



Article

How cultural values and ethnicity influence attitude toward boycotting a company in a multicultural marketplace

Cómo los valores culturales y la etnia influyen en la actitud hacia el boicot a una compañía en un mercado multicultural

Sindy Chapa ^{1*}, Olivia S. C. Bravo ²

¹ Center for Hispanic Marketing Communication, Florida State University, Florida, United States of America; schapa@fsu.edu; ORCID: [0000-0002-3462-2487](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3462-2487)

² Caribbean School of Media and Communication, Faculty of Humanities and Education, The University of the West Indies, Mona Campus, Kingston, Jamaica; olivia.bravo@uwimona.edu.jm; ORCID: [0000-0002-7914-7990](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7914-7990)

* Correspondence author / Autor de correspondencia

Received: 01/25/2025; Accepted: 04/13/2025; Published: 07/01/2025.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54167/ejbei.v2i2.1961>

Abstract: This study investigates the influence of Hofstede's cultural values on consumer attitudes toward boycotting corporations within a multicultural national context. Utilizing data from a diverse U.S. sample (N=2,574), multiple regression and ANOVA analyses were conducted to examine the predictive power of cultural dimensions and ethnic differences on boycott attitudes. Results indicate that collectivism, power distance, masculinity, long-term orientation, and indulgence significantly influence consumers' boycott attitudes, explaining a modest but meaningful portion of the variance. Notably, African American/Black participants exhibited the most positive boycott attitudes, highlighting the interplay of cultural values and socio-historical factors. These findings underscore the importance of considering both cultural and contextual factors in understanding consumer boycott behavior, offering valuable insights for marketers and scholars studying multicultural consumer markets.

Keywords: Consumer Boycotts, Cultural Values, Hofstede's Dimensions, Collectivism, Multicultural Markets, Ethnic Differences, Consumer Behavior, Attitude Prediction.

JEL Classification: M31, D12, D91.

How to cite / Como citar:

Chapa, S., & Bravo, O. S. C. (2025). How cultural values and ethnicity influence attitude toward boycotting a company in a multicultural marketplace. *Economicus Journal of Business and Economics Insights*, 2(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.54167/ejbei.v2i2.1961>



Este artículo está bajo los términos de la Licencia Creative Commons Atribución/Reconocimiento NoComercial 4.0 Internacional. This article is under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Resumen: Este estudio investiga la influencia de los valores culturales de Hofstede en las actitudes de los consumidores hacia el boicot a empresas dentro de un contexto nacional multicultural. Utilizando datos de una muestra diversa de los Estados Unidos ($N=2,574$), se realizaron análisis de regresión múltiple y ANOVA para examinar el poder predictivo de las dimensiones culturales y las diferencias étnicas sobre las actitudes hacia el boicot. Los resultados indican que el colectivismo, la distancia al poder, la masculinidad, la orientación a largo plazo y la indulgencia influyen significativamente en las actitudes de boicot de los consumidores, explicando una porción modesta pero significativa de la varianza. De manera destacada, los participantes afroamericanos/negros mostraron las actitudes más positivas hacia el boicot, lo que resalta la interacción entre los valores culturales y los factores socio-históricos. Estos hallazgos subrayan la importancia de considerar tanto los factores culturales como contextuales para comprender el comportamiento del consumidor en boicots, ofreciendo valiosos conocimientos para mercadólogos y académicos que estudian mercados multiculturales.

Palabras clave: Boicots de Consumidores, Valores Culturales, Dimensiones de Hofstede, Colectivismo, Mercados Multiculturales, Diferencias Étnicas, Comportamiento del Consumidor, Predicción de Actitudes.

Clasificación JEL: M31, D12, D91.

1. Introduction

Consumers' refusal to support a brand in protest of its position on social, political, or environmental issues has become a prevalent response in today's marketplace (Weber Shandwick, 2018; Vredenburg & Spry, 2022). In the United States, one in two adults report having boycotted a company (Bruce, 2020), while in the United Kingdom, the figure stands at one in five (Harmston, 2017). Additionally, a global study on consumer attitudes toward corporate social responsibility (CSR) found that over half of respondents would be willing to boycott a brand based on its social or political stance (Harmston, 2017). These findings suggest that consumer perceptions of CSR increasingly influence purchasing behavior, with companies perceived as socially irresponsible or unsupportive facing consumer backlash (Palma-Ruiz et al., 2020). While boycotts may not always result in changes to corporate behavior (King, 2008; Koku, 2012), they can cause significant harm to a brand's financial performance, image, and reputation (Garrett, 1987; Koku, 2012; McDonnell & King, 2013; Pruitt & Friedman, 1986). As such, understanding the drivers and barriers of consumer boycott behavior has become an area of growing interest among both academics and practitioners.

While academic interest in consumer boycott behavior has grown, much of the research has focused on culturally homogeneous marketplaces—contexts characterized by a shared and uniform culture. However, many of the countries where boycott participation is most prevalent (e.g., U.S., Canada, Italy, and U.K.; Hoffmann, 2014) are multicultural marketplaces. A multicultural marketplace is defined as a “place-centered environment (whether physical or virtual) where the marketers, consumers, brands, ideologies, and institutions of multiple cultures converge at one point of concurrent interaction” (Demangeot et al., 2015, p. 118).

