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Abstract

The present manuscript constitutes a master thesis which deals with the existence of collective movements which are related with consumer behavior, in digital era. Such collective movements are boycott campaigns. We used the exciting Greek boycott campaign, namely “Coca-Cola: Without Sip” in order to examine how collective movements are adapted in online environments. Facebook was the main Social Network Site (SNS) that we used in order to investigate the online consumer activity, through the movements regarding variables as consumer’s right awareness, online activity, movement’s efficacy and relation with corporate policies and political convictions. In total 250 respondents were collected through online survey during April 2017. Respondents were both members in boycott FB groups and non-members. Results indicate that the content and the way users – members of the campaign interact each other online, plays a paramount role in order to appeal new campaign’s supporters. The ability to express, share and comment your opinion that the new digital era offers to users, contribute to the campaign efficacy. Even though, most of correspondents support the relation between boycott campaign and political convictions, corporate policies and tactics do not affect their active participation in them. In conclusion, the results revealed that for the specific boycott campaign, the protection of rights was not the principal excuse for boycotters in order to take part in boycotting. Finally, prospective researchers could focus their attention to local boycott campaigns in the online environment.
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1. Introduction

Living in a constantly changing period, where the term of democracy has been disputed many times in past, often sociologists and economical analysts emphasizes the crisis of rights. Democratic governmental system gives the opportunity to citizens of expressing their opinions and supporting their rights. The frequent legislation interchange has led to the corruption of citizens’ rights with the willingness of reaction, protest and revolution in a framework of increasing rights disputation. What happens when legislation reformatting or corporate policies are setting with only goal the profit?

More and more global companies act illegal or unethical to reduce the costs of production and increase their profit. However, the constantly prices switching, the products devaluation and the extreme decline of income average provokes in the plural of cases domino effects, while in contrast, the consumers are unable to protest and adjust in the new conditions. There are consumers characterized, still, by rights unawareness and apathy, even though, collective movements around the world organized to react and support the rights.

The Greek government – debt crisis, started in late 2009 led the decrease of investments, decline in sales and salaries’ cut-backs. Many times, illegal and unethical corporate policies were implemented to achieve company’s sustainability. Boycott campaign are not a common phenomenon in the Greek market. However, a local boycott campaign by a colossus company, Coca-Cola was enough to attract the attention of the community, the competitive companies, journalists and economists.

Market consists of different players with different pricing policies and selected corporate policies. Boycott campaigns, as a contemporary collective movement, impinges on corporate profits, giving power to other companies gain market share and many times increasing the possibility of product quality degradation. This happened with the case of Coca-Cola boycott campaign: “Without sip”.

Consumer’s reactions, in Greece are limited. Protests usually created by workers, related with cut-backs or bad work conditions and not about rights’ advocacy. Although is the
ignorance or the half–awareness excuses for consumer’s tolerance and domination of corporate policies?

The evolution of communication and the growth of digital and mobile technology has radically changed the way of thinking about business. Companies, now can connect directly with the consumers – customers, interact and understand the way they react and express their preferences about products. On the other side, consumers - users, now can communicate and share their opinions about products and companies more easily. This brand engagement by consumers in online platforms gives external value to collective movements. Communication digital campaign could support huge boycott campaigns in the global market and endorse information’s disseminations and motivation for protest.

The following dissertation deconstructs the relation between consumer rights – collective movements specialized in boycott campaigns in the framework of digital environment. How does social networking contribute to boycott campaigns? How had social networks contributed to the success of Coca-Cola campaign? Does online activity increase the intension for participating in boycott campaigns, as part of consumer activism? The upcoming literature review will introduce the reader to the consumers’ collective movement as a result of provocative corporate and politics policies.

2. Literature review

2.1 Consumer activism – Consumer rights

The significance of consumer’s rights protection has led to collective movements calling activism. According to Dictionary.com (2017), consumer activism defined as “1. A modern movement for the protection of the consumer against useless, inferior, or dangerous products, misleading advertising, unfair pricing, etc; 2. The concept that an ever-expanding consumption of goods is advantageous to the economy; 3. The fact or practice of an increasing consumption of goods: a critic of American consumerism.” (as cited in Biharie, 2012, p.9). According to Hilton (2007), the consumer activism made an appearance when the community started to assert every type of right. Labor rights, women interdependence or even political and economy forces. Over the years, where
the consumer behavior had started to play a paramount role in political and economy scene, many associations become active with main initiative the consumer behavior research while many NGOs activated with main initiative the consumer rights protection. Countries all over Europe as United Kingdom, France, Netherlands and Germany but further the industrialized states in Asia were also developing a consumer movement, as early as 1956 in India (Hilton, 2007).

Governments, activists, collective or individuals and non-governmental organizations all over the world have established to protect the consumer rights and responsibilities. This action has led many time the reformating of the legislation as a need of consumer protection. Superior example the Kennedy acknowledgement and announcement of the consumer’s rights of choice, safety, correct orientation and the right to be heard. On 1983, the first World Consumer Rights Day was marked with a ceremony ending with the final legislation, which formatted the consumer rights, established by the Global Organization Consumers International. The conclusion was the addition of the rest 4 consumer’s rights as redress, satisfaction, healthy environment and education (Kendall, Gill, Cheney, 2007, p.243). In contemporary Greece, under the auspice of the European Consumer Center, Greek consumer can share their complaints, informing about the European legislation of consumer rights and enjoying the full benefits of the internal market. ("Consumer's Rights in Greece", 2017)

Summarizing all the above, it is recommended for the present research to highlight the consumer right to be heard (or the right to voice), as we consider that it is related with the human right support and by extension, with the consumer right support.

The right to be heard and the right to voice: Consumers have the right to equal and fair consideration in government policy-making situations, as well as prompt treatment in administrative courts or legal communities. In other words, consumers have a right to complain when there have problems or concerns. They have the right to speak up, to yell, and to expect positive results. Through this right, both business and government expect to respond to consumers (Alabama A&M and Auburn Universities, 2017).
The right to be heard assures that the government policy and the company’s development of products and services will take full under consideration the concerns and the needs of the consumers, acting with sympathy and simple and expeditious administrative procedures (“What are consumer rights? definition and meaning”, 2017). The previous assentation links with consumer activism “as a result of the inability of governments to protect the consumer” (Biharie, p.11).

When the rights of consumers are infringed on, a collective dissatisfaction occurs which is outlined by a social outrage and movement. This is a collective reaction. “When there is a lack of access to representative institutions, which challenge authorities by raising unaccepted conditions, collective action becomes contentious” (Biharie, 2012, p. 12). Social movements possess a variety of tactics and forms of mobilization as protesting, demonstrations, boycotts and blockades (Shakespeare, 1993).

2.2 Collective efficacy – Self efficacy

In addition, how do the consumers react when they feel that their rights are violated by? Are they willing to react? At a time, when the willingness to activism depends on the crucial size of the problem and whether it affects his personal life, during years of values crisis and community values’ alienation, the consumers refuse to participate when the outcome will not affect beneficially the quality of their life. When the collectivism turns into a survival game in the current unfavorable life conditions, the possibilities of activation of feelings as compassion, indignation and courage for reaction are clearly limited. However, history has indicated that every successful mass movement depends on the sense of collegiality and offer in total.

