category describes reality with a good fit, however, there is no easy way of testing it (Gummesson 2000). To ensure internal validity of the evolving constructs, constant comparison of data included comparison of numerous single case studies relating to the same no-choice product. To ensure external validity, analysis also included constant comparison between multiple case studies on different no choice-products (constructs evolving from a single case study were compared to the cases of the three other no-choice products). Consequently, data analysis was conducted in three stages:

Stage 1: Within-case analysis was performed, as originally suggested by Eisenhardt (1989). In this process, each product provides a case which is analysed as a stand-alone entity. The advantage of this approach is that unique patterns for each case can be discovered before a generalised pattern across various cases emerges (Eisenhardt 1989). The disadvantages are that generalisation of patterns is difficult and that there might be a lack of rigour and (Yin 1994; Tellis 1997).

Stage 2: To reduce the disadvantage of focusing on a single case, the results of within-case analysis were compared with one another (similar to
Eisenhardt’s (1989) cross-case analysis). As the model emerged, more useful concepts remained and less useful concepts were discounted, as suggested Martin and Turner (1986). Concepts were eliminated if they could not be validated with additional new data. In the final model, only concepts found in multiple cases across all investigated products were retained.

Stage 3: Experts were included to review specific subsets of data and interpretations which remained ambiguous, as recommended by Wagner, Lukassen and Mahlendorf (2010). The three experts engaged for this task were: 1) a researcher from the University of Wollongong’s School of Psychology; 2) a researcher from the University of Innsbruck’s School of Psychology; and 3) a researcher from the University of Wollongong’s School of Management and Marketing.

A common criticism of qualitative research methods is that the analyst can influence the data analysis and different analysts can produce different results from the same first-order data (Gummesson 2005; Rossiter 2009). The first-order data in this study was analysed by the researcher who also conducted the interviews, who, according to Rossiter (2011b), is the individual best suited to produce valid results because of their intimate knowledge of the context in which issues were raised and comments were made.

Data analysis commenced with the analyst noting key phrases and patterns of meanings, which then emerged into concepts. A concept is an idea and the content behind the label for a concept (Gummesson 2005). Two key questions were constantly guiding the process (Glaser 1992, p. 4): “What is the chief concern or problem?” “What accounts for most of the variation?” and “What concept or what property of what concept does it indicate?” If necessary, emerging concepts were then linked to one another and causal relationships established. A description of these concepts, including their origins, ideas and content, is outlined in the following section.

3.4 Findings

Major similarities and themes emerged in relation to the four products under investigation. Three themes highlighted how consumers became leading activists: 1) an
information search that resulted in concerns; 2) the nature of concerns and emotions; and 3) triggers of leading activism. The model builds on these three themes which are depicted in steps from Figure 3 to Figure 5. Additionally, there were 4) similar key factors which influenced persistent leading activism, which are illustrated in Figure 6. When model constructs are referred to in the text they are indicated in italics.

Examples of how empirical data were transformed into theoretical constructs are presented in each section. The decision on theoretical saturation was taken if at least two new data sets supported each construct.

After comparing the findings with existing literature, it is proposed that information searching behaviours, the nature of concerns and emotions are similar for boycotters and leading activists. The triggers are proposed to discriminate boycotters from leading activists, and the key factors influencing persistency are typical features of persistent leading activists.

For the purposes of reporting findings, the names of participants have been changed to ensure anonymity.

### 3.4.1 Information search that resulted in concerns

All leading activists originally started to search for information about a product as consumers. Although some already had concerns, the majority were not concerned about the product when they initially started seeking information. State or local governments and regulators (hereafter referred to as “public authorities”), producers or providers were the primary sources of information. This is surprising, because it could be assumed that leading activists would approach public authorities, producers or providers to complain at a point when they were already opposed to a particular product. In fact, the majority of participants were not initially opposed to the product; rather, many described themselves as being curious and looking for information. The following examples illustrate three different sets of typical empirical data that formed the construct of curiosity/concerns ensuring its validity:

In the beginning I was more curious and wanted to know more about [genetically modified crops]. (Morgan)
Well, I wasn’t initially opposing recycled water… The mayor raved about this wonderful project [introduction of recycled water], it was all gonna happen and then the community would know… Something as major as changing a water supply should go before the people… We wanted to know why they wanted to introduce recycled water. (Katherine)

In the beginning I was a bit pro-GM. (Rowena)

Hence, curiosity/concerns are shown in the model as the starting point in the progression from consumers to leading activists depicted in Figure 3. Initially, a minority of participants had reasons to question the integrity or legitimacy of the product. Those who had reasons could be categorised into: 1) personal reasons, which relate to a negative experience, or 2) product reasons, which relate to safety concerns or scepticism regarding the product, rather than concerns based on experience. In terms of personal reasons, leading activists typically felt that a product would negatively affect them, their families or their communities. This included, for example, experiences such as unusual behaviour of children after consuming particular foods. Reasons of a product or personal nature are depicted in Figure 3 as influencing information-seeking behaviours.

Leading activists spent significant amounts of time investigating a product, described colloquially by participants as “ages”, “centuries” or “years and years”. Investigations included approaching producers or providers as well as public authorities for information, but also expressing concerns about a product. Participants also reported using research reports, independent testing organisations and generally available sources such as newspaper reports, television or radio shows to gather information.

One participant indicated that the more she “dug into it”, the more concerned she became. A common feature of participants who approached public authorities, producers or providers was the feeling that information was often kept secret, or if provided, contradicted information provided by independent testing from scientists or other organisations. Participants often felt they were not listened to when they expressed concerns, and that in general, people who asked questions were not given due respect. These experiences are portrayed as approaching experiences with public authorities / producers / providers in Figure 3.
It was felt that in many cases when public authorities, producers or providers did respond, they failed to alleviate consumers’ concerns about the product. Instead, their response had the opposite effect: *concerns remained*, and those who were merely curious in the beginning also became concerned. Many participants felt compelled to find out more after initially seeking information. Feeling compelled to find out more was often referred to as *desire to find out more*. At this point, all participants said they were personally boycotting the product. Many eventually *resigned from approaching* public authorities, producers or providers. The relationships between the concepts of *curiosity/concern, information-seeking behaviours, and concerns remain/increase/ desire to find out more* and their role in the progression from concerned consumers to leading activists are depicted in Figure 3.

Figure 3 shows *abilities* as influencing *information-seeking behaviours*. Participants noted four types of abilities which helped them find relevant information. These were the ability to: 1) research information — the ability to find pertinent research articles, reports and documents; 2) understand this information; 3) analyse information to gain meaningful insights; and 4) know “how to write letters and how to talk to governments or producers” (Vivienne).

Citizens’ searching for information as well as inadequate government responses to concerns have been shown to be relevant to individuals for the decision to become
activists (Kieffer 1984; Grunig 1989; Aronson 1993). Regarding boycotters, little is known about their information-seeking behaviours, government responses and its influence on becoming boycotters. However, Kozinets and Handelman (1998) argue that boycotters search for information, and that the information received from several sources such as internet newsgroups or the mass media, acts as the first stage of awareness about an issue. Additionally, the “more heinous or personally affecting the information, the more the likelihood of the individual engaging in boycotting” (p. 477). This is similar to one of Smith’s (1987) explanations for an individual’s decision to join a boycott that is to “know and be concerned about the issue in question” (p. 17). Thus, it is assumed that information-seeking behaviours are similar for boycotters and leading activists.

3.4.2 Nature of concerns

After information search, four distinct types of concerns emerged: 1) product safety; 2) non-affective injustice of the situation; 3) lack of trust in public authorities; and 4) lack of informed product choice.

Product safety concerns primarily related to health and the environment. Participants considered that the products had not been tested enough scientifically, and this led to serious safety concerns. With respect to food additives, many participants were not against all additives. For example:

There are about 300 additives. About fifty cause problems but are very commonly used. (Emma)

These “problems” were later described as effects on health (such as allergies), behaviour (for example, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, ADHS) and learning.

Regarding nanoparticles, genetically modified crops (GM) and recycled water, product concerns about “serious health implications” (Rowena) were accompanied by environmental concerns. For example, Wayne believed that “cross-pollination is going to be the most challenging environmental problem with GM”, and Lee believed that “up to date no one would really know if, and how, nanoparticles effected the environment”. Lee compared current knowledge of nanoparticles to past knowledge of asbestos, which was considered safe in the 1970s but proved to be lethal to humans in the 1990s.
These examples offer evidence of validity and reliability for the construct *product safety*.

In the present study, the terms “injustice” and “trust” in public authorities are used instead of the more popularly used term of “grievances” in the social movement literature. Klundermans (1997) describes grievances as “outrage about the way authorities are treating a social problem” (p. 38). This can be experienced as a feeling of illegitimate inequality, relative deprivation, injustice, moral indignation about some state of affairs, or a suddenly imposed grievance. However, the distinction between these aspects of grievances is important, because injustice and trust provide separate pathways for consumers who evolved into leading activists. Therefore, the type of injustice is referred to as non-affective, which includes perceived unfairness of procedures, perceived collective mistreatment or dissatisfaction (van Zomeren et al. 2008).

Concerns regarding *non-affective injustice* related primarily to the market situation, and arose because of the perception that companies are too focused on satisfying their economic interests and that they lie about concerns regarding product safety:

- It [GM] is hidden away from public view. (Fred)
- They [companies] create a story about products, but it is not true. (Lee)
- The tactics of big business is corrupt to the core. (Rowena)

Additionally, participants felt there had been insufficient community consultation regarding product advantages and disadvantages, which was perceived as unfair and unjust.

Participants had little trust in public authorities which represented the third concern (*lack of trust in public authorities*). Similar to the perception of an unjust market situation, participants experienced a perceived lack of truthfulness on the part of public authorities:

- Farmers had been lied to [by the government about GM]. (Wayne)
- Their [public authorities’] claims are untrue. (Fred)
Another major issue regarding trust in public authorities related to consumer protection. As Natalee expressed, “One assumes the government wouldn’t let it [the selling of unsafe products] happen”, but in her opinion, public authorities did not provide sufficient regulation to protect consumers from unsafe products. According to Lee, a key difference between activists and non-activists is that non-activists believed public authorities “are looking after people”, which can be interpreted as having the best interests of the public at heart. Such a view was reflected by the majority of participants, for example:

Government should stop being so misleading… People in power are so gutless. (Rowena)

This view is also attributed to the belief that the government is too greatly influenced by big companies and does not act when they are aware of a problem with a certain product. Consequently, participants had lost trust in public authorities.

The fourth emerging concern for participants was lack of informed product choice. Participants demanded proper and easy to-read labelling for products, including food additives, nanoparticles and genetically modified crops. They believed that product labelling is often either insufficient or confusing for consumers. For example, creams, sunscreens or toothpaste labelling do not always clearly state whether they contain nanoparticles. Regarding food additives, Emma believed there to be a perceived labelling loophole, because manufacturers can use different names for the same ingredients. Therefore, consumers cannot make an informed choice:

Most consumers have no idea what it is when they read “hydrolysed vegetable protein”, which is MSG [glutamate] and bad for your health. (Emma)

Concerns about a lack of informed product choice were also evident in relation to recycled water. The decision to introduce recycled water was made by the government, and “They said there is no option” (Katherine) and “it is not negotiable” (Greg). However, what the community wanted was an informed choice, to “discuss it and then decide whether it is good or not” (Michael). These numerous examples provide evidence of construct validity and reliability.
Previous studies underlined all four of these concerns in relation to boycotting or activism. Specifically, boycotts and activism are regarded as a response to the *injustice* consumers perceive regarding society, ethical consumption or the market system (for example, Klandermans 1997; Shaw et al. 2006; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). It is proposed that all four concerns (*nature of concerns*) are similar for boycotters and leading activists.

### 3.4.3 Emotions

Despite the emerging concerns, participants spoke very emotionally about how they became leading activists. Most *emotions* were expressed verbally, often accompanied by variations (usually elevations) in volume and tempo of their voice. When these variations occurred, the interviewer asked about *emotions*. Rowena answered in a way typical of many participants:

> I am not angry. I am disgusted. That’s the emotion! (Rowena)

Besides being disgusted, the *emotion* of annoyance was commonly expressed; whereas feelings of anger seemed insufficient to describe participants’ feelings about public authorities, producers and the entire situation regarding products. These results are contradictory to those from previous research, in which anger emerges as the common emotion from various literatures. Anger is seen as motivator for boycott participation (Friedman 1999; Ettenson and Klein 2005; Braunsberger and Buckler 2010) and activism (Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Cameron and Nickerson 2009). Anger also plays an important motivational force in collective protest participation (Van Zomeren et al. 2004; Leach et al. 2006; Stuermer and Simon 2009). However, *emotions* play a major role in the transition from consumers to leading activist, but according to participants in this study, *emotions* were not decisive enough to actually trigger leading activism. Rather, *emotions* arose during the information search phase and were still a motivational force for persistent leading activism.

It is postulated that these *emotions* are typical not just of leading activists, but also of boycotters, particularly because leading activists said they had these feelings even before they became activists. Figure 4 includes the *nature of concerns* expressed by leading activists as well as *emotions*. The model postulates that at this point there is still no difference between boycotters and leading activists.
3.4.4 Triggers of leading activism

At this point in the model, all participants had progressed from being curious consumers and were now boycotting the product. In this step, individuals were motivated by various triggers, including: 1) the search for truth; 2) becoming a perceived expert; 3) perceiving a lack of community knowledge; 4) a view that no one does anything; and 5) a perception of a personal obligation to make change. Moreover, participants revealed their understanding of what leading activism means to them: it is based on: 6) a desire to educate; and 7) protect others; as well as 8) the willingness to make a change.

The first trigger, the search for truth, was not directly mentioned by participants. Yet the statements made indirectly revealed that leading activists believed they had uncovered the truth:
There is false and misleading labelling. (Rowena)

People deserve the truth. (Natalee)

I can’t get the truth out. No newspaper would publish [the truth] because it is too political. (Vivienne)

Leading activists dedicated a lot of time to conducting research to uncover the truth. It appears that they are driven to search for truth because they claim they are the ones who actually know the truth.

The second trigger, perceived expertise, is a logical consequence of the first trigger, the search for truth: if someone feels that they have uncovered the truth about a product, then they perceive themselves as an expert on the subject. Many participants perceived that other people also viewed them as experts. Participants saw themselves as more knowledgeable than the rest of the population. Some had been invited as “experts” to discussions about a product they opposed, on the radio or on the television. All participants had been on road shows, published books, or provided apps for easier shopping in order to avoid products, or had their own webpages.

Concerning the third trigger, lack of community knowledge, participants believed that people these days were so busy chasing wealth and paying mortgages that they did not have the time to investigate a product, and therefore remained unaware of the issues. Rowena described an interesting link between lack of knowledge by the public and how she perceived her work as leading activist:

The only ones that don’t worry about it [GM] don’t know much about it…
An average farmer has not got the time to look at this. I specialise in [GM] research I enjoy… It’s just a matter of exposing the lies. (Rowena)

The quote above also illustrates the link between knowledge, time and activism. The need for “exposing the lies” emphasised a need to educate those who simply do not have the time to investigate products themselves. These findings about a search for truth, perceived expertise and lack of community knowledge, are similar to Kozinets and Handelman’s (2004) findings: activists describe themselves as enlightened and having an “immanent wisdom, a knowledge of things hidden” (p. 696), whereas “normal” consumers are unaware and asleep (p. 701).
Interestingly, leading activists believed that if they did not change the current situation about products, no one else would. Although many participants were recruited by snowballing, which meant that at least some of them were in contact with one another, they had a distinct feeling that hardly anyone else was taking action. This pessimistic view about others’ collective actions as a motivation to make a person more willing to take action (Oliver 1984) has been overlooked so far. Recent research focused on estimated optimistic participation of others as motivator for boycott participation (Klein et al. 2004; Gupta and Ogden 2009) or efficacy as predictors for collective action (van Zomeren et al. 2008; Gupta and Ogden 2009). Yet Oliver (1984) argues that this pessimism is particularly motivating if there are diminishing marginal returns to contributions towards a collective good. This could also be interpreted as the case when starting leading activism. Therefore, this distinct feeling of no one does anything to change the situation is expected to be a fourth trigger for leading activism.

Another trigger concerns an obligation to make a change. Participants felt compelled to do something about the current situation, by using a variety of words. For example, “I must do something”, “I have to do something” or “I feel obliged to do something” were commonly used. Carrigan, Szmigin and Wright (2004) categorised “having to do…” as obligation, which was found to be typical for consumer activism (Carrigan et al. 2004; Shaw et al. 2006) as well as social movement activities such as protesting (Stuermer et al. 2003; Stuermer and Simon 2004).

Interestingly, leading activists understood their activist behaviours as willingness to make a change, and as the desire to educate and protect others:

The fact, that there is information but we don’t get it, drives me. So I am telling it. (Gayle)

When asked what “telling” meant to participants, they explained that they felt it was important to talk about the safety aspects of products, as well as how to avoid them. This was interpreted as an underlying desire to educate, but also to protect others. The desire to protect was guided by a strong sense of caring for the community and other families. With education about products, the perceived knowledge gap within the general population could be closed, and people could then protect themselves by avoiding dangerous or controversial products if they so choose. Previous qualitative
research into activism supports these findings about the desire to protect, warn or educate others (Aronson 1993; Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Ward and Ostrom 2006); however, it is postulated that these desires are specific triggers for leading activism.

Participants’ willingness to make a change was commonly expressed as “I want to make change”. The ultimate goals were changing companies’ behaviours, improving laws and regulations or banning products from the market. Previous research identified the desire to make a change as a well-known motivation for boycott participation (Klein et al. 2002; Klein et al. 2004; Hoffmann 2011) and collective action (Klandermans 1984; Stuermer et al. 2003; van Zomeren et al. 2008).

Consumers can affect change… we need to make sure the government is delivering what our community wants. (Fred)

However, willingness to make a change expands the previously used constructs about the desire to make a change with the type of involvement being considered as two separate aspects; leading or helping in making a change. Helping includes involvement, yet excludes leading. All identified triggers of leading activism are illustrated in Figure 5.
Figure 5: The transition from curious/concerned consumers to leading activists (Step 3)
3.4.5 Key factors influencing persistent leading activism

Persistent leading activism is defined as a current leading activist’s willingness to continue leading activism in future:

Once your heart is switched on, you just keep going, you never give up.
(Deborah)

Interviewer: “What would stop you from fighting?”

Lee: “A bullet in my head. They do and try to stop you. But no one is going to stop me from saying what is right.”

The quotes above are typical for persistent leading activists, who wish to continue their actions against products. Other answers included “nothing”, “me dying”, “being killed” and “dropping dead”. Sometimes these statements were followed by a laugh, and later, participants said that reaching their goals of changing regulations, laws and companies’ behaviour would “of course” stop them from being active. Of interest was the sequence of the statements, which not only represented persisting leading activism, but also a certain resignation. If leading activists believed in their effectiveness in changing companies’ behaviour, laws or regulations, one would expect them to refer to the goals before referring to “dying”. This frustration might be attributable to the fact that all participants had already been active for between three to 17 years.

When asked about what someone needs to “keep going”, four key elements emerged: 1) personality traits; 2) life experiences; 3) perceptions of efficacy, success and support; and 4) emotional importance of leading activism.

These elements are depicted graphically in Figure 6.
Regarding personality traits, the following two quotes represented two major directions: persistence and looking beyond “things” (Lee):

Being persistent… like a terrier, you never let go. (Emma)

It is in my nature to look beyond and what makes a difference. (Deborah)

“Looking beyond” could be understood as considering more than rules and regulations, similar to going beyond compliance, as suggested by Sekerka, Bagozzi and Chamigo (2009). However, considering the study context of no-choice products, it is actually more related to finding the truth and simply not believing what public authorities suggested. Other variables representing the category of personality traits were:

1) not getting discouraged (Greg, Morgan)
2) having a thick skin (Katherine)
3) keep going when others give up (Jessica)
4) keep going until I get what I want (Sophie)
5) not having a victim personality (Deborah)
6) getting mad but getting even (Deborah)

Deborah’s last statement of “getting mad but getting even” may also have been categorised as a strategy to cope with emotions (Mannarini et al. 2010). Yet, as Deborah mentioned this in the context of necessary personality traits for persistent activism, it was categorised as such.