Despite the unique challenges and opportunities that multicultural marketplaces present to brands, research remains limited on how consumers' cultural values interact with and influence boycott behavior in these complex environments. These marketplaces often include sizable ethnic subcultures (Jamal, 2003) that can exert substantial economic influence (Korzenny et al., 2017). Purchasing decisions among consumers within these subcultures are shaped by distinct cultural values (Briley, 2009), yet these values remain poorly understood by many marketing managers. De Mooij (2022) argues that marketers often overlook key cultural differences within target segments, opting instead for generalized, universal

assumptions. This issue is further complicated by the evolving nature of consumers' cultural values, as they navigate diverse sociocultural experiences that shape their beliefs, identities, and purchasing behavior.

To date, only one study has examined consumer boycott behavior from a multicultural marketplace perspective. Hoffmann (2014) found a significant relationship between cultural values and consumer boycott behavior across multiple countries. However, that study did not explore how cultural value differences influence boycott intentions within a single multicultural market. Thus, while Hoffmann's (2014) work provides a foundation, it also highlights the need for deeper inquiry.

Further research is needed to understand how cultural values influence boycott behavior among and between different cultural groups within a specific multicultural context. Recent cross-cultural studies suggest that although each country may exhibit characteristic consumption patterns, cultural influences on consumer behavior are dynamic and context-dependent (Chiu et al., 2014). Consumers may draw upon the cultural norms most salient in a given context or use consumption to express relational identity or cultural affiliation (Chiu et al., 2014). Moreover, individuals may adopt value orientations that diverge from the dominant norms of their ethnic or cultural group (de Mooij & Beniflah, 2017). Consequently, it is problematic for marketers to assume that all members of a cultural segment will respond uniformly when deciding whether to boycott a brand.

In response to this gap, the present study investigates how the cultural values of consumers from different ethnic groups influence their intentions to boycott a company within a multicultural market. Focusing on the United States—a large, diverse, and prominent site of consumer activism—this research seeks to identify the cultural values that play a critical role in shaping boycott behavior within and across ethnic groups.

This study holds considerable relevance for understanding consumer boycotts, multicultural consumer behavior, global market dynamics, business strategy, social and political impact, ethical considerations, brand reputation, and academic theory. Cultural values, as emphasized by Hofstede (1980), Yoo et al. (2011), and Czinkota and Ronkainen (2010), are key determinants of individual attitudes and responses toward boycott actions. For businesses, understanding these values is essential to crafting culturally responsive strategies, anticipating potential boycotts, and managing brand reputation. Academically, this study enriches the literature by deepening our understanding of the complex interplay between culture and consumer behavior in multicultural settings.

2. Literature review and hypotheses

2.1. Cultural values in a multicultural marketplace

Values are the foundation of a society's culture (de Mooij, 2022) and a central element of how individuals define themselves (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2022). They represent enduring beliefs or internal standards that guide people's attitudes, preferences, and behaviors (de Mooij, 2022; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Values are shaped by a society's culture, learned through socialization, and may be passed down intergenerationally (Marcus & Cetin, 2023; Sagiv & Schwartz, 2022).

At the macro level, values manifest as cultural values—those shared by a society or cultural group (de Mooij, 2022). At the micro level, individuals hold cultural value orientations, which reflect the specific values each person considers important. The distinction between these two is critical, as individuals may identify with a cultural group yet prioritize values that differ from those commonly held within that group (Chiu et al., 2014; de Mooij, 2022).

Theories of values, such as those by Hofstede (2011), and Sagiv and Schwartz (2022), were developed to classify and compare national cultures. These frameworks propose that all cultural groups possess similar value dimensions, but each group assigns different levels of importance to them (Gerlach &

Eriksson, 2021). Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Framework is the most widely applied, and includes six dimensions:

1. Power distance (acceptance of unequal power distribution),
2. Individualism vs. collectivism (preference for self/family interests vs. group/community goals),
3. Masculinity vs. femininity (value placed on assertiveness and role differentiation),
4. Uncertainty avoidance (tolerance of ambiguity),
5. Long- vs. short-term orientation (focus on future goals vs. immediate outcomes), and
6. Indulgence vs. restraint (gratification of desires vs. societal regulation of needs).

The United States is one of the most culturally diverse consumer markets. Some studies have found significant cultural value differences among ethnic groups (Hofstede, 1980, 2011), while others suggest a convergence of values toward mainstream norms (de Mooij & Beniflah, 2017; Vargas & Kemmelmeier, 2012). For example, using Hofstede's framework, de Mooij and Beniflah (2017) found that most ethnic groups in the U.S.—with the exception of Chinese Americans—shared cultural values similar to non-Hispanic whites. Chinese Americans scored significantly lower on individualism. These findings align with prior research indicating that Chinese Americans tend to be more collectivistic and less individualistic than European Americans (Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2001; Oyserman et al., 2002; Vargas & Kemmelmeier, 2012).