Collective efficacy depends on the values shared by the community members. If community members are eager to contribute and cooperate into a beneficial way, most of the times, the result reduces delinquent types. The way that the members of a group communicate and trust each other and the strong feelings of solidarity consists crucial components for the efficient operation of a group. However, related studies (read extensively the research by Maxwell, Garner & Skogan, 2011) claim that even though collective efficacy leads to the isolation of the harmful entities and theories of a
community, the effectiveness for deterring types of ideology is higher in communities where those types are disapproved.

The success of a collective movement, even if is a protesting, a demonstration, a boycott or a blockade, depends on the member’s perception of a united movement with coherence, solidarity and common goals. The member needs to apprehend the team support and the feeling of contribution to a beneficial and predicted result. The feeling of dignity as collective movement’s member consists crucial importance. During the years, the term of collectivism has been affected by the social-economical changes. This raises the need to investigate the way the members’ comprehension, the way that they contribute in a collective movement, during a period of deep crisis, indignation and poverty, characterized by the community member’s isolation and a consecutive try to survive. The term of an active citizen has dissembled by the passivity, the confused opinions about rights and duties. As a result, every type of collective movement loses its identity, enforcing by the sense of censorship. Enclosing the entire above, one more predictor that our research will investigate is the feeling of contribution and the collective efficacy of the collective movement. With specific questions, we will be underlying the sense of solidarity of contribution and the perception of participation in a movement with clear goals.

2.3 Boycott as a consumer collective movement

The definition of consumer boycott, which we choose for the present manuscript, is framed by Friedman as “an attempt by one or more parties to achieve certain objectives by urging individual consumers to refrain from making selected purchases in the marketplace” (Friedman, 1985, p. 198-199).

“Boycott participation is theorized not only as a collective effort for corporate behavior change, but also as a complex expression of each participant's individuality” (Farah, 2017, p.7).

According to history, the term boycott was used for first time by the newspaper “The Times” in 1880 as a term of an organized isolation. Captain Charles Boycott, a landowner, was the inspiring person of the word when during the “Irish land war” and
the acme of the feudalism; he denied the demands of his tenants to reduce the rent price because of the poor harvests. By contrast, he preferred to evict most of them. Thus, an organized movement encouraged the tenants of the country to shun the fields where the previous tenants were evicted by the Boycott. (En.wikipedia.org, 2016). Under the International Law, the boycott characterized as a peaceful pressure reaction. (En.wikipedia.org, 2010)

According to the related literature, there are two types of boycott, the marketing policy boycotts and the socio-political or ethical control (Smith, 1990). Moreover, Farah (2017) on his research has an extended reference of the “Macro-boycutting behavior framework” with the Egyptian case as an example of origin as a paramount variable behind consumers’ boycotting decision. In the case of macro-boycotting consumers, deliberately ignore all information about the product and focus on their beliefs about the association between the product and its COO. (The country of origin (COO), as Srinivasan & Jain referred (2003), constitutes not only a significant aspect in buyer decisions, but also in the global market perceptions.) This type of boycotting campaign, characterized by “perceived religious, political, diplomatic or even military domestic “Egregious Act” * (Aish, McKechnie, Abosag & Hassan, 2012).

(*Egregious Act: when someone decides to participate by individual in boycotting campaigns (John & Klein, 2003; Friedman, 1999; Smith, 1990).)

A new theoretical framework encloses all the above reaction, named Animosity. This is defined as “the remnants of antipathy toward another country due to past military, political, or economic conflicts, affects the buying of foreign goods.” (Klein, Ettenso, & Morris, 1998, p.90)

The “micro-boycotting” characterizes the boycott behavior, which focus on boycotts directed on companies. This type of boycott describes by the individual expression of each boycott participant in order to satisfy his self-consistency and the need to be in agreement with the values and the ethics. “The effectiveness of the boycott depends on the expectations of the group members with whom the individual identifies.” (Farah, p.7)
Klein, Smith & John (2004) tried to identify the motivations of consumer boycott finding 4 reasons why consumers boycott (Klein, Smith, & John, 2004):

1. The satisfaction of contributing in a positive result. The desire as a community member into social movements and the feeling of the membership into collectively reactions.
2. The self-enhancement. “This intrinsic reward of boycotting is derived from being admired by others for your actions” (Biharie, 2012, p.13).
3. The reinforcement of the dutiful decision of boycott participation. The consumers can realize if there is the necessity of their participation or if it is fruitless.
4. The total expense of a boycotting campaign for someone who use this product than a consumer who does not. The raising question if this movement is frivolous for a product if the consumer really needs it.

Furthermore, quantitative researches indicated four more reasons, which motivates the consumers being involved in boycott campaigns: the desire to make a difference, scope for self-improvement (linked directly with the above second motivation), the response for cancels and the enforced consumption (Aish, McKechnie, Abosag & Hassan, 2012).

Boycotting in Greece is not a common phenomenon in the contemporary community. Related to the demographics characteristics in previous researches (Titikidou, 2010), potential boycotters might be men and women around 50-59 years old, having master degrees and high incomes. As for the boycott organized groups, they should address to a middle age, cultivated group to transfer the suitable knowledge about the ethical consumerism.

2.4 Boycotts & corporate practices
Consumer options affect corporate policies and behavior while the corporate responsibility consists one of the components of company success. The ability of ‘doing the right thing’ is a main initiative for the right cooperation of shareholders and other stakeholders. The consumers, employees and investors care in ways create economic incentives for companies to give attention to corporate responsibility (Smith, 2007).
However, consumer behavior, according to Mohr et al. (2001), generally to businesses, is positive with only ¼ of them is negative, while the opposite effects are presented in Papadopoulos et al. (2011). According to the last research, perceptions of Greek consumers for major Greek firms are negative, as firstly, there is low interest for the community and employees, for the environmental protection, the safety of workers and consumers and the improving the lives of citizens. Secondly, there is dishonesty and opacity as the overpricing of products and involvement in politics. The Last factor is that with the least negative perception and is related with the contribution of large firms to economic prosperity. The authors explain that the above results are expected due to the unstable economic situation in recent years and the constant accusations of corruption, fraud, speculation and poor working conditions. The assumption that the company has increased by 3% spending on social purposes, have a positive impact on perceptions of Greek consumers against big Greek companies which slightly improves the interest to the community and its employees and factor "honesty and transparency", while, in contrast worsen consumer perceptions of the contribution of large enterprises to economic prosperity. Simply, consumers believe that if a company implemented a CSR policy; contribute less to the economic prosperity of the country. In general, consumers will react positively to companies that implement CSR policies, but must first be convinced of the sincerity of their intentions, and will not appreciate a CSR policy, if at the same time charged with 28 scandals, tax evasion, interweaving, profiteering or mistreatment of workers (Ellen et al., 2006; Papadopoulos et al., 2011). In a business environment such as that of Greece, the shift in consumer perceptions requires not just good political communication, but also attempt to consolidate the philosophy and practices of most businesses in Consumers (Papadopoulos et al., 2011). The responsibilities of a business relating to commercial issues such as innovation, quality, adequate information, perceptions honest relationship with consumers and other issues related to the commercialization of the product has a positive and direct impact on the overall picture of the company. Social behavior is described by the interest for the protection of the natural environment, budget direction to donations and social projects favoring minorities or the support for the development of society by funding social and cultural activities and generally the concern to improve the general
welfare of society. Those affect significantly positive overall image of the company, but to a lesser extent, by commercial activities.