Leading activists displayed certain personality traits which are aspects of various personality traits scales, including resilience (Connor and Davidson 2003; Campbell-
Participants understood the “way life has happened” (Fred) as relevant experiences that helped them in pursuing leading activism. These *life experiences* were regarded as an individual’s development across the life span, which is influenced by community involvement, parental modelling and prior paid or unpaid work experiences. These life experiences helped leading activists to pursue leading activism:

> I was a teacher. It’s born in me to be like that [to be a teacher]. For me, there was a landmark in education: I can make a difference, at least where I can.
>  
> (Lee)

Many participants emphasised that they had always been active in the community; for example, in organising events, discussing issues or heading committees. These experiences assisted them in pursuing leading activism. Many leading activists also had prior experience as an advocate, politician, teacher or activist. Previous research on social movements has shown that some life experiences, in particular, prior involvement in movements, can predict activism (Haan et al. 1968; Braungart and Braungart 1991; Stewart and McDermott 2004; Klandermans et al. 2008; Mannarini et al. 2009). However, it remains unexplored whether these *life experiences* can predict persistency.

In contrast to those who had relevant prior paid or unpaid work experiences, others believed that their upbringing and lessons from parents were important experiences that had influenced their continued leading activism. Because these experiences relate to the development of values instigated by parents, this subcategory of *life experiences* was classified as parental modelling. It involved learning to speak up, argue views and discuss matters.

> My parents taught me to stand up for things that are important to me.
>  
> (Deborah)

Others indicated that their parents had a strong sense of justice and taught them to be responsible people. Their upbringing; that is, parental modelling, influenced them so
much that they “cannot help but keep going” (Fred), because otherwise it would be a violation of these values.

Perceptions of efficacy, success and social support were related to making change through leading activism. The perception of efficacy to make a change was regarded as essential for persistent leading activism. Participants said that they felt they were capable of influencing others to the point of changing their minds and actions. The feeling of having an impact on society was perceived as most rewarding by leading activists. Furthermore, leading activists emphasised they had a solution and, most importantly, a strategy for how to avoid products. The aspect of influencing others is related to the construct of perceived efficacy as suggested by Mannarini et al. (2009) and Mannarini and Fedi (2012). Both studies suggest that perceived efficacy is a significant factor influencing persistent mobilisation.

Perceptions of success included the belief that a strong movement would be effective and activism is the only strategy to affect change. Participants strongly believed that their actions were successful, “even though we had some serious setbacks” (Fred). In particular, participants knew that their efforts were appreciated by others. Although the belief in success could be categorised as a type of efficacy (Brunsting and Postmes 2002), the name “perceptions of success” was chosen because success was not used as a specific meaning and included appreciation by others. Similarly, the likelihood of success has been proven to be a motivator for boycott decisions (Sen et al. 2001; Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala 2009). However, it is suggested that perceptions of success, such as the feeling that one’s actions are successful and appreciated by others, are key factors influencing persistency.

Another interesting finding relates to the perception of support. Leading activists were supported by their community and friends, which helped them in their cause. Particularly for recycled water activists, the support of the community was a major motivator. There was no unified view regarding levels of support by families. Some leading activists were supported strongly by their families, others were not. For some, their persistent fighting was in fact a challenge for their marriage and family. Existing constructs about boycotting involvement capture support of friends and family, such as the self-enhancement construct by Klein et al. (2004). Present findings build on these, but add the importance of community support for persistent leading activists.
Community support as a psychological construct of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet and Farley 1988) has helped activists to manage stressful events, and stress mediated the relationship between commitment and persistency (Mannarini 2011) and it is therefore indicated that community support influences persistency.

The emotional importance of leading activism involved an obligation towards future generations, and feeling a passion about leading activism. The following quote reveals a strong motivation concerning the obligation:

I couldn’t tell my grandchildren that I sat and did nothing. (Morgan)

In fact, the vast majority of participants included the thought about future generations (for example, children and grandchildren) when they talked about their obligation to make change. An obligation to be an activist, described as sense of duty and obligation towards others, was found to prevent activists from withdrawing their engagement (Mannarini and Fedi 2012). The following quote provides an example for perceiving sense and an obligation towards others:

To make some changes feels like the most important thing to do… God’s given me the job… so whenever I feel that I am not up to it I give it a kick in the bum and say: “keep going”. [laughing] Something greater than me is driving this message. I am just a mouthpiece really… I guess it [pursuing leading activism] is being a bit on a mission… just for future benefit… and to contribute our time on earth in a sort of positive way. (Natalee)

Not all participants spoke so candidly about their motivations for leading activism and provided as deep an insight into their belief system. However, the word “mission” was used by many. For example, Deborah described her work as a leading activist as “a significant mission in my life”. If not described as mission, leading activists felt that their opposition to products was a meaningful and important aspect of their lives.

Being passionate about leading activism and having a sense of enjoyment were perceived as essential for continuing leading activism. Such positive feelings, and specifically being globally satisfied with the experience, have been found to strengthen willingness to undertake future participation in citizen engagement (Mannarini et al.
2010). Even if not explicitly expressed, passion and joy were evident in participants’ voices, by changing to a slightly softer tone, or by speaking louder or faster, or by laughing happily:

what is a good life… you know… [with a softer, convincing tone from now on] is it having good food to eat, a place to live, meaningful work to do, meaningful relationship with all communities, meaningful relationship with the world… and work around that… and not [with a deep voice from now on] “oh, we have got to produce”… you know… [with a softer voice but speaking more quickly from now on] we’ve got to increase sales of chemicals or increase sales of seeds or increase sales of whatever. I mean, [with a soft voice, spoken slowly from now on] I think we need to take a deep breath… and a step back… and look at what we are doing and where we’re going. (Jessica)

3.5 Summary

The qualitative investigation into leading activism against no-choice products resulted in a theoretical model of the transition from (curious) consumers to leading activists, and additionally proposes key factors influencing persistency. This theoretical model serves as basis for operationalising the constructs and exploring its associations in Phase 2; and the prediction of leading activists and persistent leading activists in Phase 3.

For the prediction of leading activists in a group of boycotters, the theoretical model proposes: 1) similarities between boycotters and leading activists; and 2) triggers of leading activism. Previous literature suggests that a degree of concern might be a prerequisite for boycotting (Smith 1987; Hoffmann and Mueller 2009). Therefore, the final model incorporates having greatest personal concerns about a product as precondition for boycotting and leading activism behaviours. For the prediction of persistent leading activists in a group of leading activists, the model proposes 3) key factors influencing persistent leading activism. The theoretical model in its entity is depicted in Figure 7.
Precondition: boycotted product represents greatest personal concern
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Figure 7: Theoretical model of similarities between boycotters and leading activists, triggers of leading activism and key factors influencing persistent leading activism
The transition from a (curious) consumer to a leading activist often commenced by seeking information from several sources, and raising concerns with public authorities, producers or providers. Information seeking behaviours were caused by an interest in or concern about a product. Typical reasons were either of a personal nature (for example, health interest) or a product nature (“new product, want to know more about it”). However, when responses from public authorities, producers or providers were considered unsatisfactory – which is referred to as approaching experiences in the model – many of these consumers started boycotting the product and resigned from approaching. It can be concluded that from this first step of information-seeking four major concerns emerged, remained or increased: 1) product safety concerns; 2) concerns regarding non-affective injustice; 3) concerns regarding a lack of trust in public authorities; and 4) concerns about a lack of informed product choice. Additionally, emotions such as anger, frustration and disgust developed. By this point, leading activists were not initiating activism, but boycotting the product. Therefore, it is proposed that boycotters and leading activists display similar information-seeking behaviours, concerns and emotions.

Eight distinct triggers influenced participants to start leading activism: 1) the desire to find out the truth about a product (search for truth); 2) the feeling of being an expert on a product (perceived expertise); 3) the feeling that there was a lack of community knowledge; 4) the perception that there was no one else to change the situation (no one else does anything); and 5) a sense of obligation to act. Furthermore, participants emphasised how they understand leading activism, namely as: 6) a desire to educate and 7) protect others; and 8) as willingness to make a change. It is proposed that these triggers differentiate boycotters from leading activists, and are therefore typical perceptions of leading activists only.

All participants insisted on continuing leading activism and four key factors influenced persistency: 1) personality traits, such as not having a victim mentality; 2) life experiences related to work or childhood; 3) perception of efficacy, success and support played another important role; and 4) emotional importance, expressed through joy and passion. It is proposed that these four key factors can be used to identify persistent leading activists in a group of leading activists.
Section 4  PHASE 2: QUANTITATIVE EXPLORATORY STUDY

4.1 Purpose

Phase 2 involves: 1) operationalising constructs that were identified in Phase 1; 2) measuring them in a survey study; and 3) exploring associations between them. This produced the identification of potentially promising predictors for leading activism and persistent leading activism to be used in Phase 3.

4.2 Method

4.2.1 Fieldwork administration

4.2.1.1 Data collection

The survey was administered online because leading activists had already been successfully recruited using the internet for the sample used in Phase 1. The advantage of online questionnaires is that, based on the answers respondents give, the page logic allows respondents to be presented with the questions that are relevant to them only. Also, by using an online questionnaire it was possible to relate each question to the specific boycotted product of greatest personal concern, as indicated by the individual respondent. In Appendix 1, the questionnaire is presented in the page logic style. The term “[Q4]” in the questionnaire relates to the boycotted product of greatest personal concern chosen by the individual respondent.

Respondents were invited to complete a 30-minute questionnaire that was available via a link to a webpage on surveymonkey.com. Surveymonkey is an online tool designed to create and host online self-completion questionnaires. With the use of Surveymonkey Gold Edition, which is not free, the questionnaire was programmed so that each respondent had the product of greatest personal concern specified in the body of each question. Before beginning the questionnaire, respondents were provided with information about the study and were invited to participate. To encourage participation, 10 gift vouchers valued at $AUD50 each were offered from an online organic product store. Ten days after the initial invitation was sent a reminder to participate was posted online again. This procedure was repeated three times (each in 10-day increments). Finally, a thank you letter was posted online.
4.2.1.2 Study context

To increase the generalisability of results, six no-choice products were investigated. These products were the four included in Phase 1: recycled water, products containing food additives, genetically modified foods, products containing nanoparticles, as well as drinking water from treated seawater (desalinated water) and tap water containing fluoride (water fluoridation). The two additional products are also considered to be no-choice products. In Australia, desalinated water can be integrated into urban water supply systems to increase available supplies without public consent (Anderson 2006; El Saliby, Okour, Shon, Kandasamy and In Kim 2009). Since the 1970s, fluoride has been added to community water supplies in Australia without the consent of individual consumers. Therefore, consumers do not have a choice unless they are prepared to use bottled water to cook, wash and clean. Water fluoridation remains a controversial public health issue and has been linked to major adverse human health problems such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) or mental disorders (Grandjean and Landrigan 2014; Peckham and Asofeso 2014).

To avoid attracting respondents who were not knowledgeable about a specific product, an open-ended question about what respondents understood the chosen product to be was included (Appendix 1, p. 11). In total, 58 questionnaires with nonsense responses to this question were excluded.

4.2.1.3 Respondent recruitment

The fieldwork for this study was conducted during the period June to October 2011. The Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Wollongong approved the online survey. Emails and phone calls were used to contact leading activists who provided their contact details on webpages, blogs, on twitter or in commentary pieces in online newspaper articles related to no-choice products. In addition, online communities of organic shops, TV shows related to the investigated products and various activists’ Facebook pages were contacted. A profile was set up on Facebook, providing details about this study, the link to the questionnaire and researcher contact details. Leading activists seemed to prefer Facebook over other forms of online communication such as Twitter or blogs, so Facebook was considered appropriate for this purpose.
4.2.1.4 Sample

A combination of probability sampling and purposive sampling techniques were employed, as recommended by Teddlie and Yu (2007), because these methods yielded the largest possible sample size within the time and budgetary constraints of the study. The probability sampling method used was stratified sampling, which involves dividing the population into subgroups and taking a sample from each subgroup (Aaker, Kumar and Day 2001). The four subgroups were: 1) boycotters; 2) leading activists; 3) persistent leading activists; and 4) non-persistent leading activists. In addition, snowball and purposive sampling techniques were used. The target sample was at least 25 individuals in each subgroup, which is the corresponding minimum sample size for chi-square tests and binary logistic regressions (Howell 1997; Voss 2004; Hosmer, Lemeshow and Sturdivant 2013).

The sampling frame, as an accessible section of the target population from where the sample was drawn (Teddle and Yu 2007; Bhattacherjee 2012), consists of at least 289,602 individuals (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook page and group type</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pages related to no-choice products</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled water</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food additives</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetically modified foods</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanoproducts</td>
<td>173,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalinated water</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fluoridation</td>
<td>6,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email or phone contacts</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online newspapers (9 comments posted)</td>
<td>Number not accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>184,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups related to activism in general</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth Australia</td>
<td>2,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace Australia</td>
<td>14,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various activism pages</td>
<td>50,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic shops</td>
<td>34,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic food networks</td>
<td>3,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>122,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>289,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As of 12 June 2011.
2 This number includes 167,192 individuals following a popular Australian TV Show, which featured nanoparticles in sunscreen during data collection period.
3 For example, topics such as child immunisation programs, animal welfare or consumer welfare.
The total number of individuals in the sample frame cannot be calculated exactly because it is not known how many individuals were reached through comments in online newspaper articles and on Facebook. The number of individuals calculated for Facebook was based on the number of “likes” each Facebook group received. Individuals can join a group by “liking” and each individual can “like” a particular group only once, therefore it is assumed that the number of likes on one page is roughly equivalent to the number of individuals following this page. However, an exact number of individuals who actively follow a page cannot be calculated because it may be the case that some individuals liked a group a long time ago and are no longer actively following that group. Furthermore, each individual can like more than one group; therefore there might be some overlap of people who are represented in several groups.

4.2.1.5 Respondent screening and classification

The sample consisted of Australian adults who were identified as boycotters, leading activists, persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists against particular products. Non-boycotters (that is, regular consumers) were not included because the aim of this study was to compare boycotters with leading activists.

Phase 1 revealed that having strong personal concerns regarding a product is a precondition for becoming a boycotter or leading activist. Therefore, before participating in Phase 2 respondents were screened to ensure they had the greatest personal concern about a specific product they had previously boycotted.

The screening process was conducted as follows. Respondents were first asked to indicate how concerned they were about the six investigated products. They could indicate their concerns as “strongly concerned”, “somewhat concerned”, “not concerned at all” or “don’t know what it is”. Respondents were also asked which of the products listed caused the greatest concern for them personally, and could choose one product (Appendix 1, p. 4).

If respondents indicated that they were not concerned about any of the listed products, they were diverted to questions related to leading activism against any product, information-seeking skills, and questions related to personal characteristics and demographics (Appendix 1, pp. 5–7, 40–60). However, only 14 respondents stated that
none of the listed products was of their greatest personal concern. These responses were excluded from the final sample.

These screening questions ensured that respondents chose one product they held *strong personal concerns* about – for example, if respondents only answered “somewhat concerned” about genetically modified foods, but then chose genetically modified foods as the product of *greatest personal concern*, they were excluded from the sample. No respondent who was “somewhat concerned” was included in the survey.

All respondents who chose a *product of greatest personal concern* were asked whether they boycotted this product. In order to measure boycott participation, respondents were asked whether they try to avoid buying the product (genetically modified foods, food additives, nanoproduc...
boycotters and leading activists. If leading activists regarding any product met the selection criteria for non-persistent leading activists, they were included in the group.

A sample of persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists was needed to investigate whether key factors identified in Phase 1 were associated with persistency. Persistent leading activists are currently leading activists intending to continue leading activism in future. In a first step, currently leading activists were identified. Respondents were asked whether they were currently active (Appendix 1, second question on page 16) and about how much time they currently spend on their activities (Appendix 1, p. 19). Those who responded “none at all” were classified as non-currently leading, and were asked why they stopped being active (Appendix 1, second question, p. 17) and perceived success, social support and emotional importance (Appendix 1, p. 18). Non-currently leading activists were not considered in the sample of persistent leading activists.

In a second step, currently leading activists were asked “What are the chances that you will initiate or organise an activity such as an information session, a protest, a petition, a boycott or actively distribute information to the public regarding [product of greatest personal concern] in the future?” Respondents could indicate their willingness to continue leading activism on an 11-point Juster scale ranging from 0 in 10 (no chance, almost no chance) to 10 in 10 (absolutely certain) (Appendix 1, p. 39). The 11-point Juster scale was then collapsed into three categories of no chance (0–3), little chance (4–6), and good chance (7–10) to pursue leading activism in the future. Persistent leading activists are referred to as all respondents indicating a good chance to pursue leading activism. Twenty-nine respondents were categorised as being persistent leading activists. Non-persistent leading activists are referred to as those who indicated no chance of pursuing. A sample of 31 non-persistent leading activists was included in the sample. Respondents indicating a little chance of pursuing were not considered in this sample.

4.2.2 Measures

The questionnaire made use of a number of single-item and multi-item scales. Multi-item scales were presented in random order to minimise response-set artefacts, and were rotated to avoid order bias when appropriate (Becker 1954). The questions were
arranged in an effort to maintain the respondent’s interest by varying the types of questions. The exact measures for each construct are provided in Appendix 1.

On the basis of the construct definitions, measures were developed, or, where appropriate, predeveloped scales were used. For the most part, predeveloped scales were not considered appropriate, because they lacked content, criterion, and/or construct validity for the research question at hand (Cronbach and Meehl 1955). For the development of customised measures the C-OAR-SE method was used (Rossiter 2002; Rossiter 2011a; Rossiter 2011b). C-OAR-SE is based on expert-content validation, and items and measures are established rationally by expert judgement. Therefore, items and measures were established and then discussed with three leading activists who participated in Phase 1, as well as six academics. Two academics each were from the Faculty of Commerce and the Faculty of Psychology at the University of Wollongong in Australia; one academic was from the Faculty of Psychology at the University of Innsbruck in Austria; and one academic was from the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University Amsterdam in the Netherlands. These experts assisted in defining the constructs and in validating the content (Rossiter 2011a; Rossiter 2011b). It involved assigning items to constructs and judging whether the wording or measures were appropriate, complete or would need another aspect to be included with regard to the defined constructs. Additional aspects were included only if they corresponded to the findings in Phase 1. This procedure was repeated until the experts agreed that the measures were found to have high content and construct validity (Cronbach and Meehl 1955) as well as “very good ‘expressability’ (high answer scale validity)” as suggested by Rossiter (2011a, p. 1574).

The construct must be defined in terms of the object to be rated, the attribute it is to be rated on, and the rater entity doing the rating (Rossiter 2011a).

It follows that the attribute must be correctly represented in the measure, which must also include the object of the construct. In this study, the object represented the boycotted product respondents were strongly concerned about. The rater entity does not appear in the measure, but is included in the definition. Boycotters, leading activists, persistent leading activists or non-persistent leading activists represented rater entities in this research.
All items and measures are included in the survey questionnaire in Appendix 1. The page numbers in the following section refer to the pages in the questionnaire. The description of measures follows the constructs as presented in the theoretical model in Figure 7, on page 51, and are printed in **bold**.

4.2.2.1 **Similarities between boycotters and leading activists**

The first two questions in the survey related to the **precondition** that the boycotted product represented a respondent’s greatest personal concern. The definitions and measures are described in the Section 4.2.1.5 Respondent screening and classification, on page 56, and in the Appendix 1, p. 4. The *product of greatest personal concern* is hereafter referred to as “[product]” in the items.

Respondents were then asked about their **information-seeking behaviours** related to the product. Consumers have to know about an issue to be able to boycott (Smith 1987). In this research, “knowing about an issue” involves **information-seeking behaviours**. 

*Information-seeking behaviours* are defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s: 1) gathering information from no specified sources; 2) spending a lot of time on information search; and 3) expressing concerns to public authorities, producers or providers about a *product of greatest personal concern*. The sources of information such as scientific reports or newspaper articles are irrelevant in this research context and are therefore not investigated.

*Information-seeking behaviours* were measured with “Have you looked for information on [product]?” (p. 23). If respondents agreed that they had looked for information, then they were asked “How much time did you spend looking for information about [product]?” The answer scale included three options: “a lot of time”, “some time” and “very little time” (p. 25). If respondents expressed they did not look for information, they were automatically diverted to p. 24 in the questionnaire, which investigated their perceptions about **information-seeking reasons** (below).

All respondents were asked about **approaching public authorities** and **producers or providers** (“Did you express your concerns about [product] to public authorities such as local governments, state governments or regulators?” p. 27; and “Did you mention your concern about [product] to the producers or the providers?” (p. 29). Respondents who indicated “yes” were diverted to **approaching experiences**. Five randomised questions
each related to public authorities and producers or providers measured *approaching experiences*: “Did you feel people who ask questions are respected?”; “Did you get all information you wanted?”; “Did you get a reply?”; “Did you get contradictory information?”; and “Were you listened to?”. Respondents were asked to indicate their experiences on a three-point scale of “always”, “sometimes” or “never” (pp. 28 and 30). They were then asked whether they resigned from approaching. Having resigned from approaching is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s plan to give up approaching public authorities, producers or providers about a *product of greatest personal concern* in future. This was measured with a single item “What are the chances that you will give up approaching [public authorities/producers or providers] in future?” (pp. 29 and 31). The answer options ranged from 0 (no chance, almost no chance, 0 out of 10) to 10 (absolutely certain, 10 out of 10) on an 11-point Juster scale. Respondents could then be assigned to three main categories: First, those who were certain to keep approaching (answered 0, 1 or 2 out of 10), second, those who might stop (answered 3, 4 or 5 out of 10), and third, those who were sure to stop (answered 7, 8, 9 or 10 out of 10).