A meta-analysis by Oyserman et al. (2002) also revealed that African Americans scored higher on individualism than European Americans, while Hispanic Americans did not differ significantly from European Americans on that dimension. Much of this body of research has focused predominantly on the individualism–collectivism dimension, often neglecting other aspects of cultural variation.

To address this gap and build upon the findings of de Mooij and Beniflah (2017), the present study examines all six of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. It employs the Individual Cultural Values Scale (CVSCALE) developed by Yoo et al. (2011), which enables the measurement of individual-level cultural values (excluding indulgence/restraint). This distinction is important, as individual value orientations may not align with group-level cultural norms. Indeed, de Mooij and Beniflah (2017) cautioned against applying Hofstede's framework—originally intended for national-level comparisons—to ethnic groups within the same country, noting that these groups share the same institutions, holidays, and public figures.

Consequently, this study poses the following research question:

RQ1: What are the significant differences in cultural value orientations among the major racial and ethnic groups in the United States?

Variations in core values influenced by cultural origins are well documented among consumers from different ethnic backgrounds (Kim et al., 2002). Cultural theories suggest that social norms, customs, and unique historical experiences inherent to each group shape cultural values, which in turn influence consumer behavior (Hofstede, 2011; Triandis, 1998; Luna et al., 2001; Schwartz, 1994). Building on this theoretical framework, the study also seeks to address a second research question:

RQ2: How do cultural value orientations help explain differences in boycott attitudes across major racial and ethnic groups in the United States?

2.2. Linking cultural values to attitude towards boycotting

An individual's attitudes and behaviors are shaped by the norms, beliefs, and values embedded within their cultural environment (Triandis, 1998). The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991) offers a theoretical framework to understand how cultural values may influence consumer behavior such as boycotting. According to TPB, cultural values indirectly shape an individual's attitudes toward specific

behaviors by informing their beliefs about those behaviors and their potential consequences. In the context of boycotting, cultural values can shape how an individual perceives the efficacy, morality, or social implications of such an action. These attitudes, in combination with *subjective norms* and *perceived behavioral control*, influence one's *intention* to boycott, which in turn predicts actual boycott behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

Despite the relevance of cultural context to consumer decision-making, there remains a notable gap in the literature: no prior studies have examined how cultural values influence boycott attitudes within a single multicultural national context. Most existing research has taken a cross-national approach. Notably, Hoffmann's (2014) 36-country study demonstrated that cultural values significantly impact boycott intention and participation. Using the GLOBE framework (House et al., 2004), Hoffmann found that five out of the nine cultural value dimensions were significantly correlated with boycott intentions.

Given the established relationship between attitudes and intentions (Ajzen, 1991), and building on Hoffmann's (2014) findings, this study aims to examine cultural influences on boycott attitudes at the intranational level. Accordingly, the third research question guiding this inquiry is as follows:

RQ3: What cultural values are significant predictors of individuals' attitudes toward boycotting a product or brand within the United States?

2.3. Hypothesis and methodology

Research on behaviors conceptually adjacent to consumer boycotting suggests that cultural values may influence individuals' attitudes toward such actions. For instance, Xu et al. (2021) found that individuals with low power distance beliefs—which reflect one's views on inequality in social hierarchies—were more likely to react negatively toward companies engaged in unethical conduct. This reaction is partly due to heightened empathy for victims and intensified perceptions of harm and moral transgression.

Consumer boycotting has often been conceptualized as a prosocial behavior—a voluntary action intended to benefit others without expectation of personal reward (Klein et al., 2004; Sen et al., 2001). However, high power distance beliefs have been associated with reduced prosocial behaviors, such as charitable giving (Winterich & Zhang, 2014). Individuals high in power distance often prefer rigid hierarchies, discourage emotional expression, and adhere to strict behavioral norms (Carl et al., 2004; Hofstede, 2011), potentially perceiving boycott behavior as socially inappropriate or destabilizing. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Power distance negatively affects consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a company.

Individualism versus collectivism is among the most extensively studied cultural dimensions (Chen & Unal, 2023; Swaidan et al., 2008). Individualists have been shown to be more likely to engage in prosocial behaviors such as helping strangers and volunteering (Winterich & Zhang, 2014). However, collectivists also engage in consumer complaint behavior—conceptually related to boycotting—though often through different mechanisms (Chapa et al., 2014). While individualists may voice dissatisfaction publicly, collectivists may prefer a quieter withdrawal to preserve harmony and save face (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Boycotting, however, is a more instrumental and visible behavior than silent exit or private complaint (Friedman, 1991; Sen et al., 2001). We argue that collectivists may support boycotting if it aligns with community values, helps redress unethical corporate behavior, or serves to protect the collective well-being. Therefore:

H2: Collectivism positively affects consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a company.