Klein, Andrew and John make an extended reference on Shell’s Boycott example starting on 1995 by the hanging of six environmental activists who declared against exploitation by Royal Dutch/Shell and the Nigeria government. This was an action by the cooperation of the Nigerian government and Shell Company to keep in ignorance a growing movement among the Ogoni people. ("Boycott Shell/Free Nigeria: The main issues", 2017). As the Ogoniland consist the most profitable area in Nigeria, the people of Ogoni see little to nothing from their contribution to Shell's pocketbook. As the Shell example suggests, boycotts can serve as a form of social control of business and as a mechanism for promoting corporate social responsibility (Smith 1990 et Klein, Smith & John, 2016 p.4). The above example has direct connection with the “ethical purchase behavior”. The ethical purchase behavior involves not only the buying from companies and nations whose behaviors and offerings are deemed ethical, but also the refrain from purchasing from those whose practices are judged unethical (Farah, 2017). The type of consumers who are involved in this frame work, described by Engel and Blackwell in 1982 (p. 610) as “those persons who not only are concerned with their own personal satisfaction, but also buy with some consideration of the social and environmental well-being of others.”

The accusation of Nike of using sweatshops since the 1970, producing goods in China, Taiwan and south Chorea, led to a multi-country boycott of the brand and as an aftereffect a consecutive trial by the company to persuade the audience for the crucial CSR. “We’ve taken significant actions to improve the lives, opportunities and working conditions of the people who make our product around the world, and regularly invest in the communities where we do business. And we do this so that consumers can buy Nike products with the knowledge that these products have been manufactured under safe and fair working conditions” (Nike, 2000). Motivations against the social responsibilities varied between the relation of the environmental consciousness of consumers and company’s responsibility to environment or the company’s government authority.
According to related literature, there are two categories of purchase behavior regarding the corporate responsibility. The positive ethical consumerism and the negative ethical consumerism. The first scale is directly connected with the ethical buying. “Consumers care about issues of corporate responsibility and this will influence their purchase and consumption behaviors and this, in turn, provides incentives for companies to be socially and environmentally responsible.” (Smith, 2007, p.4). This type of consumers takes into consideration political, religious, environmental, social or other motives while their main characteristic is that the purchasing choice does not only affect themselves but also the external world around them. This has also relabeled as a “buycott”. However, Vogel (2005) referred to a 2004 European study that 75% of participants indicating that they would purchase because of social and environmental criteria, but only 3% having done so.

According to Ethical consumer magazine, there are four types of consumer ethical buying, which are related with the supporting of the 'good' companies and products as it is withdrawing our support from the 'bad' ones. (“Why Buy Ethically?”, 2016). More extensively:

- Positive Buying: Favoring specific products
- Negative Purchasing: Disapproving products
- Company-Based Purchasing: Disapproving the company and all the subsidiaries in order to change corporate policies.
- Fully-Screened Approach: Comparing and evaluating products in order to clarify which is the most ethical.

Negative ethical consumerism means when consumers treat harshly a company because of perceiving social responsibility failings, including boycotts. As Maya Farah points out on her paper, “boycotting decisions are increasingly being used by consumers as an economic voting means against companies, and even more countries, judged for some reason to be unethical” (p. 3). Corporate responsibility failings cause organized protest which are possibly related with societal causes (e.g. Muslim Boycott) or with activities from an individual company.
What are Greek consumers’ opinion about Negative Ethical Consumption?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never heard</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard it happens. Unaware of certain companies</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to buy when I can find alternatives of similar price and quality</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop buying if there is a prompt or campaign</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right away stop buying certain products - brand names</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1.** Negative Ethical Consumption: What are Greek consumers’ opinion about?
Source: Delistayrou, (2010) 'Do Greek Consumers Boycott Unethical Business’
Figure created by researcher with Microsoft Word table tool

The recent Greek case of boycott of fresh milk with the price lower than one euro, under the auspices of the Panhellenic Federation of Consumer Associations, is a substantial effort in a country, which presents excessive prices in several essential items. According to the P.F.C.A. consumer participation has been quite satisfactory, as in Athens a rate of 65.02% participated in the boycott, while on the rest of Greece ranged from 20% to 65%. However, it is worth noticing that the findings indicated an “appreciable gap between the high update rate and participation in the boycott in areas like Ioannina and Serres.” (Σύλλας, 2008). Although the literature on configuring individual decision boycott does not provide many empirical examples, the wider research effort demonstrates the complexity of issue (Σύλλας, 2008). Among other things, study the boycott to Nestle launched in 1977 in the US, showed that the motives of those who wanted to "punish" the company for the promotion of practices to poor countries, consist of various evaluative signaling at different rates gravity lead to a final decision (Σύλλας, 2008).

For example, the thought of the negative practice of Nestle – “What does Nestle is very bad”- was an important parameter for participation (80%) at the same time the desire to passage to active participation "fall" at 45% (Σύλλας, 2008). What happens and consumers do not go through the theory of disapproval obvious negative practices in
practice, namely in Corporate isolation of certain products? Did this contribute the outcome of the boycott? (Σύλλας, 2008)

2.5 Activism & online environment

With the term of social network, we empathize the explanation of Danah Boyd and Nicole Ellison (2017) as:

“The web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system. The nature and nomenclature of these connections may vary from site to site” (Boyd & Ellison, 2017).

Examples of social networks could be Facebook, Twitter, Linked in and My Space. When some joins in a social network page starts to socialize with other users that may have a personal connection. They can be friends, fans or even followers. In a social network, the user can create a profile, sharing videos and photos with the capability of commenting private messaging or even blogging. “Some sites are designed with specific ethnic, religious, sexual orientation, political, or other identity-driven categories in mind.” (Boyd & Ellison, 2017)

The “domination” of social media has led to the user-generated content. Realizing that more and more companies include social media in their advertising campaigns, more and more users are transformed into consumers, trying to express and share experiences, information or any brand stories that might concern the community. It is noteworthy to mention that there are many successful company Facebook pages, which were created by UGC, with the most famous Coca Cola Facebook page.

“The companies’ social activities on the online environment activities rely on social networks and may involve activities such as continuing business-to-consumer dialogue, socially published branded content, engagement experiences and the social presence and participation of a brand persona (e.g., Travelocity’s Traveling Gnome)” (Ashley & Tuten, 2014, p. 17). According to Social Media Report (Stelzner, 2013), a big percentage of marketers, around 80%, support the significance of social media as
components of their marketing initiatives. Its social media presence is identified with constancy and a focus on business-to-consumer dialogue. (Ashley & Tuten, 2014)

Understanding the consumer engagement, which is related directly with the brand engagement, the outcome may be positive and negative that a brand manager should consider of. Customers define the rules of brand engagement and can protect themselves (Keller, 2009).“Psychological engagement is important because consumers are not passive recipients of information; they are participants” (Schmitt, 2012; Ashley, & Tuten, 2014).