Respondents were also asked six randomised questions that measured *reasons* for information search. In order to investigate *reasons* why / why not respondents had started to search for information, two items were framed: “Why did you start looking for information? Because…” was framed for those respondents who had searched for information (p. 26). Those respondents who had not searched for information were asked, “In the past, have you felt that…” for example a “[product] affected my community” (p. 24). The responses to both items were then collapsed into one.

A boycotter’s or leading activist’s unspecified negative experiences with a product or the perception that a *product of greatest personal concern* affected their family or their community are categorised as *reasons of personal nature* motivating information search. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they started to search for information because the “[product] affected me and/or my family”, the “[product] affected my community” and “I had negative experiences with [product]”. *Reasons* of a *product nature* to start information search are related to a boycotter’s or leading activist’s perceptions that public authorities, producers or providers are not providing enough information, or having the desire to avoid the *product of greatest personal concern*. Therefore, respondents indicated whether they felt that “public authorities such as local governments, state governments or regulators were providing too little
information about [product]”, “the producer or provider was providing too little information about [product]”, and whether they “wanted the option of staying away from [product] and choosing an alternative product”. The questions number one to five and seven on pp. 24 and 26 relate to reasons for information search.

The abilities needed to search for information are defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s self-rated ability to: 1) research and analyse information in general; 2) understand scientific; and 3) approach public authorities, producers or providers for information about a product of greatest personal concern. Respondents were asked to rate their abilities on a five-point scale of “very bad” to “very good”. In case respondents had never performed one of the abilities the answer option of “never done” was also included. The items used to measure the constructs include “ability to research information” or “approach producers or providers for information” and are listed on p. 34.

Respondents who engaged in information-seeking behaviours were also asked whether their concerns remained or increased and whether they felt the desire to find out more about a product. The construct is defined as after searching for information from unspecified sources, or after approaching public authorities, producers or providers about a product of greatest personal concern, a boycotter’s or leading activist’s concerns remained or increased, and they felt the desire to find out more. The same three questions (“were you still concerned?”, “were you more concerned than before?”, and “did you feel you had to find out more?”) were presented to each respondent who indicted having searched for information or having approached public authorities, producers or providers. The answer options included “yes” or “no” (second questions on pp. 25, 28 and 30).

Nature of concerns consists of four components: 1) product safety, 2) non-affective injustice, 3) lack of trust in public authorities, and 4) lack of informed product choice.

Safety concerns are defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s concerns about a product of greatest personal concern regarding lack of scientific testing, health risks incurring from long time consumption, and the cause of environmental damage. Respondents could choose by selecting one of the options whether they think the “[product] is scientifically tested enough” or the “[product] is not scientifically tested
enough”. They could also choose between “safe” and “unsafe” regarding consuming the *product of greatest personal concern*. For two additional questions (“Are you concerned that [product]… would cause health risks if used for a long time” and “would cause environmental damage”) respondents could indicate “yes”, “no” or “don’t know”. This answering format for the latter question was chosen particularly because there is little evidence about the long-term effects and environmental damage of nanoparticles, desalinated water or recycled water. The questions can be found on p. 11.

Respondents were then asked about *non-affective injustice*, which is based on cognition or perception (van Zomeren et al. 2008). The construct in this research is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s cognition or perception that there is injustice happening regarding community consultation, producers’/providers’ economic interest, and injustice in relation to a *product of greatest personal concern*. Respondents could indicate with “enough” or “not enough” whether they thought the community had been consulted enough regarding the *product of greatest personal concern* (fourth question on p. 11). Respondents could then indicate “yes” or “no” when asked, “I am concerned that in relation to [product]… there is injustice happening” and “the producer or provider is only satisfying its economic interest” (p. 12).

*Lack of trust in public authorities* is a boycotter’s or leading activist’s mistrust in public authorities’ competence to protect consumers, as well as public authorities’ honesty towards consumers regarding a *product of greatest personal concern*. This is in line with previous research that conceptualised trust as indicated by honesty, competence, reliability or consistency (for example, Morgan and Hunt 1994; Delgado-Ballester 2004; Erdem and Swait 2004; Power, Whelan and Davies 2008; Cissé-Depardon and N'Goala 2009). Five items are adapted from previous studies using trust (Morgan and Hunt 1994; Delgado-Ballester, Munuera-Alemán and Yagüe-Guillén 2003; Singh, Kilgore, Jayanti, Agarwal and Gandarvakottai 2005; Cissé-Depardon and N'Goala 2009). For example, respondents could indicate whether they thought that public authorities “act when they know there is a problem”, “are providing enough regulations” or “are protecting the consumer/public”. The item “public authorities are too greatly influenced by producers or providers” was additionally developed for this study. All six items are listed in the second question on p. 12.
Respondents were then asked “Do you think in relation to [product] consumers or the public… have or has a product choice?” and “can make an informed product choice?” These two questions refer to lack of informed product choice, that is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s belief that consumers or the public have a choice or can make an informed choice about a product of greatest personal concern. The items are presented in the first question on p. 13.

The construct of emotions captures the existence or non-existence of a boycotter’s or leading activist’s positive and negative feelings about public authorities, producers or providers and the entire situation in the context of a product of greatest personal concern.

Measures for emotions are often framed around “I feel angry towards x” (Ettenson and Klein 2005; Valentino, Gregorowicz and Groenendyk 2009) or “How angry do you feel?” (Van Zomeren et al. 2004; Stuermer and Simon 2009). Usually, the aim is to measure the intensity of these emotions on a five- or seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. However, Lazarus (1991) suggests that a variety of emotions can motivate action, and feelings can range from annoyance to happiness (Allcorn 1994; Ward and Ostrom 2006). Several studies in consumer research use this range of emotions, distinguishing between positive and negative ones at a general level (for example, Richins 1997; Phillips and Baumgartner 2002; Laros and Steenkamp 2005). Following these suggestions, respondents could indicate “yes” or “no” whether they felt a range of positive and negative emotions about the entire situation regarding a product of greatest personal concern, public authorities, and producers or providers. The items were presented in random order, and included emotions such as feeling “disgusted”, “angry” or “happy”, and are listed on pp. 13, 29 and 31.

4.2.2.2 Triggers of leading activism

Triggers are proposed to differentiate boycotters from leading activists. In Phase 1, six triggers were identified: 1) a search for truth, 2) a perceived expertise, 3) a perceived lack of community knowledge, 4) a belief that no one else does anything, 5) a feeling of obligation to do something, and 6) a desire to educate and protect as well as the willingness to make a change.
The search for truth was measured with a single item and is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s feeling that they had to find out the truth about a product of greatest personal concern and started to search for information. For respondents who had not searched for information from an unspecified source, the question was framed as a general feeling: “In the past, have you felt that you had to find out the truth about [product]” (item number six, p. 24). For those respondents who indicated they had searched for information, the question reflected the search for truth as a cause for information search: “Why did you start looking for information? Because I felt I had to find out the truth about [product]” (item number six, p. 26).

Perceived expertise is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s feeling of being an expert or being regarded as expert by others about a product of greatest personal concern, and includes a self-assessed knowledge about product knowledge (scientific evidence, government policies or benefits to society) and product-usage knowledge (experience of its usage and how to avoid it). The construct of product-usage knowledge is borrowed from Mitchell and Dacin (1996), and the construct of product knowledge follows the definition from Moorthy, Ratchford and Talukdar (1997). Respondents were asked to indicate product-usage knowledge on a three-point scale (“not at all knowledgeable”, “moderately knowledgeable”, “very knowledgeable”). The six items presented to them included “Regarding [product], how knowledgeable are you about… and the benefits of it to society?” or “how to avoid it?”. All six items are listed in the first question, p. 32. One item was borrowed from Johnson and Russo (1984): “How would you rate your knowledge about [product] relative to the rest of the population?” Respondents were asked to rate their knowledge on a five-point scale ranging from “a lot more knowledgeable than the rest of the population” to “a lot less knowledgeable than the rest of the population” (p. 33). They could also indicate “yes” or “no” whether they felt that they were “an expert on [product]?” and whether “people see you as an expert on [product]?” (pp. 32 and 33).

A perceived lack of knowledge within the community is referred to as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s general belief that the community does not know enough about a product of greatest personal concern. This was measured with a single item (“Do you think the community knows enough about [product]?” and a binary answer scale of “yes” or “no” (third question on p. 33).
The belief that no one else does anything is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s feeling that if they don’t change the situation regarding a product of greatest personal concern then no one else will. Respondents were asked to select either “Concerning [product], do you feel that if you don’t change the situation then no one else will” or “Concerning [product], do you feel that if you don’t change the situation then someone else will” (second question p. 35).

Obligation as a trigger is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s feeling of having to do something about the current situation regarding a product of greatest personal concern. What “doing something” means is left unexplored. However, due to the research context, “having something to do” is assumed as boycotting or activism behaviour and has been categorised as obligation by Carrigan et al. (2004). Note that obligation is also part of the emotional importance of activism-construct for persistent leading activism, which investigates different components. The question “Concerning [product], do you feel you have to do something about the current situation?” with a binary answer format of “yes” or “no” refers to obligation as a trigger is included as first question, p. 35.

The construct referring to the last trigger about the desire to educate, protect and the willingness to make a change has three separate components. The desire to educate includes the components of a boycotter’s or leading activist’s desires to educate others, to allow everyone to make an informed product choice, or to pass on one’s knowledge about a product, or the belief that everyone has to know about the true situation regarding a product of greatest personal concern. Respondents were asked four questions that measured the desire to educate. They could “agree” or “disagree” with “I believe everyone needs to know what is really going on with [product]”; “I want everyone to make an informed product choice about [product]”; “I want to pass on my knowledge about [product] to family/friends”; and “I want to educate people about [product]” (p. 36).

The desire to protect is defined as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s wish to protect one’s family, other families and the community from a product of greatest personal concern and wishing something better than this product for them. Therefore, respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with “I want to protect my community from [product]”; “I want to protect my family from [product]”; “I want to
Definitions regarding willingness to make a change often include beliefs about being competent and influential in making a change, or the responsiveness to make a change (Easton 1965; Easton and Dennis 1967; Iyengar 1980; Niemi, Stephen and Mattei 1991). This research differs between the belief about the effectiveness and to which extent one would like to be involved in making a change. The belief, hence perceived efficacy, is part of the persisting activism construct which is in line with suggestions from Mannarini, Roccato et al. (2009) that collective efficacy is a significant factor motivating persistency. The extent to which a person would like to be involved in change is defined as willingness to make a change, specifically as a boycotter’s or leading activist’s willingness to lead or be involved and help in making a change concerning a product of greatest personal concern. The components of “change” are not investigated because it had not been specified by leading activists interviewed in Phase 1. Two items presented in the second question, p. 38, measure the willingness to make a change: “I want to lead in making a change concerning [product]” and “I want to be involved and help making a change concerning [product]”. Respondents could indicate with “yes” or “no” whether these statements applied to them.

4.2.2.3 Key factors influencing persistent leading activism

Four key factors were identified in Phase 1 as influencing persistency: 1) personality traits, 2) life experiences; 3) perceived efficacy, success and social support concerning their activities; as well as 4) emotional importance of leading activism.

Certain personality traits emerged in Phase 1. Some of the emerging aspects related to existing personality traits scales. According to discussions with six experts, these traits include tenacity, self-efficacy, sustainability, resilience and locus of control. After pre-testing existing scales and items as well as items derived from Phase 1, it was decided to use existing scales measuring self-efficacy and locus of control, and the newly developed items to measure personality traits in a situation an individual perceives as worth fighting for.
Personality traits are therefore defined as a persistent leading activist’s or non-persistent leading activist’s personal characteristic displayed in a situation that is perceived as worth fighting for. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement to seven statements on a five-point scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Items referring to these characteristics include: “If I feel something is worth fighting for… I do not get discouraged”; “I have a thick skin”; or “I consider more than rules and regulations in deciding what is right”. All seven items are listed on p. 40.

Regarding self-efficacy, Sherer’s general self-efficacy scale was used (Sherer et al. 1982). This general self-efficacy scale was developed to measure a general set of expectations that a person carries into new situations (Sherer et al. 1982), but also to assess expectancies of self-efficacy (Sherer and Adams 1983). Self-efficacy is the expectation that one can successfully perform a behaviour (Bandura 1977). Sherer’s general self-efficacy scale is a psychometrically sound and valid measure of dispositional general self-efficacy to predict reactions and behaviours across a variety of domains and cultures (Sherer et al. 1982; Chen, Gully and Eden 2001; Imam 2007). It is a Likert-type 17-item scale including items such as “When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them” (reverse item); “When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick with it until I finish it”, or “Failure just makes me try harder”. The scale is presented on p. 41.

The internal control index (Duttweiler 1984) is the second existing personality trait scale investigated in this research. The index measures internal locus of control: individuals with a high internal locus of control feel that they have control over their own actions as well as events in their environment (Rotter 1966), and believe that reinforcement of a specific behaviour is contingent on their own behaviour (Rotter, Chance and Phares 1972) and adopt a more active, problem-solving approach in stressful situations (Burgers 1991). Individuals with an external control orientation believe that reinforcement is contingent on luck, chance, or powerful others (Rotter et al. 1972). The internal control index (Duttweiler 1984) is a Likert-type 28-item scale focusing on aspects of personal choice, belief in one’s self, and independent action. Sample items are: “I ___ like jobs where I can make decisions and be responsible for my own work”; “I ___ like to have a say in any decisions made by any group I’m in”; or “I ___ stick to my opinions when someone disagrees with me” (Duttweiler 1984). In the
blank, respondents decide what their normal or usual attitude, feeling, or behaviour would be, ranging from “rarely” to “usually”. The scale is presented on pp. 43 and 44.

**Life experiences** as the second key factor influencing persistency can be related to the development across the life span which can have important implications for activism engagement (Stewart and McDermott 2004). *Life experiences* in this research are defined as persistent leading activists’ or non-persistent leading activists’ prior paid or unpaid work experience (for example, working as an activist or teacher), the frequency of community involvement experiences, and the experience of parents’ instilling of values in childhood or young adolescence. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had any paid or unpaid work experiences, for example, “with [product]”; “in the labour movement”; or “as a teacher”. The eleven items relating to *work experiences* can be found on p. 45. Respondents were also asked to what extent they agreed to items related to *parent’s instilments* (“I was brought up to be a responsible person”; “My parents have/had a strong sense of justice”; and “My parents taught me to stand up for things that are important to me”) on a five-point scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Another question asked to indicate the frequency on a three-point scale (“always”; “sometimes”; “never”) of “How often did you talk politics at home?”. And finally, the frequency of *community involvement* was also indicated on the three-point scale: “How often have you been involved in the community?” (p. 42).

The third key factor influencing persistency has three components: **perceived efficacy**, **success** and **social support** concerning a persistent leading activist’s activities. The definition of **perceived ability** is related to constructs used in prior research (for example, Klandermans 1984; Sen et al. 2001; Klein et al. 2002; Ettenson and Klein 2005; Mannarini et al. 2009; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). It is defined as a persistent leading activist’s or non-persistent leading activist’s feeling of being able to influence public authorities’, producers’ or providers’ behaviours through a strong movement, and feeling that one can influence others regarding a *product of greatest personal concern* and has strategies to avoid this product. Respondents could indicate **perceived efficacy** to influence of public authorities, producers or providers with “yes” or “no”. The questions were: “Do you think a strong movement against [product]… would drive public authorities to reconsider their policies?”; “would drive the producer or provider to reconsider community opinion?”; and “would be the best strategy to demand change?” (third question, p. 35). Respondents were next asked to indicate on a five-
point scale (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) their agreement to statements regarding influencing others (“I feel I can influence others and change their opinions concerning [product]”; and “I feel I can have an impact on society concerning [product]”) (first two questions, p. 38). The questions asked concerning a strategy to avoid a product were “Do you have a solution to avoid [product]” and, those who agreed to this question were also asked “Do you have a strategy to implement your solution to avoid [product]?” (pp. 9 and 10).

*Perceived success* is defined as a persistent leading activist’s or non-persistent leading activist’s perception that their activities as a leading activist regarding the *product of greatest personal concern* are successful and appreciated by others. The items related to perceived success are presented in the second question, p. 20 (“In relation to [product] do you feel that your activities are… successful?”; “appreciated by others?”). However, the questionnaire also targeted boycotters, and therefore a set of questions about *perceived success* was worded in the conditional form (second question, p. 15). Responses from boycotters were not considered in the persistent leading activism sample.

The construct of *perceived social support* is adapted from Klein, Smith et al. (2004). It is defined as a persistent leading activist’s or non-persistent leading activist’s feeling that they are supported by the community, family or friends when acting in a leading role against a *product of greatest personal concern*. Respondents could indicate “yes” or “no” whether they felt supported. The first question, p. 20, (“When you are active in relation to [product], are you supported by… the community?”; “your family?”; “your friends?”) investigated perceived social support. The same items were worded for boycotters in the conditional form and are not considered (p. 15).

The final key factor influencing persistency is related to the *emotional importance of leading activism*. The construct of *emotional importance* is defined as a persistent leading activist’s or non-persistent leading activist’s feeling that acting as leading activist against a *product of greatest personal concern* makes them happy, is heartfelt or passionate, is meaningful and is perceived as an obligation towards future generations. On p. 20, Question 4 reflects happiness and passion (“Do you feel your actions in relation to [product]… make you happy?”; “are heartfelt?”; “make you feel passionate?”). Question 3, p. 20, reflects meaningfulness (“do you feel your actions in
relation to [product]… are meaningful?” and “are your significant mission in life?”). The items for boycotters are presented on p. 15, but are not considered in this sample. Both questions on p. 37 refer to obligations. Respondents were asked to indicate “yes” or “no” whether these statements applied to them. Respondents were also asked about their obligation towards future generations: “Would you feel bad if you had to tell your grandchildren one day that you were not active, for example, initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott regarding [product]?” Respondents indicated their obligation with “yes”; “no, I wouldn’t feel bad” or “no, but I want someone else to do it” (second question, p. 37).

Socio-demographic variables were included at the end of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked about their education, occupation, relationship status or weekly income. The study uses measures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/web+pages/statistics). All questions and items can be found on pp. 46–61. Providing an answer to these questions was optional.

4.2.3 Pre-testing

The questionnaire was pre-tested to ensure that the measures corresponded semantically to the construct (Rossiter 2011a). Moreover, the pre-test checked that the questions were easily comprehensible by respondents, and that the scales were being interpreted correctly by respondents (Dolnicar and Gruen 2007). Altogether, 19 individuals participated in the pre-test. The pre-test sample was selected from the population to be used for the actual survey (Malhotra 2010), including four leading activists and 14 individuals who boycotted products, but did not participate in Phase 1 of the study. Additionally, the survey was pre-tested to make it appealing to respondents.

The questionnaire was pre-tested in two waves, as suggested by Aaker et al. (2001). The researcher was present while respondents completed the survey so that reactions to questions and scales could be observed. After the survey was completed, the respondent gave feedback about the survey and the researcher asked questions (Kumar, Aaker and Day 2009) accordingly to achieve the aims of waves one and two.

The aim of the first wave of pre-testing was to determine whether the instructions were clear; the questions were of an appropriate length and not double-barrelled as well as applicable to all respondents; whether any words had vague or ambiguous meanings but
were simple and direct; and whether the order of questions gained and maintained the respondent’s interest (Aaker et al. 2001).

The second wave of pre-testing focused on the elimination of order bias, which is the possibility that prior questions influence answers to subsequent questions (Aaker et al. 2001). Therefore, the questions were presented in a different order to several respondents. Identified bias was then corrected and the new order was pre-tested again. Each pre-testing wave was continued until no further changes were required.

4.3 Data analysis

Because the questionnaire was completed online, the collected data was automatically coded and entered into an SPSS file. This eliminated the possibility of errors in data entry. Nonetheless, frequency counts were run for all variables to check whether any mistakes had occurred during data coding or entry.

To eliminate ambiguous responses, out-of-range data or missing data (Malhotra 2010; Bhattacherjee 2012), the online survey was programmed so that respondents could not proceed to the next question until they had provided a valid answer for the current question. The data set included all responses. For the purposes of data analysis, all data was included except demographic characteristics, because this was not considered in the proposed model.