The masculinity/femininity dimension of culture has primarily been studied in relation to product preferences and self-concept (Ekebas-Turedi et al., 2021; Kimmel & Tissier-Desbordes, 1999), with limited attention to its role in boycott behavior. Existing research provides mixed insights: Nelson et al. (2006) report that masculine cultures feel a stronger obligation to help others, whereas Winterich and Zhang (2014) find a negative association between masculinity and helping behavior. We posit that individuals with stronger masculine values may favor boycotting because it can be seen as a direct and forceful way to correct corporate misconduct—aligning with masculine ideals of assertiveness, leadership, and moral responsibility (Hofstede, 2011). Thus:

H3: Masculinity positively affects consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a company.

Uncertainty avoidance reflects the extent to which individuals feel uncomfortable with ambiguity (Hofstede, 2011). High uncertainty avoidance is associated with preference for stability, resistance to change, and adherence to rules and traditions. In contrast, low uncertainty avoidance aligns with openness to change, political engagement, and protest behaviors. Since boycotting is a form of protest that challenges the status quo (Dekhil et al., 2017; Ritson & Dobscha, 1999), we argue that individuals with lower uncertainty avoidance may view it more positively. Additionally, research shows that high uncertainty avoidant consumers tend to exhibit stronger brand loyalty (Lam, 2008), which could inhibit boycott participation (Dekhil et al., 2017). Therefore:

H4: Uncertainty avoidance negatively affects consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a company.

Long-term orientation refers to a future-oriented mindset characterized by persistence, planning, and sacrifice for long-term gains (Hofstede et al., 2010). In contrast, short-term orientation emphasizes tradition, immediate gratification, and maintaining one's reputation. Prior studies indicate that long-term orientation influences both ethical judgment (Nevins et al., 2006) and prosocial behavior (Winterich & Zhang, 2014). Individuals with a long-term outlook may view boycotting favorably if it serves as a moral stand that contributes to future improvements in corporate behavior or product quality. Accordingly:

H5: Long-term orientation positively affects consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a product.

Indulgence reflects the degree to which a culture values gratification, enjoyment, and fun (Hofstede, 2011). Cultures high in indulgence often encourage spontaneous consumption and emotional expression, sometimes at the expense of long-term financial planning (Nicholls et al., 2000). In the context of consumer behavior, indulgence may reduce one's willingness to forgo consumption—central to the act of boycotting. Nixon's (1992) account of the South African sports boycott illustrates this tension: indulgence was in conflict with the self-restraint required for moral action. Based on this interpretation, we posit:

H6: Indulgence negatively affects consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a product.

Ethnic identity, closely linked to cultural values, is theorized to influence individual attitudes (Ajzen, 1991). Research has shown significant variation in boycott participation across ethnic groups in the U.S., with White consumers more likely to engage in boycott behaviors than their Asian, Black/African American, and Hispanic counterparts (Baek, 2010; Stepler & Ishizawa, 2021). Based on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H7: Consumers' attitudes toward boycotting a product differ among Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, African American/Black, and Asian consumers residing in the United States.

3. Method

Data were collected using a national online panel in collaboration with Dynata Marketing. A total of 3,500 surveys were initially completed. After removing incomplete responses and unreliable cases, the final valid sample comprised 2,574 participants. The sample included 56% females, with a median age of 35 years, a median annual income level between \$50,000 and \$59,000, and a median educational attainment of some college education. Regarding ethnic identification, 38% identified as Non-Hispanic White, 20.5% as Hispanic, 16% as African American or Black, 28% as Asian American, and 2.9% as other ethnic groups. Additional details on sample characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample characteristics.

Baseline characteristic	sample	
	<i>n</i>	%
<i>Gender</i>		
Female	1106	43.0
Male	1459	56.7
Not listed	9	0.3
<i>Marital status</i>		
Single	849	33.3
Married/partnered	1,315	51.5.3
Divorced	264	10.4
Widowed	64	2.5
Not answered	21	0.8
With Children	615	24.1
<i>Highest educational level</i>		
Elementary/Middle school	26	1.2
High school	540	21.2
Bachelor	700	27.5
Postgraduate degree	400	15.7
<i>Employment</i>		
Unemployed	921	36.1
Student	237	9.3
Employed	1349	52.9
Prefer not to answer	42	14.0
<i>Ethnicity/Race</i>		
Non-Hispanic White	997	38.7
Hispanic	527	20.5
African American/Black	415	16.1
Asian American	561	21.8
Other	74	2.9
<i>Age</i>		
18-29	695	27.0
30-44	628	24.4
45-54	374	14.5
55-64	426	16.6
65 +	453	17.6

Source: Authors.

3.1. Instruments

Hofstede's five cultural dimensions were measured using the 26-item Cultural Value Scale (CVSCALE) developed by Yoo et al. (2011), which assesses individual-level values across Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Long-Term Orientation. Items for each dimension were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). The sixth

dimension, Indulgence versus Restraint, was measured using an individual-level scale adapted from Heydari et al. (2021).

Attitudes toward boycotting large corporations were measured using a 6-item semantic differential scale adapted from Delistavrou (2022), assessing perceptions of boycotting as useful, advantageous, fair, good, reasonable, and desirable.