These online activities referring as consumer engagement defined as consumer’s non-transactional interactions with a brand or with other consumers in a brand context. (Van Doorn et al., 2010). Other theories supports that the user-consumer engages into social media actively when they want to create brand-related content or passively when brand-related content is consumed (Muntinga, Moorman, & Smit, 2011). Moreover, consumers strategically choose the brands they will discuss in online communications to construct positive self-images (Schau & Gilly, 2003).

Moreover, reactions on social media defined as online activism or digital activism, “serving six key functions: shaping public opinion; planning an action; sharing a call to action; taking action digitally; transfer of resources” (Rees, 2015). If the activist’s initial campaign goal will be achieved, then the online activism may be characterized as successful. However, “in many cases of online activism, the goal of the online components may have been achieved (awareness building, mobilization of people) while the overall goal of the campaign was not. This trend leaves the field ripe for argument from critics of online activism to discuss the validity of it as a movement” (Rees, 2015).

Particularly important motive for consumers to commenting for online products are the characteristics of the consumer, and those of the product. The marketing variables, such as design, quality and pricing, greatly affect consumer perception of the brand, and in turn their ultimate level of satisfaction. Furthermore, they influence the consumer behavior in their online comments. The style of feedback depends on the price of the
product, its image, and the stage of development of the product is available, but is independent of the size and vigor of publications. The marketing mix affects consumer satisfaction, which creates the desire to share their experiences, as well as incentives based on which consumers post their comments (Kantanoleon, 2015).

As the comments and the complaints of the consumers-users make their dissatisfaction visible, the negative information and the negative brand evaluations can lead to the deteriorated brand evaluation. According to the book “The Tipping Point” (2002), Gladwell categorizes the users who are engaged into social networks who contribute to the rapid spread of message, into three categories. Firstly, the “connectors” named as the most popular, taking into consideration their range of their contacts, the “mavens” who are the information-sharing experts and the “salesmen” who are the most suitable, regardless of the force of their character, to share the message (Cooke, 2008, p. 275).

Furthermore, according to the writers Ch. Li and J. Bernoff, on their own book “Marketing in the Groundswell” (Li & Bernoff, 2009), every of the consumer-user’s activity which has a brand mention and shared to the person’s network named as influence impression.

The influence impression related directly with the third-person effects theory in social media environments. Upon recent years, this theory was visible through traditional mass media, but the last years have been found in a range of online content. The theory is about the perception that we have that other people are influenced by mass media messages to a greater degree than ourselves (Davison, 1983). However, we are more likely to report that messages influence ourselves if those messages are positively evaluated (in terms of message quality and content), if those messages are viewed as personally self-relevant, and if influence is seen as being socially desirable (Duck, Terry & Hogg, 1995; Gunther & Mundy, 1993; Innes & Zeit, 1988 et Schweiberg, Billinson, Chock, 2014).

Social media contexts can influence the perceived personal influence of news stories. Participants reportedly perceived that stories referring to personal relevant stories, have more possibilities for impact on themselves than do non-personally relevant stories. (Schweisberger, Billinson, & Chock, 2014)
This theory many times used in online marketing. As more and more consumers, use social media for their information, the 22% of young adults (22-35) rely on their social networks for alerts or links to news stories (Purcell, Rainie, Mitchell, Rosenstiel, & Olmstead, 2010). Approximately one to four of online news users report commenting on news content (Purcell et al., 2010). The total of the comments creates a frame around the story that the online content wants to share. Facebook “frames” or comments, however, can also influence perceptions of story content through interpretation, commendation, or ridicule. “When message effects are viewed as socially undesirable (pornography, violence, etc.), then third-person effects tend to be greater.” (see Perloff, 1999) “Negatively framing news stories through the inclusion of negative or critical comments could contribute to perceptions of the social undesirability of acknowledging influence and limit people’s willingness to acknowledge message effects. It could also increase third-person effects” (Schweisberger, Billinson & Chock, 2014).

2.6 Boycott and online environment (the case of Nike Company)

Most of the times, this collective consumer activism usually comes up against marketing benefits and corporate budgets. Companies using social networks correctly can build their image, develop their public relations and create and / or positively influence the brainstorm around the catapulting of the brand awareness. In social networks, the power of the members and companies need to follow the norms imposed by them. Their primary purpose is the creation and development of relations while purely promotional or promotions treated often negatively. The increased use of new technologies has created a new type of consumer with new features. It is much more demanding and more insightful than the consumers were in the past. Having lack of
loyalty to a brand, increasing willingness to complaints and the new consumer, he
demands honesty and transparency. Described as existential, with reduced response to
messages receiving and distinguished by inclusiveness, independence, better
information and higher critical thinking. (Kantanoleon, 2015)

Remarkable is the example of Nike. Nike company had launched the successful
campaign of NIKEID custom and design since the early 1999. This service allowed
consumers to customize their footwear in detail, from choosing the colors to picking
out its fabric composition. However, Nike has been accused many times of using
sweatshop labor to produce their merchandise (see above), while even today; the company
never rejects it with evidence. In January of 2001, an email controversy between a disappointed customer and the NIKEID customer service published on a website, in contrast with many others media channels that tried to cover it ("Nike ID Sweatshop E-mail Controversy", 2017). The shoes company rejected the customer request to design his own unique running shoes with the word “sweatshop” embroidered on them ("Jonah Peretti and Nike", 2017). On month later, on February 28th, 2001, the customer Jonah Peretti made an appearance on a TV show facing Nike’s spokeperson and Director of Global Issues Management Vada Manager in a debate.

Below, we quote an excerpt of the Perettis’s research, who is also the founder of Buzzfeed Company, about the media traffic that the issue created.

“Since people only forward email to people they know, social networks were the only way that the Nike Sweatshop message could spread. Nevertheless, this still does not explain how the meme managed to travel outside of my own personal social network. After all, I only sent the email to my closest friends and they only forwarded the message to their closest friends. Yet in a few weeks, the message was circulating among
thousands of people that none of us knew” ("Nike ID Sweatshop E-mail Controversy", 2017).

“With the revolution of social media, people can more easily assemble a crowd to join them in their protest” (Biharie, p.12). Absorbing, also, is the example of the Wall Street protest in September 2011. Occupy Wall Street is a people-powered movement that began on September 17, 2011 in Liberty Square and has spread to over 1,500 cities globally (Facebook) ("Occupy Wall Street 2017", 2017). The participants were activated via social media to occupy Wall Street, which resulted in a mass protest with numerous participants (The Wall Street Journal, 2011 et Biharie, 2012 p. 11).

2.7 Political consumerism
Michelle Micheletti, the political scientist argued that “…under certain conditions shopping for services and material goods is political participation.” (Micheletti, 2003, p. 218). This clarification identified as the inclination of the consumers to assess their values and ethics with the consumptive favors. Consumer’s choices usually connect directly with moral issues regarding human rights, environmental protection, workers' rights, or even gender equality. According to the writer, they can participate actively in mass movements, expressing either their outrage (negative consumption) or win positive consumption, disapproving the above moral issues. “Citizens boycott when they decide not to purchase certain kinds of goods or goods from certain companies for political reasons. When citizens decide to follow the advice of labeling schemes they are engaging in buycotts” (p. 219). (boycott: positive ethical consumerism, see above)

2.8 Political Consumerism as Political Participation
Consumers many times express their political beliefs through their choices in the market. For many, boycott campaigns constitute “a way to signal preferences and to conciliate consumption with social, environmental or health considerations” (Delacote, 2006, p.4).