Data preparation (Aaker et al. 2001; Bhattacherjee 2012) included:

1) reversing negative loaded items in the internal locus of control scale and general self-efficacy scale according to the instructions given by the authors
2) summing questions of the same constructs (perception of efficacy, success and support and emotional importance of leading activism) with different wording for leading activists and boycotters into one variable
3) adding single items in order to create the scale measure according to the construct as provided in the measures section. For example, respondents who had searched for information, and respondents who had not searched for information, received different wordings in the questions. However, the questions related to the same constructs and were therefore added to create one measure.
After data preparation, each measure was tabulated again so that errors resulting from
data preparation could be identified and corrected, and frequency distributions were
examined (Aaker et al. 2001). The statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS
statistical software package version 19.0.

Cross-tabulations were used to gain insights into the structure and distribution of data.
To test whether there were significant differences between boycotters and leading
activists, persistent and non-persistent leading activists, chi-square tests were
performed. Pearson’s chi-square tests were used unless 25 per cent of the expected
values in any cells of a contingency table were below five. In this case, Fisher’s exact
tests were used (Campbell 2007) and are labelled as such in the results.

For non-binary data that was not normally distributed, the Mann-Whitney U-test was
applied (Voss 2004; Rinne 2008). For all other normally distributed data, t-tests were
used. Results were classified as significant if the \( p \)-value was below five per cent \( (p < 0.05) \) and marked with an asterisk (*) in the tables.

4.3.1 Sample description

The profile of the sample consisting of 58 leading activists and 172 boycotters, and the
profile of the sample consisting of 29 persistent leading activists and 31 non-persistent
leading activists are provided below. In some cases, respondents did not provide an
answer because the socio-demographic questions were optional. Where this is the case
responses are treated as missing data and percentages of the sample are given as valid
percentage values.

The majority (62\%) of leading activists who participated in this study were currently
active at the time of the survey. In terms of the number of hours spent each week on the
cause of most importance to them, 55 per cent stated they would work less than five
hours per week, 17 per cent stated between five and 10 hours, and 11 per cent devoted
more than 25 hours per week towards their cause-related activities.

Half of persistent leading activists (52\%) stated they spent less than five hours, and 17
per cent stated they spent between five and 10 hours per week on initiating or
organising activism. Seven per cent each stated they would devote between 11 to 15
hours or 16 to 20 hours of their time, and 14 percent worked even more than 25 hours towards leading activism on a weekly basis.

Slightly more boycotters and leading activists stated they watched the news and current affairs section seven days a week on TV (28%), than read it in the newspaper (24%). Only 17 per cent listened to news or current affairs programs on the radio. For 42 per cent of respondents ABC1 was the favourite TV channel and for 28 per cent of respondents, the Sydney Morning Herald was the newspaper of choice. Besides many different Australian newspapers, reading online newspapers was favoured by 21 per cent of respondents. Ten per cent of respondents did not read the newspaper at all, 12 per cent did not watch news on the TV and 19 per cent did not listen to news on the radio at all.

Reading (82%), watching TV/videos (69%) and collecting information about a particular topic on the internet (67%) represented the three most common leisure activities for boycotters and leading activists. Gambling (8%), tweeting (twitter) or vehicle maintenance (12%), and publishing on one’s own webpage (14%) were the three least common leisure activities.

Watching the news and current affairs programs on TV seven days a week was also favoured by persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists (32%), followed by reading news and current affairs in the newspaper (29%), and listening to the news programs on the radio (25%). Again, ABC1 was the favourite channel (50%), and the Sydney Morning Herald the favoured newspaper (23%). Online newspapers were preferred by 19 per cent of respondents, and only seven per cent stated they did not read the newspaper at all. Fourteen per cent did not watch the news on TV at all, and 18 per cent did not listen to the news on the radio at all.

The three most common leisure activities for persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists were reading (80%), watching TV/videos and collecting information about a particular topic on the internet (70%) as well as spending time with children or grandchildren (55%). Gambling (4%), collectables or vehicle maintenance (5%), and tweeting (twitter) (13%) were the three least common leisure activities.
4.3.1.1 Socio-demographics

One-third of leading activists and one-quarter of boycotters were male. In both samples, the majority was under 45 years old. Every second boycotter was from the Australian State of New South Wales, below ten per cent of boycotters were from the remaining states or territories each. Leading activists were predominantly from New South Wales (29%), Victoria (23%) and Queensland (20%). There was little difference between boycotters and leading activists regarding the area in which they lived and their highest level of education: approximately 67 per cent of all respondents lived in a major regional or in a capital city. Fifty-nine per cent of all respondents had gained a university degree. About two-thirds of leading activists and boycotters were married, but twice as many leading activists than boycotters were divorced (13% and 6% respectively).

This sample of persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists consists of 70 per cent women and 30 per cent men. The average age of a persistent leading activist was 50 years; whereas non-persistent leading activists were on average six years younger (average 44 years). Only one persistent leading activist was 34 years old, but 29 per cent were over 56 years. In contrast, the majority (70%) of non-persistent leading activists were under the age of 45, with just 11 per cent being older than 56 years.

Persistent leading activists were mostly recruited from New South Wales (21%), Western Australia (21%) and from Queensland (25%). They mainly came from a state or territory capital city, major regional city or regional centre (86%). Half of non-persistent leading activists (51%) lived in New South Wales; whereas the majority (87%) lived in a state or territory capital city or in a major regional city.

In both groups, approximately every second respondent (53%) had previously gained a university degree. They also had similar marital statuses, except that four times more persistent leading activists than non-persistent leading activists were divorced, and almost three times more were separated (8% and 3% respectively).

Table 2 provides information about the socio-demographics of leading activists, boycotters, persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists.
Table 2: Sample description: socio-demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 230)</th>
<th>Persistent leading activists (n = 29)</th>
<th>Non-persistent leading activists (n = 31)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Actual (68)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>Actual (3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–35</td>
<td>Actual (9)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>Actual (43)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–55</td>
<td>Actual (27)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–65</td>
<td>Actual (11)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>Actual (7)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian state/territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>Actual (3)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, 42 boycotters against no-choice products had acted as leading activists against any products before. Because of the study focus on no-choice products, these previously leading activists were not considered in the sample of boycotters and leading activists. If leading activists regarding any product met the selection criteria for non-persistent leading activists, they were included in the group. This is why the total subsample of leading activists exceeds the sample of leading activists against a no-choice product by 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>State/territory capital city</th>
<th>Major regional city</th>
<th>Regional centre</th>
<th>Rural/remote area</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate degree (PhD, Masters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate diploma/graduate certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>State/territory capital city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Postgraduate degree (PhD, Masters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major regional city</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate diploma/graduate certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional centre</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/remote area</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Postgraduate degree (PhD, Masters)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate diploma/graduate certificate</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced diploma/diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate I, II, III or IV</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently in a relationship</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.2  Employment status, occupation and income

The majority (58%) of the total sample worked part or full time, yet 12 per cent more leading activists were working full time. No leading activist was unemployed or looking for work. Prominent occupational areas in both samples were education (19%), health or community services (18%), and working in non-profit organisations (NGOs), in occupational safety and health departments (OH&S) or law as included in other areas (27%). One-quarter of the sample earned less than $AUD399 per week individually, one-quarter between $AUD1,000 and $AUD2,000, and just over one-quarter did not provide an answer. Regarding weekly household income, one-third earned less than $AUD799, and just less than one-third of the total sample earned above $AUD1,700. Again, one-quarter did not provide an answer.

Most persistent leading activists said they were working full time (32%) or were self-employment or looked after family members (22%). In contrast to this, most non-persistent leading activists were working full time (29%) or part time (29%). In both samples, occupations were mainly in the education sector (15%) or health / community services (16%). No respondent was unemployed or looking for work.

There was little difference between the two groups regarding income. Twenty-one per cent of both groups earned over $AUD1,300 individually per week, with just less than one quarter earning less than $AUD399 individually per week. Regarding weekly household income, about one quarter earned more than $AUD1,700. However, three times more persistent leading activists than non-persistent ones preferred not to provide an answer. Table 3 provides information about employment status, occupation and income.
Table 3: Sample description: employment status, occupation and income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 230)</th>
<th>Persistent leading activists (n = 29)</th>
<th>Non-persistent leading activists (n = 31)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>Actual (39)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time or casually</td>
<td>Actual (25)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment but looking for work</td>
<td>Actual (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>Actual (7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Actual (11)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time student</td>
<td>Actual (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Actual (14)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational area</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 230)</th>
<th>Persistent leading activists (n = 29)</th>
<th>Non-persistent leading activists (n = 31)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation, cafés, restaurants</td>
<td>Actual (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>Actual (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication services</td>
<td>Actual (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Actual (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and recreational services</td>
<td>Actual (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrics, gas and water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government administration and defense</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and community services</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and other services</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and business services</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross weekly individual income (AUD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0–149</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150–249</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross weekly household income (AUD)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
<td>15 (9)</td>
<td>20 (9)</td>
<td>2 (14)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0–249</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250–399</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>16 (7)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400–599</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>14 (10)</td>
<td>20 (11)</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500–799</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>18 (12)</td>
<td>25 (11)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600–799</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>28 (17)</td>
<td>35 (16)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>9 (31)</td>
<td>12 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800–999</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>25 (11)</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>7 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000–1,299</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>20 (9)</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>9 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,300–1,599</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
<td>22 (10)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>5 (18)</td>
<td>7 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,600–1,999</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td>14 (10)</td>
<td>20 (9)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,700–2,499</td>
<td>11 (19)</td>
<td>36 (22)</td>
<td>47 (21)</td>
<td>7 (25)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>10 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500–3,299</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $3,300</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.3  Product of greatest personal concern

Table 4 shows that most respondents chose genetically modified foods (44%) and food additives (39%) as the product of greatest personal concern. Desalinated water and nanoproducts were the products chosen least frequently. Leading activists were three times more likely to choose water fluoridation than boycotters.

Most persistent leading activists chose genetically modified foods (59%), followed by food additives (21%) and water fluoridation (10%). Non-persistent leading activists were mostly concerned about food additives (45%), then genetically modified foods (29%) and recycled water (13%). No respondent chose desalinated water as the product of greatest personal concern.

The product of greatest personal concern is hereafter referred to as “product”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Actual (%)</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 230)</th>
<th>Persistent leading activists (n = 29)</th>
<th>Non-persistent leading activists (n = 31)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycled water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>6 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetically modified foods</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>27 (47)</td>
<td>74 (43)</td>
<td>101 (44)</td>
<td>17 (59)</td>
<td>9 (29)</td>
<td>26 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food additives</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>18 (31)</td>
<td>71 (41)</td>
<td>89 (39)</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>14 (45)</td>
<td>20 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanoproducts</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalinated water</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fluoridation</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td>9 (5)</td>
<td>17 (7)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>5 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Results

The following sections examine each construct included in the theoretical model to explore differences between the four groups of interest: boycotters and leading activists, as well as persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists.

4.4.1 Similarities between boycotters and leading activists

The theoretical model in Phase 1 postulates similarities between boycotters and leading activists regarding information-seeking behaviours about a product they are strongly concerned about and boycott, increasing or remaining concerns and the desire to find out more after information search, nature of concerns and emotions. Overall, the statistical tests support most of these similarities postulated by the model, except for information-seeking behaviours, non-affective injustice, anger, disgust and being annoyed about public authorities and the entire situation surrounding a product. These variables indicating prevalence in leading activists are considered possible predictors in addition to the triggers in Phase 3.

4.4.1.1 Information-seeking behaviours

Information-seeking behaviours about a product consists of several aspects: 1) seeking information about a product in general; 2) experiences of approaching public authorities and producers or providers; and 3) having resigned from approaching these parties. The 4) ability of leading activists’ and boycotters’ to actually search for information is also considered. From an organisation’s perspective it might also be useful to know 5) why individuals start searching for information, which is presented in reasons to start searching for information. If this is known, it may be possible to manage these triggers such that boycotts are avoided.

Table 5 shows differences in information-seeking behaviours between boycotters and leading activists. Significantly more leading activists than boycotters seek information, spend a lot of time on it and have expressed their concerns to public authorities as well as producers or providers. Interestingly, less than one-third of boycotters approached public authorities, producers or providers, which stresses the importance of considering these two variables in the prediction model in Phase 3.
Table 5: Differences in information-seeking behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n = 230)</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought information in general</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>209 (91)</td>
<td>58 (100)</td>
<td>151 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of time spent on seeking</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>102 (44)</td>
<td>43 (74)</td>
<td>59 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concerns to public</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>99 (43)</td>
<td>48 (83)</td>
<td>51 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concerns to producer /</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>88 (38)</td>
<td>39 (67)</td>
<td>49 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 presents the similarities and differences between leading activists and boycotters regarding perceived responses of public authorities. No significant differences between the two groups were expected, and the results indicate no difference except for public authorities’ replies. About three times more leading activists than boycotters said they always got a reply when they approached public authorities for information; however, significantly more boycotters said they never received a reply. Another interesting, yet not significant result is that twice as many leading activists than boycotters reported receiving contradictory information from public authorities (40%). Furthermore, both groups stated they were only sometimes listened to, they never got all information they wanted, and they only sometimes felt that people who asked questions were respected. Because of the lack of significance of these results, these variables are not considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.
Table 6: Responses of public authorities and producers or providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses of public authorities (total n = 99; leading activists n = 48; boycotters n = 51)</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading activists</td>
<td>Boycotters</td>
<td>Leading activists</td>
<td>Boycotters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got contradictory information Actual (%)</td>
<td>19 (40)</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>25 (52)</td>
<td>34 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was listened to Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>25 (52)</td>
<td>24 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got all information I wanted Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>20 (42)</td>
<td>18 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt people who ask questions are respected Actual (%)</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>23 (48)</td>
<td>28 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got a reply Actual (%)</td>
<td>17 (35)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>26 (55)</td>
<td>28 (55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses of producers or providers (total n = 88; leading activists n = 39; boycotters n = 49)

| I got contradictory information Actual (%)    | 13 (34) | 9 (18) | 20 (51) | 30 (61) | 6 (15) | 10 (21) | 2.625 |
| I was listened to Actual (%)                  | 5 (13)  | 2 (4)  | 19 (49) | 33 (67) | 14 (38) | 14 (29) | 4.005 |
| I got all the information I wanted Actual (%) | 2 (5)   | 1 (2)  | 17 (44) | 28 (57) | 20 (51) | 20 (41) | 1.911 |
| I felt people who ask questions are respected Actual (%) | 1 (3) | 2 (4) | 20 (51) | 24 (49) | 18 (46) | 22 (47) | 0.173 |
| I got a reply Actual (%)                      | 9 (23)  | 6 (12) | 25 (64) | 31 (64) | 5 (13) | 12 (24) | 3.028 |
As expected, there were no significant differences between leading activists and boycotters in approaching experiences with producers or providers. Frequency analysis indicates that more leading activists than boycotters reported receiving contradictory information (33% versus 18%); not being listened to (38% versus 29%); and never receiving all the information they wanted (51% versus 41%). Interestingly, almost twice as many leading activists than boycotters reported always receiving a reply from producers or providers (23% versus 12%). Yet the majority of leading activists and boycotters (64%) said that producers or providers responded only some of the time. Again, due to the lack of significance of the differences found, the responses of producers or providers are not considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.

Table 7 presents the frequency distributions of those who were still approaching producers or providers and public authorities at the time of data collection. Regarding having resigned from approaching producers or providers, only 33 per cent of respondents (59 individuals) had stopped approaching at the time of data collection. The majority was still actively approaching (67%), 74 per cent of leading activists, and 62 per cent of boycotters. These results are not significant according to chi-square tests ($\chi^2$ (df = 1, n = 88) = 1.696, $p = 0.193$). Ninety per cent of leading activists reported being certain to continue approaching producers or providers in the future, and 63 per cent of boycotters reported the same. Only three per cent of leading activists and 10 per cent of boycotters were certain to stop approaching producers or providers in future. However, the frequency distributions are rather small, which might be the cause for the insignificant chi-square results. These results are therefore regarded as indicative, and are not included in the prediction model for Phase 3.

The majority (70%) of respondents who had approached public authorities in the past were still approaching at the time of data collection. Surprisingly, this figure included 14 per cent more boycotters than leading activists. According to chi-square tests this result is not significant ($\chi^2$ (df = 1, n = 99) = 2.407, $p = 0.121$). Those who were still approaching revealed significant ($p = 0.005$) differences regarding having resigned from approaching. Leading activists appeared to be determined to keep approaching public authorities (92% were certain and only 8% reported that they might stop). In contrast, only 59 per cent of boycotters were certain to continue approaching, but 31 per cent said they might stop, and nine per cent were sure to stop. Because of the rather
small cell sizes, chi-square results can only be considered as indicative and this variable is therefore not included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

Table 7: Having resigned from approaching producers, providers or public authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Producers or providers (n = 59)</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 29)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 30)</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certain to keep</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>26 (90)</td>
<td>19 (63)</td>
<td>5.674 (.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might stop</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>8 (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure to stop</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Producers or providers (n = 59)</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 37)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 32)</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certain to keep</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>34 (92)</td>
<td>19 (59)</td>
<td>10.708 (.005)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might stop</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
<td>10 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure to stop</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model that emerged from Phase 1 postulates that leading activists and boycotters have particular information seeking abilities. These are the abilities to: 1) research information; 2) analyse information; 3) understand scientific information; and 4) approach public authorities and producers or providers for information. For the statistical group analysis, the Mann-Whitney U-test was used for non-parametric samples.

Table 8 provides the results regarding information seeking abilities. More leading activists than boycotters have stated that they had approached public authorities and producers or providers (68% versus 27% respectively). It is therefore not surprising that leading activists rated both their ability to approach public authorities and producers or providers as very good ($p = 0.001$). These results are significant and are therefore considered in the prediction model in Phase 3. No significant differences between boycotters and leading activists were found regarding the ability to research, analyse and understand scientific information.
Table 8: Information seeking abilities (total n = 230; leading activists n = 58; boycotters n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Neither good nor bad</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Never done</th>
<th>p-value$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Leading activists</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>17 (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Boycotters</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
<td>19 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyse information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Leading activists</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Boycotters</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
<td>19 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understand scientific information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Leading activists</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22 (32)</td>
<td>26 (45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Boycotters</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
<td>19 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach public authorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Leading activists</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 (27)</td>
<td>30 (52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Boycotters</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 (27)</td>
<td>30 (52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach producers/providers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Leading activists</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50 (29)</td>
<td>28 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%) Boycotters</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50 (29)</td>
<td>28 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ p-value according to Mann-Whitney U-test
The last aspect of information-seeking behaviours relates to the reasons for an individual starting to search for information. Based on the model developed in Phase 1 it is expected that leading activists and boycotters have the same six product-related reasons and two personal reasons that might lead them to search for information. The results presented in Table 9 indicate that leading activists and boycotters display five of six similar product-related reasons. The feeling of having to find out the truth about a product, safety concerns related to this product, and that public authorities and producers or providers provided too little information about a product scored the highest for boycotters and leading activists. Only every second respondent said that negative product experiences lead to information search. Significant differences were found between leading activists and boycotters regarding one product-related reason, which was wanting the option of staying away from the product and choosing an alternative. The two personal reasons of perceiving that one’s family and the community was affected by a product was a trigger in significantly more leading activists than boycotters in generating a desire to start searching for information. These significant differences are considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.

Table 9: Information seeking reasons (n = 209)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 151)</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I had to find out the truth about the product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 57 (98)</td>
<td>138 (91)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were safety concerns with the product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 55 (95)</td>
<td>141 (93)</td>
<td>0.151 (.698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities were providing too little information about the product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 52 (90)</td>
<td>124 (82)</td>
<td>1.790 (.181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The producer/provider was providing too little information about the product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 50 (86)</td>
<td>129 (85)</td>
<td>0.021 (.886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had negative experiences with the product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 29 (50)</td>
<td>64 (42)</td>
<td>0.984 (.321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted the option of staying away from the product and choosing an alternative product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 58 (100)</td>
<td>140 (93)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.025)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4.1.2 Remaining or increasing concerns and the desire to find out more after information search

According to the theoretical model, *information search* about a product results not only in *remaining concerns*, but also produces *increased concerns* and a *desire to find out more*. The results confirm that this is the case for both boycotters and leading activists. Therefore, because no significant differences were found between the groups, these variables are not considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.