Demographic variables, including ethnicity, age, income, and education, were collected in the demographic section of the survey.

3.1.1. Validation of the measures

This study's analyses concentrated on a number of latent constructs, all of which were evaluated using seven-point scales, as suggested by Hair et al. (2010) for the assessment of continuous variables. The internal validity of the scales was assessed via exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and reliability analysis. EFAs confirmed that items loaded on their respective constructs, except for one item from the Power Distance scale, which was removed due to low factor loading (< 0.40). All constructs demonstrated acceptable factor variances (> 0.50) and Cronbach's alpha reliabilities exceeding 0.70, indicating adequate internal consistency (see Table 2).

Table 2. Exploratory factor analysis and Cronbach's alphas.

Measure		Factor
<i>Power Distance</i>		
People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions		0.851
People in higher positions should not ask the opinions of people in lower positions too frequently		0.864
People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions by people in higher positions		0.847
People in higher positions should not delegate important tasks to people in lower positions		0.802
	Total of Variance	70.8%
	Cronbach's alpha	0.860
<i>Collectivism</i>		
Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group		0.717
Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties		0.718
Group welfare is more important than an individual's reward		0.808
Group success is more important than individual success		0.819
Individuals should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group		0.790
Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer		0.772
	Total of Variance	59.9%
	Cronbach's alpha	0.863
<i>Masculinity</i>		
Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition		0.843
Solving difficult problems usually requires an active, forcible approach, which is typical of men		0.873
There are some jobs that a man can always do better than a woman		0.776
It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women		0.805
	Total of Variance	66.3%
	Cronbach's alpha	0.826
<i>Uncertainty Avoidance</i>		
It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures		0.596
Rules and regulations are important because they inform me of what is expected of me		0.877
Standardized work procedures are helpful		0.880
Instructions for operations are important		0.839
It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures		0.851
	Total of Variance	66.5%
	Cronbach's alpha	0.856
<i>Long-Term Oriented</i>		
I am a long-term planning person		0.805

<i>Restraint vs Indulgence</i>	Giving up today's fun for success in the future	0.823
	Working hard for success in the future	0.823
	Total of Variance	70%
	Cronbach's alpha	0.750
<i>Boycott Perception</i>	I manage my money carefully	0.763
	Going resolutely in spite	0.753
	Personal Steadiness and stability	0.830
	Total of Variance	61.2%
<i>Boycott Perception</i>	Non beneficial/Beneficial	0.853
	Useless/Useful	0.887
	Unfair/Fair	0.902
	Bad/Good	0.923
<i>Boycott Perception</i>	Unreasonable/ Reasonable	0.916
	Undesirable/Desirable	0.895
	Total of Variance	80.3%
	Cronbach's alpha	0.950

Source: Authors.

4. Results

4.1. Hypotheses testing

Multiple regression was used to test if cultural values significantly predicted consumers' attitude towards boycotting. The results showed the model to be significant, $F(6, 2574) = 30.04, p < 0.001$. However, the adjusted R^2 was 0.07, indicating that cultural values explained less than 10% of the variance in boycott attitude. In terms of hypotheses testing, the unstandardized coefficients were analyzed. As expected, the results showed that power distance ($B = -0.069, p < 0.001$) is a significant negative predictor of attitudes toward boycotting. That is, the lower the levels of power distance of the consumers, the more likely it is to have a positive attitude toward boycotting a product or brand. Thus, H1 is supported. See results in Table 3.

Table 3. Unstandardized coefficient effect of cultural values on attitude towards boycotting.

Effect	Estimate	SE	beta	t	p-value
Intercept	2.929	0.225		13.03	0.000
Power distance	-0.069	0.028	-0.057	-2.45	0.014
Collectivism	0.177	0.033	0.122	5.41	0.000
Masculinity	-0.130	0.026	-0.114	-4.93	0.000
Uncertainty Avoidance	0.040	0.037	0.025	1.09	0.272
Long-Term Orientation	0.083	0.035	0.059	2.33	0.019
Indulgence	0.187	0.040	0.116	4.62	0.000

Source: Authors.

Next, the regression results showed collectivism ($B = 0.177, p < 0.001$) to influence consumers' attitudes toward boycotting. That is, the more group-oriented, the higher the consumer's attitudes toward boycotting, and so H2 is supported. In terms of masculinity, the test showed the value ($B = -0.13, p < 0.001$) to be a statistically significant predictor. However, contrary to what was hypothesized, the results showed a negative effect. This means that individuals with less masculine characteristics will be more prone to express a more positive attitude towards boycotting. Thus, H3 is partially supported.

Regarding the effect of the level of uncertainty avoidance, the results showed no significant impact on attitude toward boycotting. Thus, H4 is rejected. See Table 3. Further, the long-term orientation value was found to be a significant positive predictor of consumers' attitudes toward boycotting ($B = 0.083$, $p = 0.019$). Thus, H5 is supported. In terms of indulgence vs. restraint, the variable was measured using a restraint scale as opposed to indulgence. The results showed a significant positive effect ($B = 0.187$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, H6 is partially supported. In other words, it was found that consumers who exhibited lower indulgence were more likely to have a positive attitude toward boycotting.