According to Micheletti (2003, p. 218), defined political participation as “those voluntary activities by which members of a society share in the working with influential institutions whose formulation of norms and rules and practices thereof affect our
common concerns for well-being.” Two scales define political participation. The consumer’s activities in the political system and in the market. The first scale is specified by the membership in political parties, the interest’s groups, the willing of voting, the transnational promotion networks, the government employ and the contact with the politicians. On the other hand, the contact with the company managers, the involving in political consumerist networks and the boycott activity is expressed the level of consumer interaction into the market place.

2.9 Boycott Effectiveness
The effectiveness of a movement depends on the presentence of the goal fulfillment. The goal will lead to an opinion change, a product favor or a life attitude. The researchers who we have referred above investigate the collective movement of boycott as a theoretical framework supported in history references, motives and results in these attempts. As Ph. Delacote refers the effectiveness not only by the power of opinion change and the disapproval to its target but also the social and environmental impact which may have. Moreover, as history indicates, to prove your disagreement for a firm, many times boycotters resort to substitute firms. As a result, the potential to success of a boycott campaign depends most of the times to the quality of the substitute. For a boycotter is simpler to choose a brand than an entire sector to campaign for because there are more chances to find easily a good substitute (Delacote, 2006). The writer presents the collective movement “as a war of attrition between a firm and a group of consumers” (p. 21).

2.10 Cases of Boycott
Upon clarifying the significance of boycott campaign, in this part, we refer some of the most famous boycott campaigns around the world, as the “Ethical Consumer” online portal and magazine inventories the recent years. It is important to mention that Wikipedia.org has published an updated list of boycott campaigns from 1769 to present, however, for avoiding generality we mention the boycott cases that are related with the ethical consumerism. The categories of boycott campaigns are categorized regarding the purpose of the boycott campaign. For example, environment, animal rights, political and human rights, tax avoidance.
Adidas manufactures shoes by Kangaroo leather or Air France airline agency’s action to use monkeys into lavatories to check long-distance airplane journeys are some of them. Travelling to Alaska is boycotted by an environmental organization as a reaction movement against the Alaskan Government’s decision to allow wolf hunting. Additionally, Bluefin tuna consists an endangered species. However, plenty of sushi restaurants use this kind of tuna for sushi cooking. A campaign against sushi restaurants started in UK. The worst environmental disaster, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, BP is included in the list of the most Boycott Call.

In the field of human rights, a big boycott campaign was started against the activities of Shell industry in the Niger Delta or the “monitoring center” that Nokia Siemens Company to the Iranian regime in order to enhance its ability to crack down on dissent during recent protests are some of boycott cases.

Tony Chocolonely, antipodean, is the chocolate industry famous for their practices supporting the free of slave workers for cacao collection in Africa. According to owner’s documentary (which was promoted during the 19th documentary film festival in Thessaloniki) in a journalist’s project trying to debunk the kid’s slavery exploitation against NESTLE, he conducted a research with main purpose the evidence searching to uncover the corporate practices of Nestle into using slaves. For this reason, the Dutch investigative reporter Teun (Tony) van de Keuken creates his one chocolate earning a satisfactory store capacity in the USA and Dutch market. ("how it all began | Tony's Chocolonely", 2017)

The regime and the “fragile” political and economic system of Israel has consisted of many time the excuse of a boycott campaign. The main reason is the “following 'decades of refusal to abide by UN resolutions, International Humanitarian law and the Fourth Geneva Convention” ("Israel boycotts", 2015). The Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS)* movement called for a giant boycott movement to the Swedish H&M clothes factory for the stores opening in the under arms area. Moreover, Motorola is boycotted by New- Yorkers for the firm's business dealings with the Israel Defense Forces. Ben & Jerrys and contractual relationship of the company with an Israeli franchise that manufactures ice cream in Israel and sells it in Israeli settlements in the
occupied West Bank and East Jerusalem creates a movement by Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions too.

Regarding the worker rights, Starbucks is one of the most famous company’s over the bad treatment to Ethiopian Coffee Farmers.

*BDS movement: A crucial civil society intervention aimed at exerting economic pressure on Israel, de-legitimising the country as an apartheid state, and harming the incomes of the companies that are complicit its activities. In 2005, Palestinian civil society issued a call for “Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel until it Complies with International Law and Universal Principles of Human Rights”. It was endorsed by more than 150 Palestinian groups and is a non-violent tactic. The three-pronged approach operates at multiple levels: from individual consumers to institutional investors to states. It presents an opportunity for the international community to stand in solidarity with the Palestinian people and demand an end to Israel's occupation of Palestinian lands and military aggression against the Palestinian people. (“Israel boycotts”, 2015)

2.11 The example of Coca- Cola boycott campaign
Coca Cola Company is a colossus company of soft drinks. It includes brands as Fanta, Sprite, Dr Pepper, Glaceau Smartwater, Oasis, Schweppes mixers, Innocent smoothies & many more. With annual revenue £29.88 billion since July of 2016, Coca Cola company consists the world’s famous soft drinks company and a mayor sponsor of the Olympic Games.

To date, the company, many times has disconcerted with the public relationships and decisions, as one of the colossus in the global market, with subsidiaries in 28 countries and a gross sale of around EUR 6.9 billion in 2013 alone. For many researchers and journalists is the only beverage company with the most boycott campaigns. Coca Cola company has given rise to the most various and crucial boycott campaigns against it. The syndicalist’s murders, the cooperation with fascists or even the identification with the American imperialism were enough to incite even the USA.
John Pemberton, a pharmacist from Georgia, was the creator of Coca-Cola formula who died in 1888. The first use of that drink was for pharmacy proposes. Pemberton was wounded in the civil war, and like many others became addicted to morphine while trying to relieve the pain. As a result, Coca Cola non-alcoholic drink contributed to the rehab from morphine. Asa G. Candler (1851-1929) was the founder of “The Coca-Cola Company” in 1892 (Gray, 2014).

In 1964, Atlanta native Martin Luther King, became the first and only Atlanta’s citizen to be honored with the Nobel Peace Prize. This was an absurd issue for many Atlanta natives, as Robert Woodruff (1889-1985) (the president of Coca-Cola in 1923-1954) was sensible to racial acts to Black and White community of Atlanta. However, award-winning King, on his last speech, in Memphis, among his campaign the rights of Blacks, on 1968, encouraged to boycott Coca-Cola because of its discriminatory employment practices (as in, less salary for blacks, fewer advancements compared to whites, etc.). The next day after this speech, King was assassinated in the hotel who accommodated in Memphis.

In 1999, a lawsuit accused Coca-Cola Company for the huge salary discrimination for racial purposes while in South Africa, it had been retaining business ties with apartheid during advertising tricks by selling some of its assets to the Black business community.