However, to gain insights into whether public authorities or producers and providers could ease concerns, the results are presented separately in Table 10. According to the results, public authorities were not able to reduce concerns. One hundred per cent of boycotters and leading activists stated that their concerns remained. Ninety per cent of leading activists reported being even more concerned than they were before they approached public authorities in the first place, and 87 per cent felt the desire to find out more. Public authorities were slightly more successful in reducing concerns of boycotters - about one-quarter of boycotters stated they were not concerned any more and were not encouraged to find out more after the approach.

The results show that producers or providers are slightly more successful than public authorities in reducing concerns. Producers or providers were able to reduce concerns for only three per cent of leading activists, and only four per cent of boycotters. Nevertheless, the majority of respondents stated that they were more concerned than before the approach, and that they felt the desire to find out more about the product.
Table 10: Concerns and the desire to find out more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns remained</th>
<th>After general information search (n = 209)</th>
<th>After approaching public authorities (n = 99)</th>
<th>After approaching producers or providers (n = 88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading Activists (n = 58)</td>
<td>Boycotters (n = 151)</td>
<td>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns remained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>58 (100)</td>
<td>151 (100)</td>
<td>no results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns increased</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>53 (91)</td>
<td>130 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to find out more</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>53 (91)</td>
<td>130 (86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.3 Nature of concerns

Based on the findings of Phase 1, the nature of respondents’ concerns can be split into four different categories: 1) product safety; 2) non-affective injustice; 3) lack of trust in public authorities; and 4) lack of informed product choice. The model developed in Phase 1 postulates that there are no significant differences between leading activists and boycotters regarding these concerns. Overall, the results support the model, except for some aspects of non-affective injustice. Specifically, non-affective injustice in relation to the product is therefore considered in the theoretical model in Phase 3.

Concerns about product safety considered health risks, environmental damage, scientific testing and that the product was unsafe for human use or consumption. Ninety-three per cent of all respondents were concerned that the products would cause health risks if used for a long time (Table 11). Seventy-nine per cent of leading activists and 64 per cent of boycotters were concerned that the products would cause environmental damage. Interestingly, almost one-quarter of boycotters, which is twice as many leading activists, were unsure about environmental damage.
Table 11: Concerns about product safety (total n = 230; leading activists n = 58; boycotters n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading activists</td>
<td>Boycotters</td>
<td>Leading activists</td>
<td>Boycotters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product would cause health risks if used for a long time</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>54 (93)</td>
<td>160 (93)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>46 (79)</td>
<td>110 (64)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product would cause environmental damage</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>54 (93)</td>
<td>160 (93)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 provides additional detailed results about the nature of concerns. Except for non-affective injustice, which is perceived significantly more strongly by leading activists than boycotters, the results clearly show that boycotters and leading activists share the same concerns. Almost all respondents (94%) thought that the products were not scientifically tested enough and were unsafe for human use or consumption (safety concerns). Ninety-seven per cent of all respondents agreed that the community had not been consulted enough about the products (lack of informed product choice), and 98 per cent of all respondents were sure that producers or providers were only satisfying their economic interests (non-affective injustice).

Table 12: Nature of concerns (n = 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leading Activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Chi-square ( \chi^2 ) (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product is scientifically not tested enough</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>54 (93)</td>
<td>163 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>55 (95)</td>
<td>158 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-affective injustice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community has been consulted enough</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The producer/provider is only satisfying its economic interest</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>57 (98)</td>
<td>163 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is injustice happening in relation to products</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>56 (97)</td>
<td>139 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of trust in public authorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities act when they know there is a problem</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td>41 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities are too greatly influenced by producers/providers</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>52 (90)</td>
<td>150 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities take responsibility for resulting problems</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities are honest to consumers/the public</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>9 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trust in public authorities was weak for both boycotters and leading activists. Overall, frequency tests revealed that boycotters were marginally more likely to trust public authorities than leading activists, between three and ten per cent. Interestingly, the greatest difference of ten per cent agreement between the groups produced the variables about trust in public authorities that they will act when they know there is a problem. The second greatest difference of five per cent, was regarding public authorities taking responsibility for resulting problems.

A similar proportion of both groups agreed that public authorities were too greatly influenced by producers or providers, and were not honest with consumers or the public. Leading activists indicated they had no trust at all in public authorities in providing consumer protection or regulation (zero%). These two matters were also assigned to the lowest trust category by boycotters.

Finally, concerns about a lack of informed product choice produced one unexpected result: 40 per cent of leading activists and 45 per cent of boycotters agreed that consumers or the public do have a product choice. This could be explained by the fact that 73 per cent of all respondents had a solution for how to avoid the products, so they therefore felt as though they had a choice. However, only a minority of leading activists and boycotters (17% versus 28%) believed that consumers or the public can make an informed product choice.

4.4.1.4 Emotions

Based on the model developed in Phase 1 it is expected that boycotters and leading activists display similar types of emotions towards: 1) public authorities; 2) producers or providers; and 3) the entire situation. The results are presented in Table 13.
Table 13: Emotions regarding public authorities, producers or providers and the entire situation surrounding a product (total n = 230; leading activists n = 58; boycotters n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Leading activists</th>
<th>Producers/providers</th>
<th>Entire situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>45 (78)</td>
<td>7.040 (.008)*</td>
<td>100 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgusted</td>
<td>47 (81)</td>
<td>13.241 (.000)*</td>
<td>93 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>54 (93)</td>
<td>6.325 (.012)*</td>
<td>134 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displeased</td>
<td>52 (90)</td>
<td>0.071 (.790)</td>
<td>151 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td>0.861 (.353)</td>
<td>34 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>Fisher's exact test (.442)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>Fisher's exact test (.574)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>Fisher's exact test (1.000)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't care</td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
<td>0.050 (.823)</td>
<td>35 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fisher's exact test
The findings partly support the model. There are no significant differences between the two groups regarding emotions of being displeased, indifferent, happy, safe and comfortable. Moreover, respondents did not care about public authorities, producers or providers and the entire situation. No differences were found in how annoyed the two groups felt towards producers or providers. As expected, positive feelings scored low, negative feelings scored high.

The findings do not support the model developed in Phase 1 regarding the negative emotions of being angry and disgusted towards public authorities, producers or providers as well as the entire situation surrounding the products. Leading activists typically scored higher in these negative emotions. Furthermore, the emotion of being annoyed is another typical feature of leading activists, yet this annoyance only seemed to be directed at public authorities and the situation as a whole, rather than towards producers or providers.

Two emotions revealed the greatest difference between the two groups of respondents: leading activists were significantly more likely to be angry with the entire situation (28% more than boycotters); and they were also more likely to be disgusted with the public authorities (27% more than boycotters). Feeling angry has previously been found as motivating boycotting behaviour and collective action (Ettenson and Klein 2005; Stuermer and Simon 2009; Lindenmeier et al. 2012), and is therefore considered as a possible predictor for the model in Phase 3.

4.4.2 Triggers of leading activism

Contrary to the previous section where it was (based on the model developed in Phase 1) expected that boycotters would not significantly differ from leading activists, it is now expected that significant differences will be found between the groups regarding triggers of leading activism.

The triggers postulated in the theoretical model are: 1) search for truth; 2) perceived expertise; 3) perceived lack of knowledge within community about a product; 4) a belief that no one else does anything; 5) a feeling of obligation to do something; and 6) a desire to educate and protect as well as the willingness to make a change. Results indicate that all triggers except for a perceived lack of knowledge within the community and some aspects of the desire to educate and protect others do differentiate between
leading activists and boycotters. All significant triggers are included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

4.4.2.1  Search for truth

As expected, significant differences were found between groups concerning their feeling that they needed to search for truth regarding their product of concern ($\chi^2$ (df = 1, n = 230) = 6.297, $p = 0.012$)): 98 per cent of leading activists felt they had to search for the truth, compared to 87 per cent of boycotters.

4.4.2.2  Perceived expertise

Leading activists were more likely to believe they were a lot more knowledgeable about products when compared to the rest of the population (52% compared to 20% of boycotters), whereas boycotters were more likely to believe they were just more knowledgeable (51% compared to 43% of leading activists). Only five per cent of leading activists believed they were as knowledgeable as the rest of the population, yet 28 per cent of boycotters believed this to be the case. Only one per cent of boycotters believed they were a lot less knowledgeable than the rest of the population; whereas no leading activist believed themselves to be less knowledgeable. These results are significant according to the Mann-Witney U-test ($p = 0.000$).

The results presented in Table 14 suggest that perceived knowledge is a component of the perceived expertise construct, which acts as a trigger for leading activism. Boycotters described themselves as being moderately knowledgeable regarding all measures. Chi-square tests reported significant differences between leading activists and boycotters; specifically, leading activists reported more often than boycotters to be very knowledgeable about:

- the work of public authorities
- government policies
- the experiences of its usage and its scientific evidence
- the dangers to society
- the benefits to society
- product alternatives
- how to avoid no-choice products.
Table 14: Knowledge as a component of perceived expertise (total n = 230; leading activists n = 58; boycotters n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived knowledge about</th>
<th>Not at all knowledgeable</th>
<th>Moderately knowledgeable</th>
<th>Very knowledgeable</th>
<th>Chi-square ( \chi^2 ) (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading activists</td>
<td>Boycotters</td>
<td>Leading activists</td>
<td>Boycotters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of public authorities</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 (17)</td>
<td>55 (37)</td>
<td>32 (55)</td>
<td>103 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policies</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 (17)</td>
<td>55 (37)</td>
<td>31 (53)</td>
<td>98 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of usage</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (12)</td>
<td>38 (22)</td>
<td>26 (45)</td>
<td>108 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific evidence</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (12)</td>
<td>29 (17)</td>
<td>30 (52)</td>
<td>120 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangers to society</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>21 (36)</td>
<td>118 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to society</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (10)</td>
<td>40 (23)</td>
<td>25 (43)</td>
<td>95 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product alternatives</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>24 (14)</td>
<td>24 (41)</td>
<td>86 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to avoid it</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>28 (16)</td>
<td>22 (38)</td>
<td>76 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \( p < .05 \)
Only 36 per cent of leading activists perceived themselves as experts, which contradicts the qualitative findings in Phase 1. However, when compared to boycotters, leading activists were significantly more likely to feel as though they were experts and that they were regarded as such by others (Table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15: Perception as expert (n = 230)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel as though I am an expert (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others regard me as an expert (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.3  Lack of knowledge within community

All leading activists (100%) and almost all boycotters (98%) agreed that the community does not know enough about a product. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups according to Fisher’s exact test ($p = 0.252$). Therefore, this trigger is not included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

4.4.2.4  No one does anything

The results confirm that significantly more leading activists than boycotters perceived that if they did not change the situation concerning a product, no one else would (64% compared with 38%, respectively; $\chi^2$ (df = 1, n = 230) = 11.882, $p = 0.001$). Consequently, this construct serves as a trigger for leading activists and is therefore suggested to be included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

4.4.2.5  Obligation to change

As expected, significantly more leading activists (90%) than boycotters (69%) felt an obligation to do something about the current situation regarding a product ($\chi^2$ (df = 1, n = 230) = 9.529, $p = 0.002$). Therefore, obligation to change serves as trigger in the prediction model in Phase 3.
4.4.2.6 *Desire to educate and protect, as well as the willingness to make a change*

Leading activists differed from boycotters in only five out of 12 items used to measure the *desire to educate and protect*, as well as the *willingness to make a change*. The item “educating people about a product” in the second row of Table 16 can be considered to be one of the triggers for leading activism, because significantly more leading activists than boycotters agreed to it. In particular, the desire to protect others suggests that leading activists’ have a caring attitude towards the community, which also appears to be a significant trigger for leading activism. The results regarding protecting the community as well as other families, depicted in the middle of Table 16, are significant. The last part of Table 16 displays the differences in the types of involvement respondents have regarding the *willingness to make a change*. Fifty-five per cent of leading activists indicated a desire to take the lead in making a change, compared to only 16 per cent of boycotters. When asked if respondents wanted to help or support in making a change, 93 per cent of leading activists agreed, compared to only 82 per cent of boycotters. Both results are significant; therefore, both items regarding the *willingness to make a change* are considered triggers for leading activism and included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

Table 16: Desire to educate, protect and willingness to make a change (n = 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leading activists (n = 58)</th>
<th>Boycotters (n = 172)</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to educate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating people about a product</td>
<td>Actual (%) 55 (95)</td>
<td>139 (81)</td>
<td>6.452 (.011)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to pass on knowledge to friends/family</td>
<td>Actual (%) 56 (97)</td>
<td>160 (93)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone needs to know what is going on</td>
<td>Actual (%) 57 (98)</td>
<td>169 (98)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting everyone to make an informed product choice</td>
<td>Actual (%) 57 (98)</td>
<td>169 (98)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to protect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to protect community</td>
<td>Actual (%) 58 (100)</td>
<td>151 (88)</td>
<td>7.793 (.005)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to protect other families</td>
<td>Actual (%) 57 (98)</td>
<td>151 (88)</td>
<td>5.128 (.024)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Differences between persistent and non-persistent leading activists regarding wanting to protect own family, wanting something better for own family, wanting something better for other families, wanting something better for community, willingness to make a change (lead in change and help/support in change), and Fisher’s exact test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wanting to protect own family</th>
<th>Actual (%)</th>
<th>Fisher’s exact test (.116)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting something better for own family</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting something better for other families</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting something better for community</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to make a change</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead in change</th>
<th>Actual (%)</th>
<th>Fisher’s exact test (.002)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help / support in change</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.041)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.3 Key factors influencing persistent leading activism

The aim of this section is to explore which of the key factors found in Phase 1 distinguish persistent leading activists from non-persistent leading activists. These key factors can then be included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

The model developed in Phase 1 postulates that persistent leading activists differ from non-persistent leading activists regarding specific: 1) personality traits; 2) life experiences; 3) perceived efficacy, success and social support concerning their activities; as well as 4) emotional importance of leading activism.

#### 4.4.3.1 Personality traits

The three personality traits investigated are: 1) activism personality traits; 2) general self-efficacy; and 3) internal locus of control. It is expected that persistent leading activists differ from non-persistent leading activists regarding all three categories. The results confirm higher general self-efficacy and internal locus of control of persistent leading activists (Table 17), but also show some similarities between the two groups concerning activism personality traits (Table 18).
Table 17: Personality traits: scores and standard deviations by persistent and non-persistent leading activists (total n = 60,58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent (n = 29)</td>
<td>Non-persistent (n = 31)</td>
<td>Persistent (n = 29)</td>
<td>Non-persistent (n = 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-efficacy</td>
<td>73.41</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal locus of control</td>
<td>97.29</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: General activism traits of persistent and non-persistent leading activists
(total n = 60; persistent leading activists n = 29; non-persistent leading activists n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>( p )-value according to Mann-Whitney U-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep going until I get what I want</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 6 (19) 10 (35) 15 (52) 9 (31) 3 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep going when others give up</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0 (0) 1 (3) 1 (3) 5 (16) 3 (10) 7 (23) 14 (48) 13 (42) 11 (38) 5 (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get mad, but then get even</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>3 (10) 4 (13) 5 (17) 11 (35) 9 (31) 12 (39) 5 (17) 4 (13) 7 (24) 0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have a victim mentality</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (3) 0 (0) 0 (0) 1 (3) 2 (7) 5 (16) 10 (34) 17 (55) 16 (55) 8 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t get discouraged</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0 (0) 1 (3) 4 (14) 6 (19) 3 (10) 4 (13) 12 (41) 15 (48) 10 (34) 5 (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a thick skin</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (3) 0 (0) 5 (17) 9 (29) 1 (3) 5 (16) 14 (48) 14 (45) 8 (28) 3 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider more than rules and regulations in deciding what is right</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>0 (0) 1 (3) 0 (0) 2 (6) 1 (3) 5 (16) 12 (41) 11 (35) 16 (55) 12 (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p \)-value according to Mann-Whitney U-test
As can be seen in Table 18, general activism traits also showed some similarities between persistent and non-persistent leading activists. Persistent leading activists typically: keep going until they get what they want; keep going when others give up; get mad but then get even; and don’t have a victim mentality. High scores regarding not getting discouraged, having a thick skin and considering more than rules and regulations in deciding what is right, were characteristics of both persistent and non-persistent leading activists. The significant results are considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.

4.4.3.2 Life experiences

Life experiences are influenced by: 1) prior paid or unpaid work experiences; 2) community involvement; and 3) parental modelling. Based on the model developed in Phase 1, it is postulated that persistent leading activists have more of the life experiences identified in Phase 1 than non-persistent leading activists.

Table 19 shows that the persistent leading activists were more likely to have prior paid or unpaid work experience as an activist, and also more experience with the particular product that concerned them ($p = 0.004$ and $p = 0.008$, respectively). These experiences are considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.

All other results are indicative only because they are not significant. Persistent and non-persistent leading activists were more likely to have had experience performing community work, as head of a group of people, in the public sector or in a non-government organisation. Half of persistent leading activists had experience as a teacher.

| Table 19: Differences in work experiences by persistent and non-persistent leading activists (n = 56) |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Work experience with a product | Persistent (n = 28) | Non-persistent (n = 28) | Chi-square | p-value |
| Actual (%) | 11 (39) | 2 (7) | 8.114 | .004* |
| As an activist | Actual (%) | 11 (68) | 9 (32) | 7.143 | .008* |
Community involvement is not a significant characteristic of persistent leading activists, but seems to be a common characteristic of all leading activists ($\chi^2 (df = 1, n = 60) = 1.610, p = 0.205$). All respondents had been involved in the community. About one-half of persistent leading activists stated they had always been involved in the community (45%), the other half stated that their involvement had been sometimes (55%). Interestingly, just over one-quarter of non-persistent leading activists said that they had always been involved (29%), but almost three-quarters (71%) stated that they had sometimes been involved in the community. This result supports previous research, which has found that community involvement has an impact on participation in collective action (Klandermans et al. 2008; Mannarini et al. 2009).

No significant differences were found between persistent and non-persistent leading activists regarding all measures of parental modelling (Table 20). Persistent leading activists were more likely to agree strongly that they had been brought up to be responsible people, that their parents had a strong sense of justice and that they taught them to stand up to things that are important for them. Non-persistent leading activists were less likely to “agree strongly” and were more likely to “agree” only. In addition, most respondents reported having “sometimes” talked politics at home (55% persistent leading activists compared to 61% of non-persistent leading activists); followed by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community work</th>
<th>Actual (%)</th>
<th>26 (93)</th>
<th>22 (79)</th>
<th>Fisher’s exact test (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As head of a group of people</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>22 (79)</td>
<td>17 (61)</td>
<td>2.112 (.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>16 (57)</td>
<td>20 (71)</td>
<td>1.244 (.265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a non-governmental organisation</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>17 (61)</td>
<td>17 (61)</td>
<td>0.000 (1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As teacher</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>24 (50)</td>
<td>9 (32)</td>
<td>1.845 (.174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an advocate</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>13 (46)</td>
<td>8 (29)</td>
<td>1.905 (.168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour movement</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>7 (25)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>1.948 (.163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH&amp;S representative</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>5 (18)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As politician</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“never” (31% persistent leading activists versus 23% non-persistent leading activists).
Interestingly though, only 14 per cent of persistent leading activists and 16 per cent of non-persistent leading activists stated that they had always talked politics at home ($\chi^2$ (df = 1, n = 60) = 0.759, p = 0.552). The results regarding parental modelling appear to be typical of activists in general (rather than a characteristic that differentiates persistent leading activists), a finding which supports previous research (for example, Haan et al. 1968; Block et al. 1969). Due to the lack of significant differences found, none of these variables are included in the prediction model in Phase 3.
Table 20: Differences in parental modelling by persistent and non-persistent leading activists
(total n = 60; persistent leading activists n = 29; non-persistent leading activists n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>p-value(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Non-persistent</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Non-persistent</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Non-persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought up to be responsible person</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have/had strong sense of justice</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents taught to stand up for things that are important for oneself</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3.3 Perceptions of efficacy, success and social support

It is expected that persistent leading activists differ from non-persistent leading activists regarding the perceptions of: 1) *efficacy*; 2) *success*; and 3) *social support*. The results are partly significant, and therefore confirm that persistent leading activists are more likely to report perceptions of success, support and efficacy. The related significant variables are therefore considered in the prediction model in Phase 3.

Previous research has suggested that *perceived efficacy* influences persistency (Mannarini 2011; Mannarini and Fedi 2012). However, *perceived efficacy* has also been found to encourage participation in collective action (for example, Stuermer and Simon 2004; van Stekelenburg et al. 2009). The present results support both previous findings.