To compare the effect of attitudes toward boycotting among ethnic groups, a one-way ANOVA between groups was run between Non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanic Americans, African Americans/Blacks, and Asian Americans. The results showed a significant group difference ($F = 4.06$, $p = 0.003$). Further, a Univariate Bonferroni test indicated a statistical difference when comparing African Americans/Blacks with Non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans. The mean difference test showed African Americans had more positive attitudes toward boycotting than Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Non-Hispanic Whites, in that order. In addition, the results showed no significant difference between the other three groups. Therefore, H7 is partially supported. See results in Table 4.

Table 4. One-way ANOVA comparing attitude towards boycotting across ethnic groups.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	42.114	4	10.529	4.064	0.003
Univariate Bonferroni Test					
African American		Mean Difference			Sig.
Non-Hispanic White		0.33846			0.007
Hispanics		0.34845			0.018
Asian Americans		0.36568			0.008
Others		0.55394			0.081

Source: Authors.

4.2. Exploring the research questions

A one-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to compare cultural value orientations among Non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanic Americans, African Americans/Blacks, and Asian Americans (RQ1). The analysis revealed significant differences across ethnic groups in power distance [$F(4, 3477) = 5.768$, $p < 0.001$], collectivism [$F(4, 3476) = 6.019$, $p < 0.001$], and masculinity [$F(4, 3470) = 8.2$, $p < 0.001$]. Post hoc Bonferroni tests indicated that Non-Hispanic Whites exhibited significantly lower power distance ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.49$) than both Hispanic Americans ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.45$) and African Americans/Blacks ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.62$). Asian Americans reported significantly higher collectivism ($M = 4.5$, $SD = 1.24$) compared to Non-Hispanic Whites ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.13$), while no other significant differences in collectivism were observed among the remaining groups. Masculinity scores were significantly lower for Non-Hispanic Whites ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.48$) relative to African Americans/Blacks ($M = 3.8$, $SD = 1.49$), Hispanic Americans ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.5$), and Asian Americans ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.34$).

A subsequent multiple linear regression analysis assessed the influence of cultural value orientations on boycott attitudes, revealing a modest yet significant effect (RQ2). Standardized regression coefficients identified collectivism as the strongest predictor of consumer boycott attitudes (RQ3; see Table 3). Additionally, lower levels of indulgence and masculinity also significantly predicted more positive attitudes toward boycotting.

5. Discussion and limitations

This study examined cultural values across racial and ethnic groups within a multicultural intranational context, aiming to identify the key cultural dimensions shaping consumer attitudes toward boycotting companies. It also recognized the adaptive and dynamic nature of cultural values among consumers.

Findings demonstrate that cultural values significantly predict consumers' boycott attitudes in multicultural markets, aligning with the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), which posits that underlying beliefs and values shape behavioral attitudes. Although the overall effect size was modest, all cultural values except uncertainty avoidance significantly contributed to explaining boycott attitudes. Collectivism emerged as the most influential predictor: consumers emphasizing group welfare were more likely to endorse boycotting, likely because such behavior benefits their in-group while preserving self-esteem and reputation.

Interestingly, Asian Americans reported the highest collectivism but did not express the most positive boycott attitudes. Conversely, African Americans/Blacks showed the most favorable boycott attitudes despite having collectivism scores comparable to other groups. This suggests that cultural values alone do not fully explain boycott attitudes; socio-historical experiences, normative beliefs, and moral orientations also play important roles. For example, the historical legacy of protest and boycotting within African American communities (National Humanities Center, 2007) may cultivate a collective acceptance of such actions as legitimate forms of social response. Furthermore, Swaidan et al. (2008) found that African American participants high in collectivism and low in masculinity reported greater moral idealism—adherence to universal moral principles irrespective of context.

The divergence between highest collectivism (Asian Americans) and most positive boycott attitudes (African Americans/Blacks) highlights the need for marketers and researchers to integrate socio-political and historical contexts when examining consumer boycott behavior.

Moreover, the fact that African Americans/Blacks had the most positive boycott attitudes contrasts with prior research indicating higher boycott participation among White consumers (Baek, 2010; Stepler & Ishizawa, 2021). This suggests a potential attitude-behavior gap. According to the Theory of Planned Behavior, positive attitudes should predict behavior; however, barriers such as limited access to substitute products and skepticism about boycott efficacy may inhibit actual participation. Perceived and actual behavioral control and situational constraints likely influence whether positive attitudes translate into action. Overall, this exploratory study reinforces the relevance of cultural values in consumer boycott behavior while acknowledging ethnic differences in values and attitudes.