Despite the above, ironically, Adolf Hitler many times, during the WWII, places himself against Coca-Cola Company. A big question was raised in how the company managed to maintain in the German market. The strategy in Germany before and during WWII was to bring in market Coke as a German drink, appealing to industrial workers to “Mach doch mal Pause”, translated as Come on, take a break. (“Campaign to Stop Killer Coke | Tell Coca-Cola to STOP the VIOLENCE! », 2017). Other sources referred the dictatorship’s Hitler did not block the company’s profitability. Although, the only problem, which had to face down, is the syrup transport from America to Germany, basic component of coke drink. Nevertheless, the company, to avoid any lack of profit, introduce in the European market the orange juice, FANTA. Michael Moor on the Documentary titled “Corporation” claimed that FANTA orange juice is the Nazism drink. It makes sense that many supporters of Nazism movement evolved into important
corporate members and stopped their corporation after Hitler’s suicide. From the other side of earth, the same moment, in America, the company shared to the army free drinks as a campaign of corporate social responsibility, presented the coca cola drink as the national drink. With this smart strategy, the company tried to deposit tons of sugar instead of many other competitors who could not avoid the global saving pores strategy.

During the decade of 1980-1990 in the Modern Museum of Art in Colombia a red canvas with the country name and the font of the brand cola was exposed. This was one of the plenty reactions regarding the corporate policies to the workers’ rights.

Coca-Cola drink needs four glasses of water for 330 ml of coke soda. This has an impact on countries, as India, where thousands of farmers across have difficulties to make a living because of crop failure because of the water shortages created by the company (Srivastava, 2008). Moreover, Coca-Cola sponsored the World Water Forum as a clearly public relations strategic tactic to divert attention from the reality of Coca-Cola’s relationship with water (Srivastava, 2008).

In the Greek market, Coca-Cola Hellenic Bottling Company (Coca-Cola HBC AG) did business since 1969. According to Steward Redqueen research, the amount of the company contribution in the Greek economy is calculated around 924 million euro, 0.5% of GDP approximately (Akrivou, 2016). In order to raise the exporting activities, the company invested 24 million Euros for the new facilities construction in Athens. With this movement, the company is trying to contribute in the Greek economy recovery.

In October 2012, Coca-Cola Hellenic Bottling Company (Coca-Cola HBC AG) decided to move its headquarters to Switzerland and its shares from the Athens Stock Exchange to London. In October 2013, the company decided to move its facilities to Bulgaria where the cost of production and employers is lower than in Greece. From this moment, a big boycott campaign has been starting with many dismissed workers and protesters who alleged that inhuman work conditions and the immoral decisions who are opposites of the “business programs of social responsibility”. The boycott agenda concluded the layoffs of hundreds of workers, cut hundreds of jobs and relocating production to the
neighbor country which are cheaper for multinational corporations in terms of labor costs.

In November 2013, Coca-Cola 3E sued the Pan-Hellenic Federation of Labor Bottled Drinks Association and the Union of Coca Cola workers because of defamation and causing moral harm. Coca cola asked compensation of 250,000 Euros from each worker, i.e. total of 5.5 million Euros. ("The strikers of Coca-Cola, the boycott and the judicial judgment", 2014)

The First-Degree Court of Athens rejected the company’s request as the boycott supporters are not participating in the competitive environment, and activate by person for ideological, political, and religious reasons. In fact, the company asked a court to prohibit employees wearing T-shirts displaying “boycott Coca Cola products until they reopen the factories.” (“Boycott Coca Cola until they rehire their employees” | Verba Volant”, 2014).

In simple words, the main aim of the Greek boycott campaign is the re-opening of the factory in Thessaloniki and the re-employment of redundant workers. However, the company supports that has already offered them many recommendations for arrangements (free cars for the independent distributors in the delivery of its products, ensured their jobs by offering a 3-year or 5-year contract, until covering the cost of all legal and bureaucratic procedures).

To date, the defamations and the denigration of the company have had negative impact on the sales in the domestic market. The extravagant advertising campaigns with main theme the consumer care and sensible social profile, now, creates a mass confusion about the social corporate responsibility formed after years of advertising.

3. Theoretical framework

Following the above, extensive references of manuscripts and researches about the content of boycott, the way participants activate through the years and specific examples, many questions are raised in how this collective movement has transformed over the years.
The revolution of technology and the way the world communicate has affect also the way citizens as consumers or citizens as social media users participate in movements and express their rights. In most of the researches referred in collective movements, boycott campaigns are the most frequent case as an example of collective action which is relevant to rights’ protection in fields as environment, workers, poverty.

The purpose of the present manuscript is to find answers to questions as:

1. How does social networking contribute to boycott campaigns?

2. Does online activity increase the intention for participating in boycott campaigns, as part of consumer activism?

3. Nowadays, do the consumers act collectively to protect their rights and what is the relation with the corporate policies?

* in Digital environment
We construct eight hypotheses to investigate the relation between social networking, collective movements & consumer rights.

**Hypothesis test 1: Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s online activity**

Many social networks and groups into them are created to serve various goals. Facebook groups for example are one case of user-generated platforms, which is created to serve organizing or socializing issues. Except the individual use of social networks and the interpersonal socializing, social networks usually serve political, ethical or marketing goals. Focusing on the marketing goals and the relationship consumer-company, the most significant characteristic is the user’s accessibility to create content. This many times used by companies to create a business to consumer dialogue for the increase of brand-content. As more the brand engagement content by the users is increased, the effects to the company profiles are varied. Every time, it depends on the marketing mix of the product or even the extroversion of the company. Concluding we believe that the activity of every user (frequency, content, way) is important factor to investigate through boycott campaigns.

**Hypothesis test 2: Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s third person perception**

The case of negative effect is related with the online activism against a company action or statement. The user create content and share experience to raise awareness against to the company. Boycott online campaigns consists part of this activism. The user’s perception is influenced by the content and the third person comments and most of the way the co-user’s comments, react and communicate in social networks, affect my attitude. For the present thesis, we agree that the user online activity is structured by the variables as the duration spending online, the reason that he uses Facebook, informative, entertainment, socializing. Particularizing the way that user behaves on digital environment; we related his activity to his opinion about the campaign, the knowledge
about that and the way that he activates. The way that he activates influenced by the
others co-user activity and opinion on Facebook groups.

**Hypothesis test 3: Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s perception of Coca-Cola Campaign**

We agree with the fact the content of every platform plays a significant role for the
market’s acceptance. Referring on the traditional marketing mix (product, place, price,
promotion), the new digital era came to replace the traditional components and the
platform content takes the position of the product. Concerning the significance of the
product’s characteristics for its request’s development in trade marketing, an appealing
content is also part of the successful development. We investigate the present boycott
campaign example through various groups on Facebook. The campaign although has
its own official page: Coca cola apergia. We inquire into the beliefs of the
 correspondents about the quality of the page’s content and the way that boycotters
promote the campaign around the city via traditional way (leaflets, posters) or via online
posts and sharing digital campaigns. On the consumer’s behavior side, we believe that
if the consumer users know enough and could appealed by a digital campaign to learn
more about the campaign, then the reactions and the eagerness of the users to participate
could be increased.