As can be seen from Table 1, persistent leading activists differ significantly from non-persistent leading activists with respect to the perception of influencing others and changing their opinions, as well as having an impact on society. Furthermore, the results indicate that up to one-third of non-persistent leading activists did not agree with these perceptions.
Table 21: Differences in perceived efficacy by persistent and non-persistent leading activists I
(total n = 60; persistent leading activists n = 29; non-persistent leading activists n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel to be able to influence others and change their opinions concerning a product</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>p-value (^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Non-persistent</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Non-persistent</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Non-persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel to be able to influence others and change their opinions concerning a product</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (26)</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>21 (72)</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel to have an impact on society concerning a product</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (13)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>20 (69)</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) p-value according to Mann-Whitney U-test
The results in Table 22 support previous findings that perceived efficacy encourages participation in activism, because overall, there is strong agreement from both groups with no significant differences. Results show similarities between persistent leading activists and non-persistent leading activists with respect to the perceptions about driving public authorities and producers or providers to reconsider change, and about activism as the best strategy to demand change. In addition, both groups said that they felt they had a solution to avoid a product and they had a strategy to implement this solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22: Differences in perceived efficacy by persistent and non-persistent leading activists II (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistent (n = 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism would drive public authorities to reconsider change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism would drive producers / providers to reconsider community opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism would be the best strategy to demand change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution to avoid a product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to implement solution to avoid a product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social support includes support from community, friends and family, and is expected to be a significant predictor of persistent leading activism. Significant differences were found between persistent and non-persistent leading activists with regard to social support, namely that significantly more persistent leading activists than non-persistent leading activists perceived that they had support from the community and friends. Perceived support from the family is high for both persistent and non-persistent leading activists (Table 23).
As can be seen from Table 23, results confirm that persistent leading activists were significantly more likely to perceive their actions as successful and felt appreciated by others, compared to non-persistent leading activists. It can therefore be concluded that a perception of being successful is a characteristic of persistent leading activists.

4.4.3.4 Emotional importance of leading activism

*Emotional importance of leading activism* consists of two constructs: passion and obligation. Results confirm that all but one measure differentiates between persistent and non-persistent leading activists and can therefore be considered as predictors for persistency in the model in Phase 3.

The perception that leading activism is a significant mission in one’s life, is heartfelt and meaningful, and makes one feel passionate, are characteristics that differentiate persistent leading activists (Table 24). This is consistent with Mannarini et al.’s (2010) finding that being globally satisfied with the experience strengthens future participation by activists. Overall, persistent and non-persistent leading activists achieved higher scores regarding leading activism being heartfelt, and scored lower for leading activism being a significant mission in life.

Only approximately half of the sample indicated that leading activism made them happy. Thirty-eight per cent of persistent leading activists stated that their roles as
leading activists did not make them happy. However, these differences were not significant, and therefore these constructs are not included in the prediction model in Phase 3.

Table 24: Passion about and obligation towards leading activism by persistent and non-persistent leading activists (n = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passion</th>
<th>Persistent (n = 29)</th>
<th>Non-persistent (n = 31)</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$ (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading activism is my significant mission in life</td>
<td>Actual (%) 18 (65)</td>
<td>11 (35)</td>
<td>5.406 (0.020)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading activism is heartfelt</td>
<td>Actual (%) 29 (100)</td>
<td>25 (81)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.024)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading activism is meaningful to me</td>
<td>Actual (%) 28 (97)</td>
<td>23 (74)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.027)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading activism makes me feel passionate</td>
<td>Actual (%) 27 (93)</td>
<td>22 (71)</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test (.043)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading activism makes me happy</td>
<td>Actual (%) 18 (62)</td>
<td>15 (48)</td>
<td>1.133 (.287)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Obligation                                 | Feel obliged to mobilise | Actual (%) 29 (100) | 13 (42) | 24.055 (.000)* |

Obligation has previously been found to prevent activists from withdrawing their engagement with a cause (Mannarini and Fedi 2012). Consistent with this finding, inner obligations to mobilise, as well as the obligation towards grandchildren, are significant characteristics of persistent leading activists (Table 24 and Table 25).
Table 25: Obligation towards future generations by persistent and non-persistent leading activists
(total n = 60; persistent leading activists n = 29; non-persistent leading activists n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would feel bad if I had to tell my grandchildren one day that I was not leading activism regarding a product</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, would not feel bad</th>
<th>No, but want someone else to lead activism</th>
<th>p-value$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Actual (%)</td>
<td>27 (93)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p$-value according to Mann-Whitney U-test.
4.5 Summary

Phase 2 set out to operationalise the constructs developed in the theoretical model in Phase 1 and to explore its associations. The aim was to identify potential variables that could serve as possible predictors to be considered in the prediction models in Phase 3.

Group differences between boycotters and leading activists were analysed in order to identify the variables which may predict leading activism. These include all but one postulated triggers for leading activism. The trigger of an existing lack of knowledge about a boycotted product within the community was equally likely to be perceived by boycotters as by leading activists, and is therefore not suggested as possible predictor.

The theoretical model developed in Phase 1 also postulates similarities between boycotters and leading activists. The tests provide overall strong empirical support for similarities regarding the desire to find out more and remaining or increasing concerns after information search about a boycotted product of greatest personal concern; the nature of concerns such as product safety, perceived unfairness, trust in public authorities, and a lack of informed product choice; and experiences of approaching public authorities and producers or providers. However, information searching behaviours; personal reasons to start searching for information; abilities to approach public authorities, producers or providers; non-affective injustice; and being angry, annoyed and disgusted about public authorities, producers or providers or the entire situation surrounding a product were additionally identified as possible indicators for leading activism.

The analysis also revealed possible predictors for persistent leading activism: emotional importance of leading activism, such as the feeling that leading activism was a significant mission in life or a feeling of obligation towards future generations; perceptions of efficacy, success and social support from the community and friends; prior paid or unpaid work experiences as an activist or related to the boycotted product; and personality traits such as internal locus of control and general self-efficacy.
Section 5  PHASE 3: IDENTIFYING PREDICTORS OF LEADING ACTIVISM AND PERSISTENT LEADING ACTIVISM

5.1 Purpose

Phase 3 identifies which information and measures serve as the best predictors of: 1) leading activism; and 2) persistent leading activism. To identify the predictors, a set of possible indicators were selected from Phase 2. If a small set of predictors can be identified, companies could use these predictors to identify and reach out to potential leading activists to include them as stakeholders for product and policy development or market research purposes. Targeting leading activists as stakeholders for companies has the potential to lead to product improvements that are more in line with community attitudes and needs.

5.2 Method

For each participant in the sample it is known whether they are a leading activist and whether they are a persistent leading activist. This information serves as the binary dependent variable for the study. For the prediction of binary outcome variables, binary logistic regression analysis is a suitable method (Bhattacherjee 2012) if the required minimum sample size of 50 is achieved (Green 1991; Fromm 2005; VanVoorhis and Morgan 2007). The data collected in Phase 2 is used for this analysis, which has a sample size of n = 230 for predicting leading activists, and a sample size of n = 60 for predicting persistent leading activists.

Variables found to be associated with participants being leading activists or persistent leading activists in Phase 2 are included in the pool of potential predictors for leading activism and persistent leading activism. Statistical model building involves seeking the most parsimonious model that still accurately reflects the true outcome experience of the data, and involves minimising the number of variables in the model in order to avoid an overfit (Hosmer et al. 2013). This leads to the question of how many predictor variables can be included in a binary logistic regression analysis with the given set of data. Hosmer et al. (2013) emphasise that determining the number of predictor variables is a complex problem, and that a final determination must consider the context of the total study. This includes the actual number of events (cases) per variable (minimum of 10
observed frequencies in a contingency table of response by predictor), the total sample size and the mix of discrete, continuous and interaction terms in the theoretical model. The required statistical tests were performed in Phase 2 and are presented in the results section. In addition to considering frequencies in contingency tables, and a data set of foremost dichotomous or continuous variables, Hosmer et al. (2013) suggest applying the rule of thumb of five events (cases) per predictor variable of the least frequent outcome variable \( p < \min(n_1, n_0)/5 \) by Vittinghoff and McCulloch (2006). Therefore, 11 predictor variables were chosen from the pool of possible variables for predicting leading activists among boycotters \((11.6 = 58/5)\), and five predictors \((5.6 = 28/5)\) were chosen for predicting persistent leading activists among leading activists.

5.2.1.1 Selection of independent variables to be included to predict leading activism

The theoretical model developed in Phase 1 of the study postulates eight triggers of leading activism. Using the selection criteria recommended by Hosmer et al. (2013), five triggers were included in the prediction model (Table 26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triggers</th>
<th>Minimum of 10 observed frequencies in contingency table</th>
<th>Significant p-value</th>
<th>Selected for binary regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search for truth</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-perception as expert</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being perceived as expert by others</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge by community</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one does anything</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to educate</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to protect</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to make change</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to help/support</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When running logistic regression analysis, it is important to consider not only the postulated theoretical model, but also the context of the total study and previous research (Hosmer et al. 2013). Phase 2 extends the theoretical model and reveals that
leading activists displayed typical information-seeking behaviours, such as researching information or expressing concerns to public authorities and producers or providers. These time-consuming activities were often performed because of a feeling that a product affected their community or the family. To consider the total context of the study, in addition to triggers, two predictor variables about information-seeking behaviours (expressed concerns to public authorities and producers or providers), and two variables considering the causes for information-seeking behaviours (product affected community or oneself and family) were included.

Finally, previous research found anger to be an important trigger for activism and boycotting behaviour. Therefore, two variables measuring anger were also considered. All additional six variables fulfil the requirement of a minimum of 10 observed frequencies in a contingency table.

5.2.1.2 Selection of independent variables to be included to predict persistent leading activism

As can be seen from Table 27, results from Phase 2 reveal five possible predictors that fulfil the selection criteria. All five were included in the binary regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key factors</th>
<th>Minimum of 10 observed frequencies in contingency table</th>
<th>Significant p-value</th>
<th>Selected for binary regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality traits</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior paid or unpaid work experiences with boycotted product</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as an activist</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of efficacy, success, and social support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support of friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support of community</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional importance of leading activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant mission in life</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation towards future generation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistical analyses were conducted using the statistical software package SPSS, version 19.0. Goodness-of-fit statistics (that is, the Hosmer and Lemeshow value) are not performed because they are not powerful enough to fit a small to medium sized sample \((n < 400)\) (Hosmer, Hosmer, Le Cessie and Lemeshow 1997).

5.3 Results

5.3.1 Predicting leading activism

Table 28 presents the results of a binary logistic regression, and shows that three independent variables predict leading activism among boycotters well \((\chi^2 = 104.23, p = .000\) with \(df = 11)\). Eighty-six per cent of the cases were identified correctly into one of the two groups. The prediction success for leading activists is 64 per cent, and for boycotters 93 per cent. This implies that three predictors alone increase the correct identification of leading activists among boycotters from 25 per cent to 64 per cent in the model. A high Nagelkerke’s \(r^2\) of 53.8 per cent (Mayerl and Urban 2010) and the \(-2\) log likelihood of 156 (Fromm 2005) both support the strong fit of all three predictors to group leading activists and boycotters correctly. According to the Wald criterion (fourth column), the three strongest significant predictors are expressing concerns to public authorities, wanting to lead in making change, and being regarded as expert by others. All other independent variables in the model are not significant and therefore are indicative only.

Table 28: Regression coefficients for binary logistic regression predicting leading activism (\(n = 230)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(p)-value</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concerns to public authorities</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>16.895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\cdot)000*</td>
<td>8.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to lead in making change</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>13.721</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\cdot)000*</td>
<td>6.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others regard oneself as expert</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>11.912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\cdot)001*</td>
<td>7.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started information search</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>2.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>2.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because community was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started information search</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because a product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affected myself or my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-perception as expert</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The positive coefficient $B$ in the second column indicates the influence of each predictor on increasing predictability; whereas a negative coefficient $B$ reduces predictability. All three significant predictor variables increase the logit of being a leading activist by two units. Surprisingly, anger about public authorities and feeling an obligation to make a change reduces the logit of being a leading activist by one-third of a unit. However, according to the Wald criterion, these two variables are not significant and therefore indicative only.

It is inferred that all three significant predictors have a strong probability to discriminate leading activists from boycotters based on the high odd ratios (Exp(B)), given in the far right column of Table 28. If an individual expresses concerns to public authorities, then they are eight times more likely to be a leading activist than boycotter. If an individual perceives that others regard them as an expert, then this individual is 7.7 times more likely to be a leading activist; and a person wanting to lead in change is 6.4 times more likely to be a leading activist than a boycotter. Regarding the insignificant predictors, only starting to search for information because the community was affected indicates that an individual is twice as likely to be a leading activist as a boycotter ($p = .104$). Anger about public authorities and feeling obliged to make a change indicate the weakest odd ratios of 0.7.

### 5.3.2 Predicting persistent leading activism

The binary logistic regression developed to predict persistent leading activists identified 89 per cent of the cases correctly ($\chi^2 = 41.28$, $p = .000$ with df = 5). Three significant predictors correctly identify 93 per cent of persistent leading activists, and 86 per cent of non-persistent leading activists. This is an increase of 43 per cent in prediction.
success of persistent leading activists. A Nagelkerke’s $r^2$ of 69.5 per cent (Mayerl and Urban 2010) and the -2 log likelihood of 36 (Fromm 2005) both support the strong fit of all three predictors presented in Table 29.

Table 29: Regression coefficients for binary logistic regression predicting persistent leading activism (n = 56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obligation to change for future generations</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>9.449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>20.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid or unpaid work experience as an activist</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>6.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One's actions are supported by community</td>
<td>1.764</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>3.705</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.054*</td>
<td>5.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceive actions as successful</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>3.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading activism is my significant mission in life</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-18.181</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>12.282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to B-coefficients (second column) and odd rations (last column), the strongest predictor for persistency is feeling an obligation to make a change for future generations. If a person feels this type of obligation, they are 21 times more likely to be a persistent leading activist than a non-persistent leading activist. The other two predictors increase the probability of being a persistent leading activist by six times. These predictors are having paid or unpaid work experience as an activist, and the perception that one’s actions are supported by the community. Importantly, the latter predictor is just above the significance level of $p < .05$. However, model comparisons of the first two variables with the first three variables both result in significant chi-square values, increasing -2 log likelihood ratios and in high odds ratios. These results indicate that one’s actions are supported by the community also serves as good predictor, and was therefore included in the final set of predictors.

5.4 Summary

The resulting models contain only a subset of the predictor variables which, according to the Wald-statistics, best predict the binary outcome variables of leading activists and persistent leading activists.
The results presented in Phase 3 suggest that three measures are required to assign 86 per cent of respondents into the groups of boycotters and leading activists. *Expressing concerns to public authorities, wanting to lead in change and perceive that others regard oneself as expert* assign 64 per cent of respondents to the group of leading activists. Besides the latter two predictors, public authorities could apply two additional predictors: *expressing concerns to producers or providers and start to search for information because the community is affected by a product*. These four predictors assign 83 per cent of respondents correctly into the two groups; whereas 55 per cent of leading activists are predicted correctly.

The set of variables predicting persistent leading activism comprises three measures: *obligation to make change for future generations, paid or unpaid work experience as an activist* and *perceived community support*. These three predictors identify 93 per cent of respondents as persistent leading activists.
Section 6  DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research addresses one of the questions raised by Smith et al. (2010), which is how organisations can find the “right stakeholders” to engage with (p. 8). The study focuses on identifying potential leading activists and persistent leading activists as one particular type of stakeholder so that they can be included as potential stakeholders in decision making for industry and public policy makers. Compared to existing theoretical frameworks, this research contributes to a better understanding of:

1. Stakeholder theory, by extending knowledge about the identification of leading activists and persistent leading activists as one particular type of stakeholder, and their defining characteristics. Furthermore, this research suggests a new method to identify particular stakeholders with a set of predictors.

2. Anti-consumption literature, by: a) providing evidence of similarities between boycotters and leading activists, as well as persistent and non-persistent leading activists. The majority of existing research focuses either on boycotters or activists, but often does not differentiate between those two groups at all and has not explored the link between boycotters and activists before. Differentiating between boycotters and leading activists allows for a better understanding of motives, characteristics or behaviours, specifically if a company or public authority wishes or is under pressure to engage with these different types of stakeholders; and by b) providing a theoretical model of the stages through which individuals progress during the transformation from consumer to boycotter and leading activist and their identifying key factors. The theoretical model demonstrates that boycotting behaviour is only one step in the progression to a persistent leading activist. In contrast to existing frameworks, the newly developed model allows companies or public authorities to react to consumer behaviours at any step.

3. Market research practice by providing practical guidance regarding how to gain access to individuals more likely to become leading activists and persistent leading activists prior to them undertaking boycotting behaviours. Existing frameworks do not provide practical guidance with a set of predictor variables. The benefit of this new approach is to gain market insights to key individuals
when introducing, for example, controversial products, and potentially offers benefits not only to companies and regulators or governments, but also to the community as a whole.

The aims of this study are to investigate which predictors could best identify: 1) leading activists among the population of boycotting consumers; and 2) persistent leading activists among the population of leading activists. This is achieved in a three-phase mixed methods approach, ensuring that the “end product is more than the sum of the individual quantitative and qualitative parts” (Bryman 2007, p. 8). Phase 1 examines and develops a theoretical model of the process by which consumers evolve into leading activists and key factors influencing persistent leading activism. Phase 2 explores group differences between boycotters and leading activists, triggers of leading activism and key factors differing persistent leading activists from non-persistent leading activists. Phase 3 identifies variables that predict membership of the two key anti-consumer groups of interest (leading activists and persistent leading activists).

A qualitative investigation into the process of consumers evolving into leading activists in Phase 1 results in a theoretical model. Similarities and differences of the theoretical model to previous research are discussed in the Findings section of Phase I (3.4). However, unlike existing theoretical models of activism in general (e.g., Kieffer 1984; Grunig 1989; Aronson 1993), this model is applied in a marketing context and describes consumers evolving into leading activists. Furthermore, it provides new insights into four varying degrees of anti-consumption behaviour that are clearly defined (boycotting, leading activism, persistent activism and non-persistent leading activism). The benefit of this new approach is to gain market insights to key individuals when introducing, for example, controversial products, and potentially offers benefits not only to companies and regulators or governments, but also to the community as a whole. Differentiating between the four varying degrees of anti-consumption behaviour allows for a better understanding of motives, characteristics or behaviours, specifically if a company or public authority wishes to engage with one particular type of stakeholders. Therefore, three distinct new propositions are presented: 1) consumers boycott a product before they start to mobilise others against it as leading activists. Certain similarities between boycotters and leading activists are evident; 2) distinct triggers initiate leading activism, which discriminate between boycotters and leading activists; and 3) key
factors influence activism persistency. Phase 1 also reveals the new insight that persistent leading activists are often initially supportive of the product when it is introduced into the market. However, curiosity about a controversial product can rapidly transform into concern about it and subsequently into a rejection of it, particularly when the information provided by industry and policy makers is perceived as vague. The finding about providing vague information is in line with previous research that reveals that inadequate government responses to concerns influence citizens becoming activists (Kieffer 1984; Grunig 1989; Aronson 1993). The theoretical model, developed construct by construct provides a better understanding of boycotting and leading activism because it shows the history of actual consumers becoming leading activists. Boycotting behaviour is only one step in the progression. The strength of the theoretical model being developed construct by construct is that companies or public authorities could react to consumer behaviours at any step. It is beneficial to react to boycotts at any step because it prevents companies or public authorities from significantly reduced market values (Friedman 1985; Pruitt and Friedman 1986; Pruitt, Wei and White 1988), negative public perceptions, damaged reputations, loss of the overall prestige or increased costs caused by boycotts (King 2008). However, the model is not a standalone contribution. Rather, it serves as basis for validation through quantitative testing and the identification of predictors in Phase 2 and Phase 3.

Phase 2 is exploratory and aims to gain insight into which of the constructs in the theoretical model were empirically associated with leading activism and persistent leading activism. Results point to the existence of similarities between boycotters and leading activists, reveal triggers of leading activism and key factors that influence persistent leading activism. Boycotters and leading activists displayed similarities with respect to concerns that remained and increased after they searched for information, and that resulted in the desire to find out more about a product. However, leading activists typically spent more time on searching for information, and raised their concerns with public authorities and producers or providers. The experiences of approaching public authorities and producers or providers was similar for both boycotters and leading activists, but leading activists rated themselves higher in their ability to do so effectively. Interestingly, leading activists typically started to search for information because a product affected themselves, their family, and/or their community.
The types of concerns about a product were similar between boycotters and leading activists, apart from the concern about non-affective injustice. Emotions were also similar for both boycotters and leading activists, except for being angry and disgusted about public authorities, producers or providers and the whole situation surrounding a particular product. Leading activists were also typically displeased about public authorities and the entire situation.