Despite these contributions, some limitations merit consideration. The use of an online panel sample raises concerns about potential selection bias; future research should incorporate non-response bias tests to enhance validity. The relatively small representation of Asians from Western countries limits generalizability for this subgroup. Additionally, data collection was restricted to the U.S., limiting applicability to other multicultural contexts. To improve robustness, replication studies in similarly diverse countries, such as England or Australia, are recommended. Further research should also explore urban-rural differences and age cohort effects to capture a more comprehensive understanding of consumer boycott attitudes across demographic segments.

CRedit Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.C., & O.B.; methodology, S.C.; software, O.B.; validation, S.C.; formal analysis, S.C.; investigation, O.B.; resources, S.C.; data curation, O.B.; writing—original draft preparation, S.C., & O.B.; writing—review and editing, S.C.; visualization, O.B.; supervision, S.C. "All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript."

Conflicts of Interest: "The authors declare no conflicts of interest."

Important Note: A preliminary version of this article has been previously published as a pre-print and is available on SSRN at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4823087> or via DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4823087>.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-t](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t)
- Baek, Y. M. (2010). To Buy or Not to Buy: Who are Political Consumers? What do they Think and How do they Participate? *Political Studies*, 58(5), 1065–1086. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2010.00832.x>
- Briley, D. A. (2009). Cultural Influence on Consumer Motivations: A Dynamic View. In: C. Nakata (Ed.) *Beyond Hofstede*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230240834_9
- Bruce, G. (2020, July 15). Half of Americans Have Boycotted a Brand. YouGov. <https://today.yougov.com/politics/articles/30888-brand-boycotts>
- Carl, D., Gupta, V., & Javidan, M. (2004). Power Distance. In V. Gupta, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan, P. Hanges, & R. House (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 513–563). Sage Publications.
- Chapa, O., Hernandez, M. D., Wang, Y. J., & Skalski, C. (2014). Do Individualists Complain More than Collectivists? A Four-Country Analysis on Consumer Complaint Behavior. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 26(5), 373–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2014.933089>
- Chen, C., & Unal, A. (2023, June 21). Individualism-Collectivism: A Review of Conceptualization and Measurement. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.350>
- Chiu, C. Y., Kwan, L. Y. Y., Li, D., Peng, L., & Peng, S. (2014). Culture and consumer behavior. *Foundations and Trends in Marketing*, 7(2), 109–179. <https://doi.org/10.1561/17000000032>
- Coon, H. M., & Kimmelmeier, M. (2001). Cultural Orientations in the United States: (Re)Examining Differences among Ethnic Groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(3), 348–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032003006>
- Czinkota, M. R., & Ronkainen, I. A. (2011). *Global business: positioning ventures ahead*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Global-Business-Positioning-Ventures-Ahead/Czinkota-Ronkainen/p/book/9780415801942>
- de Mooij, M., & Beniflah, J. (2017). Measuring Cross-Cultural Differences of Ethnic Groups within Nations: Convergence or Divergence of Cultural Values? The Case of the United States. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 29(1), 2–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2016.1227758>
- de Mooij, M. (2022). *Global Marketing and advertising: Understanding cultural paradoxes* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Dekhil, F., Jridi, H., & Farhat, H. (2017). Effect of Religiosity on the Decision to Participate in a Boycott. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 8(2), 309–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jima-01-2013-0008>
- Delistavrou, A. (2022). Theory of Planned Behaviour and Boycotting: The Moderating Role of Socio-Political Control and Demographics. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 17(2), 270–87. <https://doi.org/10.1108/emjb-02-2021-0020>
- Demangeot, C., Broderick, A. J., & Craig, S. C. (2015). Multicultural Marketplaces. *International Marketing Review*, 32(2), 118–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/imr-01-2015-0017>
- Ekebas-Turedi, C., Cilingir Uk, Z., Basfirinci, C., & Pinar, M. (2021). A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Gender-Based Food Stereotypes and Consumption Intentions among Millennial Consumers. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 33(2), 209–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2020.1771644>
- Friedman, M. (1991). Consumer Boycotts: A Conceptual Framework and Research Agenda. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(1), 149–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1991.tb01817.x>
- Garrett, D. E. (1987). The Effectiveness of Marketing Policy Boycotts: Environmental Opposition to Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251128>
- Gerlach, P., & Eriksson, K. (2021). Measuring Cultural Dimensions: External Validity and Internal Consistency of Hofstede's VSM 2013 Scales. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12: 662604. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.662604>

- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Harmston, S. (2017, April 7). One in Five Consumers Have Boycotted a Brand. YouGov. <https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2017/04/07/one-five-consumers-have-boycotted-brand>
- Heydari, A., Laroche, M., Paulin, M., & Richard, M. O. (2021). Hofstede's individual-level indulgence dimension: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 62, 102640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102640>
- Hoffmann, S. (2014). Does National Culture Impact Consumer Boycott Prevalence? A Multi-Country Study. *European Journal of International Management*, 8(2), 141–59. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ejim.2014.059580>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(80\)90013-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(80)90013-3)
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Jamal, A. (2003). Marketing in a Multicultural World: The Interplay between Marketing, Ethnicity and Consumption. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(11/12), 1599–1620. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560310495375>
- Kim, J., Forsythe, S., Gu, Q., & Jae Moon, S. (2002). Cross-cultural consumer values, needs and purchase behavior", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(6), 481–502. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760210444869>
- Kimmel, A. J., & Tissier-Desbordes, E. (1999). Males, masculinity, and consumption: An exploratory investigation. *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 4, 243–251. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/12811075ecf671fd7e2335df07ac21e5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=7206596>
- King, B. G. (2008). A Political Mediation Model of Corporate Response to Social Movement Activism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3), 395–421. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.53.3.395>
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C., & John, A. (2004). Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation." *Journal of Marketing*, 68(3), 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.3.92.34770>
- Koku, P. S. (2012). On the Effectiveness of Consumer Boycotts Organized through the Internet: The Market Model. *Journal of Services Marketing* 26(1), 20–26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041211199698>
- Korzenny, F., Chapa, S., & Korzenny, B. A. (2017). *Hispanic marketing: The power of the new Latino consumer* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315688824>
- Lam, D. (2008). Cultural Influence on Proneness to Brand Loyalty. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 19(3), 7–21. https://doi.org/10.1300/j046v19n03_02
- Luna, D., & Forquer Gupta, S. (2001). An Integrative Framework for Cross-cultural Consumer Behavior. *International Marketing Review*, 18(1), 45–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330110381998>
- Marcus, J., & Cetin, E. (2023). Genetic Predictors of Cultural Values Variation between Societies. *Scientific Reports* 13(1), 7986. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-34845-x>
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.98.2.224>
- McDonnell, M.-H., & King, B. (2013). Keeping up Appearances: Reputational Threat and Impression Management after Social Movement Boycotts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(3), 387–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213500032>
- National Humanities Center. (2007). The making of the African American identity: Volume III, 1917-1968. Toolbox Library: Primary Resources in U.S. History and Literature. <https://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/pds/maai3/maai3.htm>
- Nelson, M. R., Brunel, F. F., & Supphellen, M., & Manchanda, R. V. (2006). Effects of Culture, Gender, and Moral Obligations on Responses to Charity Advertising across Masculine and Feminine Cultures. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1601_7
- Nevins, J. L., Bearden, W. O., & Money, B. (2006). Ethical Values and Long-Term Orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 71(3), 261–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9138-x>

- Nicholls, J. A. F., Li, F., Mandokovic, T., Roslow, S., & Kranendonk, C. J. (2000). US-Chilean mirrors: shoppers in two countries. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(2), 106–119. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760010317187>
- Nixon, R. (1992). Apartheid on the Run: The South African Sports Boycott. *Transition*, 58, 68–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2934968>
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 3–72. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3>
- Palma-Ruiz, J. M., Castillo-Appaiz, J., & Gómez-Martínez, R. (2020). Socially responsible investing as a competitive strategy for trading companies in times of upheaval amid COVID-19: Evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 8(3), 41. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijfs8030041>
- Pruitt, S. W., & Friedman, M. (1986). Determining the Effectiveness of Consumer Boycotts: A Stock Price Analysis of Their Impact on Corporate Targets. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 9(4), 375–387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00380573>
- Ritson, M., & Dobscha, S. (1999). Marketing heretics: resistance is/is not futile. *ACR North American Advances*, 26(1), 159.
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2022). Personal Values across Cultures. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 73(1), 517–546. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-020821-125100>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications* (pp. 85–119). Sage Publications.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value Hierarchies across Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(3), 268–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032003002>
- Sen, S., Gürhan-Canli, Z., & Morwitz, V. (2001). Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(3), 399–417. <https://doi.org/10.1086/323729>
- Stepler, R., & Ishizawa, H. (2021). Immigrant Voices: How Do Patterns of Expressive Forms of Civic Engagement Differ across Immigrant Generation? *Societies Without Border*, 12(2), 1–22. <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1286&context=swb>
- Swaidan, Z., Rawwas, M. Y. A., & Vitell, S. J. (2008). Culture and Moral Ideologies of African Americans. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679160203>
- Triandis, H. C. (1998). *Individualism and collectivism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429499845>
- Vargas, J. H., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2012). Ethnicity and Contemporary American Culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(2), 195–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022112443733>
- Vredenburg, J., & Spry, A. (2022). Consumer activism and social movements. In *The Routledge Companion to Marketing and Society* (pp. 109–123). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003028079-10>
- Weber Shandwick (2018, January 30). Battle of the wallets: The changing landscape of consumer activism. <https://webershandwick.com/news/battle-of-the-wallets-the-changing-landscape-of-consumer-activism>
- Winterich, K. P., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Accepting Inequality Deters Responsibility: How Power Distance Decreases Charitable Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(2), 274–93. <https://doi.org/10.1086/675927>
- Xu, H., Bolton, L. E., & Winterich, K. P. (2021). How Do Consumers React to Company Moral Transgressions? The Role of Power Distance Belief and Empathy for Victims. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48(1), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucaa067>
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's Five Dimensions of Cultural Values at the Individual Level: Development and Validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(3–4), 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2011.578059>