**Hypothesis test 4: Collective efficacy in boycott campaigns varies based on the
membership in Facebook Boycott Groups**

&

**Hypothesis test 5: Personal efficacy in boycott campaigns varies based on the
membership in Facebook Boycott Groups**

Recent years, social media and social networks have become a common space where
collective activism is currently constituted and negotiated (Thorson, 2013). Literature
theories suggest that social media and the reaction among social networks participants
influence participation in collective actions (Enjolras, 2013). Determinant results for
our research is the Harlow and Harp examination about social network site (SNS) as
using by activist groups in the US and Latin America, found that online activism might lead to offline political actions (2012). For many researchers, there is a direct relationship between certain types of social media use and participation in collective actions. However, the collective activism especially in social media relates to the collective efficacy. According to Badura, Collective efficacy is defined as “a group's shared belief in its joint capabilities to perform courses of action required to successfully achieve a certain level of performance” (Bandura, 1997, p. 447). The importance of the presence of collective efficacy in a group might indeed be critical if someone considers motivational power that the participant has. According to Bandura, also, collective efficacy has the same antecedents with self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as an individual's belief (or confidence) about his or her abilities to raise motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context (Bandura, 1997; Stajkovic& Luthans, 1998, 1998). This theory of personality and motivation is also related with the willingness to participation in collective movements. As lower is the self-esteem and self-efficacy of the participant as restrict the eagerness to support the collective activism. For our research, we agree that the collective efficacy, in other words, the opinion that a group has a sharing belief that with common behavior and good participation they can achieve their goal and complementary, perception that every participant has individually that with his own capabilities and skill can contribute to success of boycott campaign.

Hypothesis test 6: Membership in Facebook Boycott Campaigns differed based on consumer right awareness

Upon analyzing extensively in the literature review, phenomenon of boycotting analyzed through various aspects of historical literature review. Expressed as a mass movement consists a result of purchasing power operation. The companies should balance the needs and rights of consumers. The consumer-client should understand the social face of business in a constantly changing and unfavorable economic environment. In this survey, the case study of boycotting is investigated with various aspects that
related with the humanistic treatment of consumers and their rights, in addition to the research of their reaction every time they feel that the rights are violated.

Living in a constantly changing period, where the term of democracy has been disputed many times, often sociologists and economical analysts emphasizes the crisis of rights. The frequent legislation interchange has led to the affiliation of citizens’ rights where the willingness of reaction, protest and revolution in a framework of rights disputation. Discussing about consumers the constantly prices switching, the products devaluation and the extreme decline of income average provokes in the plural of cases the ignorance of protest and the force adjustment in the new circumstances. However, as researchers, we are not confident of the fact that the consumers-citizens have the knowledge of their rights. As already has been mentioned, according to the last legislation the consumer rights are distinguished as the right of choice, safety, the right correct orientation and the right to be heard. With oriented questions, we will try to clarify the consumer’s perceptions of their rights. Their clear information, the way who they express them and the feeling of rights satisfaction though collective movements as boycott campaigns will be clarified. The conceptional interpretation of the right to be heard will be led to conclusions regarding the link of consumer activism as a need of rights express. Important components of groups who activate for a common purpose is the combined ideology and the mutual support of the members. In this way, many non-governmental organizations and authorities has succeeded through the years provoking and pressing legislations, governmental actions and community conviction. We agree with the fact that the participants in boycott campaigns comprehend their rights and protest for them through participating in collective movements.

**Hypothesis test 7: Membership in Facebook Boycott Groups differed based on user’s Corporate Social Responsibility perception.**

Upon this section, we analyzed the membership through the perception of identity as consumer status and how does he/she behave and benefits by the participation in boycotting. An important factor that will look through our questions related to the image and the opinion that the consumer has towards the companies. Using a given variable of Corporate Social Responsibility as a cause of boycott if is not applied
properly, we will examine the perception and the comprehension of consumers in the case and whether the correct implementation of CSR is affected their purchasing preferences.

The last years there is an imperative need of the company role redefinition in the community. Press groups, as non-governmental organizations, media channels and activists act to deter companies act against legislation, environmental and work conditions. As result, companies seek to adopt actions with a positive impact. European commission on 2011 enacted the term of corporate social responsibility (CSR) as the company responsibility for their impact in the community. Commission promotes integration of social, environmental, ethical aspects, human rights and the consumer in business operation. In the Greek market, the last years, commission tries to insert the term of CSR to the consumers’ perception. Since now, many quantitative researches conducted, indicating the company’s difficulty to recognize the benefits of CSR implication. Researches highlighted the inexperience of the undertakings for CSR actions but distinguished their interest for more information. In December 2007-January 2008, on a sample of 1000 citizens conducted research on Greece on responsible Consumption and CSR. The survey was conducted in 32 countries, while for Greece was designed and implemented by the Institute Communication, in collaboration with the Social and Political Sciences department of Panteion University. Results indicated that 86.2% of respondents distrust the intentions of a company for a more responsible, social function, believing that aim the improvement of the corporate image, without a sincere contribution to society total. 77.6% of respondents do not recognize honesty and sincerity in business sensitized social and environmental. The 70.2% of respondents stated ignorance or has heard little about businesses that are trying to be responsible, while 72.7% is eager to learn about social responsibility. The consumers compare their one beliefs and ethics with the company’s activities. The ethical responsibilities consist of behaviors and norms that society expects by a business to follow the run the concerns of consumers, workers, shareholders and society for what they consider as fair and honest as well as the protection and the respect of the moral rights of the parties concerned. It is important to avoid disputing of ethical regulations with main aim the
business success. At the same time, it is important to recognize and respect the new ethical regulations adopted by society and are often under debate their legitimacy. Society expects business response, even if it means that these values reflect higher activity level than required by law. In this way, businesses reflect the dynamic relationship with its legal responsibilities, and seek the continuous expansion and simultaneously higher expectations put in operation business over the required legal framework. Thus, these practices are not imposed by law, but are constantly expanding and exist as expectations and beyond over it.

On the other hand, the moral behavior such as the interest in the fulfillment of its obligations towards its shareholders, suppliers, distributors, respect for human rights and consistency with the rules laid down in law in the exercise of its activity, not it has a significant effect. This behavior is not recognizable by consumers, who perceive this information as insufficient (Singh et al., 2008). Essentially, there are few who understand ethical labor relations between employer and employee. In the case of boycotting and the Greek example of Coca Cola, this posed the unethical and immoral behavior of the undertaking is the unethical actions of human resources management. Thus, what we should investigate in this research is whether it is perceived by consumers the relationship between employers and employees, as part of CSR, although recognizes CSR aspects from the company, if it affects their product preferences as well if the unethical work behavior of a company has in the past affect them. We support the opinion that if a consumer could recognize the corporate policies and can support them and understand which of them contribute to the “public good” then can more eagerly participate in collective movements, as boycott age.