Seven of the eight triggers identified in Phase 1 are associated with leading activism. These include a desire to search for the truth, having a perceived level of personal expertise, feeling that no one else does anything, feeling an obligation to change the current situation, and having a desire to educate others and protect them from a particular product. The willingness to lead in making a change was also found to be a trigger.

Key factors influencing persistency are life experiences such as prior paid or unpaid work experience with the boycotted product, and personal experience as an activist emerged as relevant. Persistent leading activists typically perceived they could influence others and change their opinions, have an impact on society and had high perceived levels of social support from their community and friends. Persistent leading activists also perceived their activist activities as successful, as a significant mission in life, as a heartfelt, meaningful and passionate mission and as being appreciated by others. Personality traits, a feeling of obligation to mobilise others and towards future generations were also indicative of persistent leading activism.

Findings from Phase 1 and 2 extend existing research on anti-consumption by providing a detailed transition model of consumers evolving into persistent leading activists, and by identifying similarities and differences between boycotters and leading activists. These include typical information-seeking behaviours of leading activists such as approaching public authorities or producers and providers. Consequently, the findings emphasise the importance of developing and specifying a clear definition of the degrees of involvement in anti-consumption, such as boycotting, protesting or leading activism. Previous research has argued that anti-consumption constructs and definitions are complex and that more research is needed (e.g., Kozinets et al. 2010, Hoffmann 2011). The application of clear definitions are important for more specific research into anti-consumers’ distinct motivations, concerns and needs. Understanding these distinct
motivations, concerns and needs are important because they may improve the capacity of organisations to develop policies and products more aligned with community desires, particularly if considered in the early stages of development. However, there is no guarantee whether a cooperation with potential leading activists or persistent leading activists will be successful. There is no existing research exploring cooperation with potential leading activists or persistent leading activists. A cooperation might not be successful, because both parties may not in all cases share interests and may not find an agreement due to perceptual incongruities (Ross and Lusch 1982). Drawing on experiences with confirmed activists and conflicts shows that many cooperations are successful (for example Baron (2001), Smith, Ansett and Erez (2011) and Garriga (2014). There is a great possibility that a cooperation with potential leading activists is even more promising because a cooperation is intended before a conflict even escalates.

Phase 3 presents one model to identify leading activists and one model to identify persistent leading activists. The first model identifies three predictors to discriminate leading activists from a group of boycotters with a prediction success of 64 per cent accuracy. The predictors are: 1) expressing concerns about a product to public authorities; 2) wanting to take the lead in making a change concerning a particular product; and 3) being perceived as an expert on a particular product by others.

Previous research suggests that the desire to make a difference prompts boycott participation, activism and collective action (for example, Brunsting and Postmes 2002; Klein et al. 2004; Hoffmann and Mueller 2009). Findings from this research support the influence of the desire to make a difference on activism and boycott participation, but emphasise the difference in its meaning for boycotters and leading activists. While the two groups both agree to supporting and helping in making a change, leading activists clearly distinguish themselves from boycotters in the desire to take the lead in making a change.

Only three predictors were required to successfully predict 93 per cent of persistent leading activists among leading activists. These were: 1) to feel an obligation towards future generations; 2) paid or unpaid work experience as an activist; and 3) perceiving that one has the support of the community. While feeling an obligation and community support – often described as social support within a group of activists – have been identified as important for persistent activism commitment before (for example, Mannarini 2011; Mannarini, Rochira and Talo 2012), previous activism experiences
were not related to persistency, but to later engagement (Braungart and Braungart 1991; Cole and Stewart 1996).

These findings about a minimum set of measures for reliable prediction of group membership of leading activists and persistent leading activists also contribute to the stakeholder literature. Little guidance is available to assist organisations proactively identify stakeholders (Crane and Ruebottom 2011). Several studies have indicated that organisations often fail to approach stakeholders systematically (Harvey and Schaefer 2001; Dunham et al. 2006; Phillips et al. 2010; Mainardes et al. 2011; Neville et al. 2011). Rather, existing stakeholder identification frameworks depend on the quality of the communication skills of decision makers, and rely on trial and error (as described in Ozanne, Corus and Saatcioglu 2009). As several studies show (for example, Harvey and Schaefer 2001), particularly when using web-based tools (for example, Chakravorti 2010; Driessen, Kok and Hillebrand 2013; Gyrd-Jones and Kornum 2013; Korschun and Du 2013), organisations do not necessarily identify key stakeholders themselves, but depend on managers’ intuition or stakeholders’ self-selection. The sets of proposed predictors and measures avoid a reliance on trial and error and provide a tool to enable quick and easy identification of potential future stakeholders and persistent leading activists. The predictors and measures are specifically relevant for companies or public authorities who are interested in developing a cooperation with potential leading activists or persistent leading activists. It is possible that including potential leading activists and persistent leading activists in early product or policy development could modify products to be more in line with community expectations and needs, as suggested by Henderson (1993) more than twenty years ago.

The predictors also answer Smith et al.’s (2010) question of how marketing managers can find stakeholders who “are especially influential or relevant in regard to customers” (p. 7). Activists are one of several possible stakeholders, yet are especially influential to consumers, communities, organisations and society as a whole (Freeman 1984; Mitchell et al. 1997; Witkowski 1989; Lee et al. 2013). Moreover activists are often regarded as “unfriendly” yet important to engage with (Freeman et al. 2007, p. 60). Previous research has shown that identifying activists remains challenging (Hall and Vrendenberg 2005; Dunham et al. 2006; Roloff 2008; Izberk-Bilgin 2010), because there is no approved method to identify activists in advance (Roloff 2008). However, these findings provide tools to identify and engage with potential leading activists or
persistent leading activists even before activists are confirmed or frustrated and regarded as potentially harmful by organisations or public authorities.

The findings are practically useful for both commercial industry and public policy makers. For example, the transition model in Phase 1 reveals that all leading activists approached public authorities and industry for information and had raised their concerns before starting to mobilise against a product. Phase 2 confirms these efforts with a larger sample and infers these as typical behaviours of leading activists. In Phase 3, these behaviours are identified as significant predictors for leading activism. Consequently, public policy makers and industry should listen carefully to those who are strongly concerned about a product, and who raise their concerns. Although this seems to be most critical for preventing activism, previous studies have highlighted that public authorities often miss opportunities to listen and engage with critical and concerned consumers, which has resulted in a total rejection of a government’s plan to introduce a new product (for example, Hurlimann and Dolnicar 2010).

The results also reveal that public authorities and industry rarely provide all information requested by boycotters or leading activists. Where such information has been provided it is often contradictory. Moreover, boycotters and leading activists alike felt that they were not listened to and not respected for asking questions. Consequently, their existing concerns could not be reduced by public authorities and industry. Instead, concerns were increased and they had the desire to find out more. Leading activists and persistent leading activists typically followed this desire, found out more and finally perceived themselves as experts on a product topic and were perceived as experts by other consumers. Kozinets and Handelman (2004), for example, also suggest that activists have an “immanent wisdom, a knowledge of things hidden” (p. 696) and can therefore be regarded as experts. These findings infer that an open information policy about a product or policy from the beginning, and exercising democracy by including those who raise their concerns, can help save time and money, reduce the chances of failures and can fundamentally change the way industry and policy makers manage the product implementation process.

The identified predictors also allow targeting of potential leading activists and persistent leading activists as stakeholders more easily and far more economically than with traditional stakeholder identification methods (for example, Bryson 2004; Reed et al.
2009). Instead of using, for example, Bryson’s (2004) five-steps-process of stakeholder identification, the six predictors could be included in stakeholder marketing 2.0 tools (Chakravorti 2010) and help in identifying leading activists and persistent leading activists in virtual dialogues or for entering virtual dialogues in social media, as described by Gyrd-Jones and Kornum (2013) or Korschun and Du (2013). Therefore, the six predictors could be posted in virtual dialogues. If these virtual dialogues with potential leading activists and persistent leading activists were fruitful and they are willing to share their knowledge, they could then be actively included as part of the product development processes. According to Gyrd-Jones and Kornum (2013), an overlap of interests, values and cultural codes are crucial drivers for companies’ willingness to cooperate with activists. Again, these crucial drivers rely on studies about confirmed activists. This research does not focus on confirmed activists, rather suggests the cooperation with potential leading activists. The advantage is that power or information asymmetry have not played a role yet or if so, a very small one. Also, typical power games played by companies to amplify stakeholders’ demands in ongoing conflicting interests as described by Vallaster and von Wallpach (2013) have at this point not started yet, because the predictors identify potential leading activists and not confirmed ones. However, the approach of including the predictors in stakeholder marketing 2.0 tools is an example for easier and more economic targeting than with traditional stakeholder identification processes. Of course, this is only possible on the condition that companies or public authorities wish or are under pressure to include potential leading activists or persistent leading activists.

It is important to recognise that the predictors can be used and implemented in marketing research methods before an organisation or public authority is adversely affected by public boycotts. The predictors enable organisations and public authorities to consider the views of potential activists as stakeholders in the early stages of policy or product development, before such consumers evolve into leading activists. This could be, for example, during the introduction of a controversial product. In such a case traditional stakeholder identification processes clearly fail because they mostly rely on power, legitimacy and urgency as core attributes (Mitchell et al. 1997). In fact, these alternative processes may even hinder engagement with activists, because if public rejection is in the early stages organisations and public authorities may not perceive boycotting as powerful, legitimate or urgent. Consequently, organisations or public
authorities may fail to engage with this type of stakeholder. However, at the point where activists achieve power it is often too late for organisations and public authorities to form a relationship with them. Previous practice and research clearly indicates that activists can become powerful very quickly and force change at a high cost for organisations and public authorities (Hurliman and Dolnicar, 2010; Smith et al. 2010; Vallester and von Wallpach 2013; Hoffmann 2013), but that these costs can be minimised or avoided if engagement with activists is fruitful (Argenti 2004; Handelman et al. 2010; Ingenbleek and Immink 2010; Mish and Scammon 2010; Smith et al. 2011).

The predictors used for stakeholder identification as proposed in this research effectively circumvent traditional identification processes. Instead, the predictors are managerially useful and enable organisations and public authorities to identify well in advance that a boycott is imminent. They then have the opportunity to engage with potential leading activists or persistent leading activists as stakeholders before negative consequences occur, both for consumers and organisations.

The present study is limited by the fact that leading activists are an extremely hard group to identify and reach. Significant challenges were associated with obtaining a sample. With a relatively small sample, the statistical regression analyses can only identify those variables with a strong relationship to the independent variable. However, chi-square tests indicated that more variables had the potential to predict leading activists and particularly, persistent leading activists. Future research could test the model with a larger sample size, and it is possible that in this case that some of the other variables would be identified as significant predictors too. This would be possible if funding was obtained to assist with the sample recruitment.

Furthermore, the study focused on a particular controversial category of products in Australia: no-choice products. No-choice products are an important avenue for future research (for example, micro-plastics used in commonly used products or harmful dyes used in clothing), and it would therefore be useful for the predictors identified here to be tested on a wider range of products in other countries in order to ensure the transferability of the results. Ideally, research testing the predictors of leading activism and persistent leading activism would include longitudinal studies of consumers and the process by which the transformation between consumer groups occurs. Further research could also examine whether the inclusion of leading activists and persistent leading activists as stakeholders within organisational processes is as promising for market
research, product development and policy making, as previous studies have suggested (for example, Smith et al. 2011; Garriga 2014).

Finally, the study identifies additional research questions that warrant attention through future research. Findings reveal significant differences between boycotters and leading activists regarding information-seeking behaviours. Of particular interest are the links between information-seeking behaviours and the formation of emotions such as anger and disgust, and perceptions of a lack of trust and non-affective injustice. For example, if public authorities or industry could reduce concerns and actively involve potential leading activists, this could possibly avoid the formation of anger or non-affective injustice. The present study suggests that anger might stem from disappointing experiences of approaching public authorities and producers or providers. In contrast to previous research that found emotions as triggers for boycotting and activism (Ettenson and Klein 2005; Klandermans et al. 2008; Hoffmann and Mueller 2009), this research suggests that emotions such as anger and disgust significantly differentiate boycotters from leading activists, but do not predict leading activism. However, more research exploring emotions could help to identify their influence on information-seeking behaviours, but future work is needed to further explore the link between approaching experiences, anger and boycotting/activism behaviours. In this case it might be helpful to also consider a sample of consumers. The comparisons of boycotters, leading activists, persistent leading activists and consumers could reveal further insights. However, consumers were not the focus in this research and were therefore not considered.

Boycotting and leading activism are expressions of consumers’ anti-consumption behaviours. According to Kozinets et al. (2010), the definitions and constructs of anti-consumption are as “foggy as a November morning on the Scottish Moors” (p. 226). However, this research helps to reduce the fog by introducing more specific definitions between the degrees of anti-consumption (boycotting versus leading activism, persistent versus non-persistent leading activism). This has produced a better understanding of similarities and differences between the defined groups, and the triggers of their behaviours. Researchers are invited to use the definitions proposed in this research not only to explore further motivations, behaviours and differences, but also for rigorous testing of the theoretical model and predictor variables.
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APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE
Thank you for your interest in this study. The research will provide valuable insight into the processes by which people become active against products that concern them and a lot of us in our society. This insight has the potential to lead to product improvements which are more in line with community attitudes and needs. It also shines a spotlight on the importance of community support when developing and implementing products that affect all of us.

The survey focuses on a range of products which some consumers are concerned about but can affect every one in our society. There are various questions about the nature of any concerns and the ability of individuals to make a change. For the purpose of understanding the characteristics of different types of consumers you will also be asked some questions about yourself. If you would like to discuss any aspect of the research project, please contact Ms Petra Meyer (pkm894@uowmail.edu.au), Prof. Sara Dolnicar (sarad@uow.edu.au) or Dr Melanie Randle (mrandle@uow.edu.au).

This is an anonymous survey, which means you will not be identifiable at any time. The survey should take about 30 minutes to complete. If you need to leave the survey and return to it later please keep this original survey link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/makechanges.

When you are ready you can click on this link and pick up where you left off. Please note, that only completed surveys can be included in the findings.

Please indicate below if you would like more information about the study or if you would like to proceed straight to the consent form and begin the questionnaire.

☐ I would like more detailed information on the study before giving consent to participate.

☐ I would like to proceed straight to the consent form.

---

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Title
Inquiry into Consumer Boycotting / Activism for Market Research: Products which can affect all of us

Research Aims
• To investigate the process of why people boycott products
• To investigate people’s willingness to change
• To investigate people’s abilities to change

Investigators
Petra Meyer, Faculty of Commerce, email: pkm894@uowmail.edu.au;
Professor Sara Dolnicar, Faculty of Commerce, phone: 02 4221 4858, email: sarad@uow.edu.au;
Dr. Melanie Randle, Faculty of Commerce, phone: 02 4221 4858, email: mrandle@uow.edu.au

Method and Demands on Participants
If you choose to be included, you will be asked to click through an online anonymous survey, programmed by Petra Meyer with the software Survey Monkey Gold. The survey will probably take about 30 minutes to be completed, and you will be asked a number of questions which relate to boycott and activism. Please note that it is your perceptions and experiences of boycotting and activism that are being sought. If you consent, the survey data will be collected for later analysis by the researcher. The data will be used for no other purpose than research. You will remain anonymous and it will not be possible for you to be identified in any report that results from this study.

Possible Risks, Inconveniences and Discomforts
Apart from the 30-40 minutes of your time for completing the survey, we foresee minimal risk for you. Your involvement in the study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time during completion of the survey. Refusal to participate after completing the study will not be possible because this is an anonymous survey and the participant will not be identifiable.

Funding and Benefits of the Research
This study is funded by a PhD funding from the University of Wollongong and has no support from companies or industries. This research will provide valuable insight into the process of why people start boycotting and being active against products. An inquiry into boycotting consumers and activists for market research helps us to better understand the target market, which in turn can reduce the possibility of public boycotts or product failures. Listening to boycotters and activists also holds the potential of product improvement which benefits the community and strengthens its importance. Findings from the study will be published in a PhD thesis and are likely to be published in academic journals or conference papers. Confidentiality is assured and you will not be identified in any part of the research.

Ethics Review and Complaints
This study has been reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee if the University of Wollongong. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted, you can contact the UOW ethics officer on (02) 4221 4457 or rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.
CONSENT FORM

Inquiry into Consumer Boycotting / Activism for Market Research: Products which can affect all of us

This is an anonymous survey.

Researcher: Petra Meyer
School of Management & Marketing
University of Wollongong

I have been given information about the project “An Inquiry into Consumer Boycotting / Activism for Market Research”. I understand Petra Meyer is conducting this research as part of a PhD supervised by Professor Sara Dolnicar and Dr. Melanie Randle in the School of Management & Marketing at the University of Wollongong.

I understand that, if I consent to participate in this project, I will be required to complete a questionnaire about my views on boycotting and activism for market research. These also include items such as perceived success, abilities to make change and skills.

If I have any enquiries about the research, I can contact Petra Meyer (email pkm894@uowmail.edu.au), Professor Sara Dolnicar (phone 02 4221 3862, email sarad@uow.edu.au) or Dr. Melanie Randle (phone 02 4221 4858, email mrandle@uow.edu.au). If I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the research is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 02 4221 4457 or rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can refuse or withdraw consent to participate during the survey. Once the survey has been completed, withdrawal is not possible because this is an anonymous survey and my data will not be identifiable.

I understand that the data collected from my participation will be used for the purpose of understanding better the valuable inputs of boycotting consumers and activists, their abilities and willingness to make change, in a PhD thesis. The data will possibly result in a publication in an academic journal or a conference paper and I consent for it to be used in that manner. I understand that the information I provide contributes to results based on the collective answers of all participants, not individual responses. I also understand that it will not be possible for the information I provide to be identified in any report that results from this study since this is an anonymous online survey.

By checking the button below, I am indicating my consent to participate in the project “Inquiry into Consumer Boycotting / Activism for Market Research: Products which can affect all of us”.

I consent to participate in this online survey

CONCERN

The first questions relate to your concern about certain products.

Here is a list of products for consumption or use. How concerned are you about these products?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Strongly concerned</th>
<th>Somewhat concerned</th>
<th>Not concerned at all</th>
<th>Don’t know what it is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foods from genetically modified crops (GM Foods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods containing colours, flavours or preservatives (Food Additives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water from treated wastewater (Recycled Water)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water from treated seawater (Desalinated Water)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap water containing fluoride (Water Fluoridation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products containing nano particles (Nano Products)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of greatest personal concern to you?

Please choose carefully because most of the questionnaire will relate to this product.

- GM Foods
- Food Additives
- Recycled Water
- Desalinated Water
- Water Fluoridation
- Nano Products
- none of the above
Regarding ANY OTHER product or service, have you ever INITIATED or ORGANISED an activity such as an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

Which product or service was it?

What you initiated or organised was ...

- [ ] ... in favour of it?
- [ ] ... opposed to it?

What did you initiate or organise exactly?

Do you feel you were successful in what you did?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no
GENERAL INFORMATION SEEKING SKILLS

Here we are interested in your general skills to seek information.

In general, how would you rate your ability to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very bad</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>neither</th>
<th>good nor bad</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>never done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand scientific information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach public authorities such as local governments, state governments or regulators for information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach producers or providers for information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIENCE

The following questions are about your experience related to the product of your greatest personal concern.

Do you try to avoid buying [Q4]?
☐ yes
☐ no

Are you...
☐ ... in favour of [Q4]?
☐ ... opposed to [Q4]?
☐ ... neutral in regard to [Q4]?

To the best of your knowledge...

☐ ... is [Q4] available to you? yes no don't know
☐ ... do you consume [Q4]?

Do you try to avoid consuming [Q4]?
☐ yes
☐ no
**EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a solution to avoid [Q4]?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a strategy to implement your solution to avoid [Q4]?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here we are interested in the reasons of your concern.

Please describe just in a few words what you understand [Q4] to be.

Do you think [Q4] is ...
- ... scientifically tested enough
- ... not scientifically tested enough

[Q4] to consume or use is ...
- ... safe
- ... unsafe

Concerning [Q4] the community has been/is consulted ...
- ... enough
- ... not enough

Are you concerned that [Q4] ...
- ... would cause health risks if used for a long time?
- ... would cause environmental damage?
NATURE OF CONCERNS

Do you think in relation to [Q4] consumers or the public ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... have or has a product choice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... can make an informed product choice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the context of [Q4], how do you feel about the entire situation? (please provide one answer per row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displeased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t care about entire situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIENCE

Have you ever INITIATED or ORGANISED an activity such as an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott regarding [Q4]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPERIENCE

When answering the next questions, please imagine you are active and a mobiliser in relation to [Q4]. By “mobilising” we mean “initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott”.

If you were mobilising in relation to [Q4], do you think you would be supported by ...

... the community?  
   yes  no  not sure

... your family?  
   yes  no  not sure

... your friends?  
   yes  no  not sure

If you were mobilising in relation to [Q4] do you think it would be ...

... successful?  
   yes  no  don’t know

... appreciated by others?  
   yes  no  not sure

If you were mobilising relation to [Q4] do you think it would ...

... make you happy?  
   yes  no

... be heartfelt?  
   yes  no

... make you feel passionate?  
   yes  no

If you were mobilizing relation to [Q4] do you feel it would ...

... be meaningful?  
   yes  no

... be your significant mission in life?  
   yes  no

EXPERIENCE

What did you initiate or organise exactly regarding [Q4]?

Are you currently active in regard to [Q4], e.g., organising or initiating an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott?

   yes
   no
**EXPERIENCE**

In an average week when you were active, how much of your time did you spend on initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition, a boycott regarding [Q4]?

- none at all
- less than 5 hours per week
- 5-10 hours per week
- 11-15 hours per week
- 16-20 hours per week
- 21-25 hours per week
- more than 25 hours per week

Why did you stop being active regarding [Q4]?

---

**MAKING CHANGE**

Please think of the times when you were active when answering the following questions about making change in the society. By “active” or “action” we mean initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott.

In the past, when you were active in relation to [Q4], were you supported by ...

- ... the community?
- ... your family?
- ... your friends?

In relation to [Q4] did you feel that your activities were ...

- ... successful?
- ... appreciated by others?

Did you feel your actions in relation to [Q4]...

- ... were meaningful?
- ... were your significant mission in life?

Did you feel your actions in relation to [Q4]...

- ... made you happy?
- ... were heartfelt?
- ... made you feel passionate?
EXPERIENCE
How much of your time do you currently spend on initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott regarding [Q4]?

- none at all
- less than 5 hours per week
- 5-10 hours per week
- 11-15 hours per week
- 16-20 hours per week
- 21-25 hours per week
- more than 25 hours per week

MAKING CHANGE
The following questions are about making change in the society, what we describe as being "active" or as "action". By "active" or "action" we mean initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott.

When you are active in relation to [Q4], are you supported by ...

- yes
- no

... the community?
... your family?
... your friends?

In relation to [Q4] do you feel that your activities are ...

- yes
- no

... successful?
... appreciated by others?

Do you feel your actions in relation to [Q4] ...

- yes
- no

... are meaningful?
... are your significant mission in life?

Do you feel your actions in relation to [Q4] ...  

- yes
- no

... make you happy?
... are heartfelt?
... make you feel passionate?
EXPERIENCE

Regarding ANY OTHER product or service, have you ever INITIATED or ORGANISED an activity such as an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

EXPERIENCE

Which product or service was it?

What you initiated or organised was ...

- [ ] ... in favour of it?
- [ ] ... opposed to it?

What did you initiate or organise exactly?

Do you feel you were successful in what you did?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no
The following questions are about information seeking in relation to the product you choose, the reasons for it and the processes related to it.

Have you looked for information on [Q4]?

- yes
- no

In the past, have you felt that ...

- [Q4] affected you and/or your family
- [Q4] affected your community
- public authorities such as local governments, state governments or regulators were providing enough information about [Q4]
- the producer / provider was providing enough information about [Q4]
- you had negative experiences with [Q4]
- you had to find out the truth about [Q4]
- you wanted the option of staying away from [Q4] and choosing an alternative product?
How much time did you spend looking for information about [Q4]?

- a lot of time
- some time
- very little time

After you found information about [Q4] ...

- were you still concerned?
- were you more concerned than before?
- did you feel you had to find out more about [Q4]?

SEEKING INFORMATION

Why did you start looking for information? Because ...

- [Q4] affected me and/or my family
- [Q4] affected my community
- I felt public authorities such as local governments, state governments or regulators were providing too little information about [Q4]
- the producer / provider was providing too little information about [Q4]
- I had negative experiences with [Q4]
- I felt I had to find out the truth about [Q4]
- I wanted the option of staying away from [Q4] and choosing an alternative product
SEEKING INFORMATION

Did you express your concerns about [Q4] to PUBLIC AUTHORITIES such as local governments, state governments or regulators?

☐ yes
☐ no
What are the chances that you will give up approaching public authorities about [Q4] in future?

- No chance, almost no chance (1 in 10)
- Very slight possibility (2 in 10)
- Slight possibility (3 in 10)
- Some possibility (4 in 10)
- Fair possibility (5 in 10)
- Good possibility (6 in 10)
- Fairly good possibility (7 in 10)
- Very probable (8 in 10)
- Almost certain (9 in 10)
- Virtually certain (10 in 10)

In the context of [Q4], how do you feel about public authorities? (please provide one answer per row)

- Comfortable
- Safe
- Happy
- Annoyed
- Don't care about public authorities
- Indifferent
- Disgusted
- Displeased
- Angry

Did you mention your concerns about [Q4] to the PRODUCER or the PROVIDER?

- Yes
- No

Here we are interested in how you felt about approaching producers or providers.

When you approached the PRODUCER or PROVIDER about [Q4] ...

- ... did you feel that people who ask questions are respected?
- ... did you get a reply?
- ... did you get all information you wanted?
- ... were you listened to?
- ... did you get contradictory information?

After approaching the PRODUCER or PROVIDER about [Q4] ...

- ... were you still concerned?
- ... were you more concerned than before?
- ... did you feel you had to find out more?

Have you given up approaching the PRODUCER or PROVIDER about [Q4]?

- Yes
- No
PRODUCERS OR PROVIDERS

What are the chances that you will give up approaching the PRODUCER or PROVIDER about [Q4] in future?

- No chance, almost no chance (1 in 10)
- Very slight possibility (2 in 10)
- Slight possibility (3 in 10)
- Some possibility (4 in 10)
- Fairly good possibility (5 in 10)
- Good possibility (6 in 10)
- Fairly probable (7 in 10)
- Very probable (8 in 10)
- Almost sure (9 in 10)

In the context of [Q4], how do you feel about the PRODUCER or PROVIDER? (please provide one answer per row)

- Safe
- Comfortable
- Displeased
- Annoyed
- Happy
- Angry
- Disgusted
- Don't care about producer or provider
- Indifferent

You have completed more than half of the survey now. Please keep going, your views are important to us! Thank you.

KNOWLEDGE

In this section we would like to know how knowledgeable you feel about the product of your concern.

Regarding [Q4], how knowledgeable are you about ...

- the work of public authorities
- scientific evidence
- government policies
- the product alternatives
- the benefits of it to society
- the experiences of its usage
- the dangers to society
- how to avoid it

Do you feel you are an expert on [Q4]?

- yes
- no
**KNOWLEDGE**

Do you feel that people see you as an expert on [Q4]?
- yes
- no

How would you rate your knowledge about [Q4] relative to the rest of the population?
- a lot more knowledgeable than the rest of the population
- more knowledgeable than the rest of the population
- as knowledgeable as the rest of the population
- less knowledgeable than the rest of the population
- a lot less knowledgeable than the rest of the population

Do you think the community knows enough about [Q4]?
- yes
- no

**GENERAL INFORMATION SEEKING SKILLS**

Here we are interested in your general skills to seek information.

In general, how would you rate your ability to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very bad</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>neither good nor bad</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>never done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand scientific information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach public authorities such as local governments, state governments or regulators for information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach producers or providers for information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAKING CHANGE

This section of the questionnaire deals with the willingness to make change in general, as well as in relation to the product of your concern.

Concerning [Q4], do you feel you have to do something about the current situation?
- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

Concerning [Q4], do you feel that ...
- [ ] ... if you don’t change the situation then no one else will
- [ ] ... if you don’t change the situation, someone else will

Do you think a strong movement against [Q4]...
- [ ] ... would drive public authorities to reconsider their policies?
- [ ] ... would drive the producer or provider to reconsider community opinion?
- [ ] ... would be the best strategy to demand change?

---

MAKING CHANGE

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want something better than [Q4] for my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe everyone needs to know what is really going on with [Q4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want something better than [Q4] for my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to protect my family from [Q4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want everyone to make an informed product choice about [Q4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want something better than [Q4] for other families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to protect other families from [Q4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to pass on my knowledge about [Q4] to family/friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to educate people about [Q4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to protect my community from [Q4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAKING CHANGE

Do you feel obliged to do something regarding [Q4]?

- yes
- no

Would you feel bad if you had to tell your grandchildren one day that you were not active, e.g., initiating or organising an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition or a boycott regarding [Q4]?

- yes
- no, I wouldn't feel bad
- no, but I want someone else to do it

MAKING CHANGE

To what extent do you agree with the following self-descriptions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can influence others and change their opinions concerning [Q4]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can have an impact on society concerning [Q4]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the following statements applying to you?

- yes
- no

I want to lead in making a change concerning [Q4]

I want to be involved and help making a change concerning [Q4]
MAKING CHANGE

What are the chances that you will initiate or organise an activity such as an information session, a webpage, a protest, a petition, a boycott regarding [Q4] in the future?

You have completed 2/3 of the questionnaire! Not much left. Please keep on going! Thank you!

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

For the purpose of understanding the characteristics of different types of consumers we would like to ask you questions about yourself.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? If I feel something is worth fighting for …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… I do not get discouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I have a thick skin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I keep going when others give up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I keep going until I get what I want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I consider more than rules and regulations in deciding what is right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I do not have a victim personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… I get mad, but then get even.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

This part of the questionnaire is a series of statements about your personal attitudes and traits. Each statement represents a commonly held belief. Please read each statement and decide to what extent it describes you. There are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some of the statements and disagree with others. Please indicate your own personal feelings about each statement below by ticking the box that best describes your attitude or feeling. Please be very truthful and describe yourself as you really are, not as you would like to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I can't do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid facing difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick with it until I finish it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I decide to do something new, I go right to work on it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was brought up to be a responsible person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents have/had a strong sense of justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents taught me to stand up for things that are important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did you talk politics at home when you were young?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have you been involved in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure just makes me try harder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel insecure about my ability to do things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a self-reliant person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give up easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally speaking, to what extent do you agree with the following self-descriptions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was brought up to be a responsible person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents have/had a strong sense of justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents taught me to stand up for things that are important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... did you talk politics at home when you were young?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have you been involved in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Please read each statement. Where there is a blank _ decide what your normal or usual attitude, feeling, or behaviour would be:

RARELY, OCCASIONALLY, SOMETIMES, FREQUENTLY, USUALLY

Of course there are always unusual situations in which this would not be the case, but think of what you would do or feel in most normal situations.

1. When faced with a problem I _______ try to forget it.

2. I _______ need frequent encouragement from others for me to keep working at a difficult task.

3. I _______ change my opinion when someone I admire disagrees with me.

4. If I want something I _______ work hard to get it.

5. I ________ prefer to learn the facts about something from someone else rather than have to dig them out for myself.

6. I will ______ accept jobs that require me to supervise others.

7. I _______ have a hard time saying "no" when someone tries to sell me something I don't want.

8. I _______ like to have a say in any decisions made by any group I'm in.

9. I ________ consider the different sides of an issue before making any decisions.

10. What other people think _______ has a great influence on my behaviour.

11. Whenever something good happens to me I _______ feel it is because I've earned it.

12. I _______ enjoy being in a position of leadership.

13. I ______ need someone else to praise my work before I am satisfied with what I've done.

14. I am ______ sure enough of my opinions to try and influence others.

15. When something is going to affect me I _______ learn as much about it as I can.

16. I _______ decide to do things on the spur of the moment.

17. For me, knowing I've done something well is ______ more important than being praised by someone else.

18. I _______ let other people's demands keep me from doing things I want to do.

19. I _______ stick to my opinions when someone disagrees with me.

20. I _______ do what I feel like doing not what other people think I ought to do.

21. I ______ get discouraged when doing something that takes a long time to achieve results.

22. When part of a group I ______ prefer to let other people make all the decisions.

23. When I have a problem I ___ follow the advice of friends or relatives.

24. I ____ enjoy trying to do difficult tasks more than I enjoy trying to do easy tasks.

25. I ______ prefer situations where I can depend on someone else's ability rather than just my own.

26. Having someone important tell me I did a good job is _______ more important to me than feeling I've done a good job.

27. When I'm involved in something I _______ try to find out all I can about what is going on even when someone else is in charge.

This is the second part - please keep going, your help is very much appreciated!
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Do you have paid or unpaid work experience ...

... with [Q4] yes no
... in community work
... in the public sector
... as a politician
... as an OH&S representative
... in the labour movement
... as a teacher
... in a Non-governmental organisation
... as an activist
... as an advocate
... as being the head of a group of people

DEMOGRAPHICS

To conclude the survey we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself such as work, watching news and leisure activities:

Which Australian State/Territory do you live in?

- Australian Capital Territory (ACT)
- New South Wales (NSW)
- Northern Territory (NT)
- Queensland (QLD)
- South Australia (SA)
- Tasmania (TAS)
- Victoria (VIC)
- Western Australia (WA)
- Another country (please specify)

Which best describes the area where you live?

- State/Territory capital city
- major regional city
- regional centre
- rural / remote area
DEMOGRAPHICS

Are you ...?
- male
- female

How old are you?
Please type in a number in the box below.
years old:

Please select the highest level of education you have attained to date:
- Postgraduate Degree or equivalent (Doctoral Degree Level, Master Degree Level)
- Graduate Diploma/Graduate Certificate
- Bachelor Degree
- Advanced Diploma/Diploma or equivalent
- Certificate I,II,III or IV
- Year 12
- Year 10
- Below Year 10
- Other

Other (please specify)

DEMOGRAPHICS

Which of the following best describes your employment status?
- Working full-time
- Working part-time or casually
- Unemployed but looking for work
- Homemaker
- Retired
- Full-time student
- Other

Other (please specify)
Which best describes the industry or business where you currently work?

- Accommodation, cafes and restaurants
- Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- Communication services
- Construction
- Cultural and recreational services
- Education
- Electricity, gas and water supply
- Finance and insurance
- Government administration and defence
- Health and community services
- Manufacturing
- Mining
- Personal and other services
- Property and business services
- Retail trade
- Transport and storage
- Wholesale trade
- Other

Other (please specify):

Which best describes the industry or business where you used to work?

- Accommodation, cafes and restaurants
- Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- Communication services
- Construction
- Cultural and recreational services
- Education
- Electricity, gas and water supply
- Finance and insurance
- Government administration and defence
- Health and community services
- Manufacturing
- Mining
- Personal and other services
- Property and business services
- Retail trade
- Transport and storage
- Wholesale trade
- Other

Other (please specify):
Which best describes the industry or business where you would like to work?

- Accommodation, cafes and restaurants
- Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- Communication services
- Construction
- Cultural and recreational services
- Education
- Electricity, gas and water supply
- Finance and insurance
- Government administration and defence
- Health and community services
- Manufacturing
- Mining
- Personal and other services
- Property and business services
- Retail trade
- Transport and storage
- Wholesale trade
- Others
- Other (please specify)

What is your gross weekly individual income in AUS$ (before tax)?

- $0-$149 ($1-$7,799 annually)
- $150-$249 ($7,800-$12,999 annually)
- $250-$399 ($13,000-$20,799 annually)
- $400-$599 ($20,800-$31,199 annually)
- $600-$799 ($31,200-$41,599 annually)
- $800-$999 ($41,600-$51,999 annually)
- $1,000-$1,299 ($52,000-$67,599 annually)
- $1,300-$1,599 ($67,600-$83,199 annually)
- $1,600-$1,999 ($83,200-$103,999 annually)
- $2,000 or more ($104,000 or more annually)
- no answer

What is your gross weekly household income in AUS$ (before tax)?

- $0-$249 ($0-$12,999 annually)
- $250-$499 ($13,000-$25,999 annually)
- $500-$799 ($26,000-$41,599 annually)
- $800-$1,199 ($41,600-$62,399 annually)
- $1,200-$1,699 ($62,400-$88,399 annually)
- $1,700-$2,499 ($88,400-$129,999 annually)
- $2,500-$3,299 ($130,000-$171,599 annually)
- $3,300 or more ($171,600 or more annually)
- no answer
**DEMGRAPHICS**

On how many days a week do you usually read the NEWS and CURRENT AFFAIRS SECTION of the newspaper?

Please only count the days on which you read the news and current affairs sections and exclude days on which you only read other sections (e.g. sports, entertainment, etc.).

- [ ] 1 day a week
- [ ] 2 days a week
- [ ] 3 days a week
- [ ] 4 days a week
- [ ] 5 days a week
- [ ] 6 days a week
- [ ] 7 days a week
- [ ] I read the newspaper on an irregular basis (less than once a week)
- [ ] I don’t read the newspaper at all

**What is your favorite newspaper?**

- [ ] The Australian
- [ ] Australian Financial Review
- [ ] The Canberra Times
- [ ] The Daily Telegraph (Sydney)
- [ ] Sydney Morning Herald
- [ ] The Age (Melbourne)
- [ ] The Herald Sun (Melbourne)
- [ ] The Courier-Mail (Brisbane)
- [ ] The Advertiser (Adelaide)
- [ ] The West Australian (Perth)
- [ ] The Mercury (Hobart)
- [ ] The Northern Territory News
- [ ] A regional daily newspaper (please specify below)
- [ ] A local daily newspaper (please specify below)
- [ ] Other paper or reading news online (please specify below)

Please specify here
On how many days a week do you usually watch NEWS and CURRENT AFFAIRS programs on TV?

Please only count the days on which you watch news and current affairs programs and exclude days on which you watch dramas, sports, etc. only.

- 1 day a week
- 2 days a week
- 3 days a week
- 4 days a week
- 5 days a week
- 6 days a week
- 7 days a week
- I watch TV news on an irregular basis (less than once a week)
- I don’t watch TV news at all

DEMOGRAPHICS

What is your favourite television channel?

- ABC1
- ABC2
- ABC3
- Channel 7 (PRIME)
- Channel 9 (WIN)
- Channel TEN (Capital/Southern Cross)
- ONE
- SBS ONE
- SBS TWO
- 7mate
- 7TWO
- Go!
- GEM
- ELEVEN
- One HD
- Pay TV (e.g., Austar/Foxtel)
- Another channel not listed, which I receive free-to-air (please specify below)
- Another channel not listed, which I receive from a subscription TV service (please specify below)

Please specify here
DEMOGRAPHICS

On how many days a week do you usually listen to NEWS programs on the radio?

Please only count the days on which you listen to news on the radio.

- 1 day a week
- 2 days a week
- 3 days a week
- 4 days a week
- 5 days a week
- 6 days a week
- 7 days a week
- I listen to the radio news on an irregular basis (less than once a week)
- I do not listen to the radio news at all

DEMOGRAPHICS

Which of the following best describes your marital status?

- Never married
- Married
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- other
**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?

- [ ] Not currently in a relationship
- [ ] In a relationship (opposite sex) but not living together
- [ ] In a relationship (same sex) but not living together
- [ ] Living with a partner (opposite sex)
- [ ] Living with a partner (same sex)

**LEISURE ACTIVITIES**

This is the very last question:

Which of the following do you enjoy in your leisure time?

Please tick as many as are applicable

- [ ] Watching TV / videos
- [ ] Cinema
- [ ] Reading
- [ ] Talking on the phone
- [ ] Collect information on the internet about a particular topic
- [ ] Social networking (Facebook, MySpace etc.)
- [ ] Twitter
- [ ] Posting your opinion on newsgroups (e.g., yahoo)
- [ ] Publish on your own webpage
- [ ] Spreading the news about a particular concern
- [ ] Card / board games / puzzles / crosswords
- [ ] Gardening
- [ ] Theatre / cultural events
- [ ] Writing
- [ ] Studying / self-improvement
- [ ] Sports / fitness
- [ ] Entertaining with friends
- [ ] Music
- [ ] Gambling / betting
- [ ] Attend a protest event about a particular topic (e.g., talk, support group, information session)
- [ ] Give a lecture or talk about a particular topic
- [ ] Participate in a protest march or demonstration
- [ ] Participate in discussion groups designed to discuss issues or solutions of a particular concern
- [ ] Vehicle maintenance / improvement
- [ ] Computer games
- [ ] Playing musical instruments
- [ ] With children / grandchildren
- [ ] Gourmet food & wine
Done! Thank you very much for your time and effort in completing this survey. We really appreciate it!

If you are interested in results of this research, please contact pkm894@uowmail.edu.au.

If you would like to participate in the draw of ten $50.- vouchers, could you please write down your email address in the box below. If you win a prize we will inform you via this email address. Thank you.

Please exit the survey and your responses are sent to the University of Wollongong and will remain strictly confidential.

Your help is very much appreciated. All the best to you!

Petra

PS: Please also forward the link to the survey to others who are concerned or could have an interest in the topic of activism related to products that can affect everyone in our society. Thanks a lot!