**Hypothesis test 8: Membership in Boycott Facebook Group varies based on political convictions of boycott campaign members**

We have already mentioned, Michelle Minecheletti indicated two types of political participation, the participation in the political system and the participation in the market. With this research, we aim to identify if and in which cases the negative ethical consumerism has relationship with the political convictions. Many times, companies cooperate with the governments to gain beneficial tax legislation. Moreover, there are
cases, where governmental delegates presented legal corporate actions the same time when they need to take objective decisions for the political-economic systems. In the case of Greece, the economic situation, led many companies and factories to close or to change their payrolls tactics. However, floozy was the decisions from famous colossus factories to shut it down and many of the employees be out of work. Nevertheless, there are supporters who believe that the decision for redundancy is a result of the crucial economic crisis in Greece. The same time, the decision of Coca Cola Company to transport the factories in Bulgaria, keeping the same profit and the same supply chain in Greece firing thousands of workers raise oppositions. The phenomenon of boycott Coca-Cola is supported by consumers who are sensitives with cases related to the capital and low strata’s. However, who of these supports are political sensitive and labor rights supporters. We need to clarify if in this specific part of participants there is the conviction of an unfair economic and political system and if their participation related with their ideology.

4. Methodology
The way somebody approaches a problem or problems or the way somebody searches to answer them refers to the term of methodology. This section justifies the methodology that is being used to meet the aims and objectives of this research since is one of the most important decisions in an academic investigation, which will guide in which way the data will be collected, how it will be analyzed and finally it can influence the outcomes of the study.

4.1 Research approach
The main research approaches are two: deduction and induction. As Saunders (2012) wrote, the deductive approach (testing theory) there are developed a theory and a hypothesis and then the hypothesis is tested. In the induction approach (building theory), firstly the data is collected and then a theory is developed because of the data analysis. In this study, a deductive approach will be used because the research starts with a theory based on the literature review and then a model is tested with the existing theory. The deductive approach is usually associated with the positivism and with quantitative research methods (Reinharz, 1995; Saunders, 2012).
4.2 Research design
This study uses an explanatory research because it explains relationship between variables. Moving to the main research strategies, these are Experiment, Survey, Case Study, Action Research, Grounded Theory, Ethnography and Archival Research. This specific study uses the strategy of Survey, which is related, with the collection of a large amount of data by using questionnaire. Finally, the survey allows an easy comparison and can be used to suggest possible relationships between variables (Saunders, 2012).

Referring to data collection techniques, there are two main research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative. In the present thesis, we collect our data with questionnaire disseminations, supporting although in the example of Coca cola Greek boycott campaign: Ούτε Γουλιά.

4.3 Sample and data collection
The survey was created based on types of social networks as Facebook. Facebook is one of the most famous social networks platforms, which gives the ability to the user to contribute with their content giving with this way, value in the main operation of the medium. User contribution is one of the key priorities for not only Facebook but also YouTube, Quora, Flickr, etc. Based on this characteristic, we use the user ability of creating groups embedded its content to specify the sample which want to search. The population was framing as the users of Facebook, variable age but Greek nationality with activation as consumers. The questionnaire was provided online via Google drive, in Greek Language, which were fully anonymous while the data were collected during the month March. The survey lasts around 1 month. The questionnaire structured with 40 questions. The first twelve (12) are about the rights awareness and the perception about the corporate policies. To be more clarified, before every part of questions a small introduction inserts the respondent to the issue.

To investigate in depth the case of boycott and the relation with the online environment we created a questionnaire with separated parts related to the hypothesis and we addressed to two opposite Facebook group users. In the question number 13, the respondent chooses if she or he participates in relevant groups with title boycott or related issue, connected with the working rights injustice, the political system etc. We
agree firstly that the participation in Facebook group campaigns identify with the fact that they are supporters of the boycott campaign Coca-Cola: Ούτε γουλιά. In this case, the group, which answers the first match of questions, have already been supporters of the campaign, while the rest of the correspondents are not surely supporters of the campaign.

Explaining thoroughly the questionnaire (see appendix) the first three questions are related with the variable right awareness. Questions from 4 to 10 test the Corporate Social Responsibility perception about the efficiency of corporate polices to the consumer opinions. Questions 11-16 are measured the relationship and activity of the user on Facebook. This variable named as online activity. Question 13 is the one, which categorized the two groups of membership and non-membership in boycott campaigns. From question 17 to 20, we measured the variable named from the theory reference “third person perception”. 21 to 36 are characterized as attitude questions and are structured by Likert scale. The first six questions measured the personal efficacy variable and the following for the collective efficacy. Questions 31 32 33 ask the users their perception about the campaign while the last two test the relation between the political statements and the participation in boycott campaigns.

Some of them are the following existing Facebook groups:

- “Μποικοτάζ με λόγο” (Boycottaze with reason)
- “ΜΠΟΙΚΟΤΑΖ” (Boycottaze)
- “ΠΡΩΗΝ ΣΥΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ COCA COLA” (Ex Coca-Cola colleagues)
- “ΠΟΙΑ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΑ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ ΠΡΟΙΟΝΤΑ” (Which are the Greek Products?)
- “Μποικοτάζ Τώρα” (Boycott Now)
- “ΜΠΟΙΚΟΤΑΖ σε όσες εταιρίες μειώνουν μισθούς των υπαλλήλων” (Boycotting every company reducing the wages)
- “ΗΡΘΕ Η ΩΡΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ” (It’s time for citizens’ act)
- “OXI στο δημόσιο των κρατικοδιαίτων θρεφταριών”
Finally, the quantitative data analysis will be made on IBM SPSS program.

5. Results

5.1 Means and Std. Deviation

As first part of analyzing the survey, we refer the following table, which summarizes all the questions (Scale, Ordinal, Nominal including new computing variables) their means and the std. deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/ Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Boycott Facebook Group Membership</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How much do you think that you know your rights? (variable)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much satisfied do you feel of the way companies activate to protect your rights as consumer?</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 15-20 is the consumer emergencu phone call. Are you aware of its existence?</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you ever heard about Corporate social policies of Coca cola company in Greece?</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do you evaluate these policies?</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have you bought any product by this company, positively influenced by its CSR?</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you believe that the previous two activities are contradictory?</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you think that the way a company works and is managed affect your product’s preference? (variable)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much time do you spend online on Facebook? (variable)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you use Facebook to get informed about social and political news?</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are you a member in Facebook groups related with social issues?</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How frequently do you visit the Boycott Facebook page?</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Please evaluate the clarity of the campaign goal &quot;Coca cola: Ούτε γουλιά&quot;.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have you ever share an uploaded post on your personal profile page or on a friend’s?</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you read comments related with the campaigns?</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do you spend time to write related with the campaign comments?</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My beliefs are identified with the Facebook group participants’ beliefs.</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I feel proud of being member in one Facebook boycott group.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It’s very important for me to be member in a Facebook group/</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. My online activity in Boycott Facebook Groups influence the other co-users’ activity.  | 2.95  | 1.254 |
25. My participation on Boycott Facebook Groups related with Boycott campaigns contributes to the campaign efficiency. | 2.99  | 1.156 |
26. Comments of co-users’ influence my attitude to the present Boycott campaign. | 2.54  | 1.136 |
27. I believe that all together we can motivate the public to boycott. | 2.70  | 2.193 |
28. I believe that all together we can inform the public about the goal of the boycott campaign. | 3.14  | 1.114 |
29. I believe that all together we can achieve the goal. | 3.51  | 1.106 |
30. I believe that all together with this campaign can relocate the factories of Coca Cola to Greece. | 3.55  | 1.112 |
31. I believe that Coca-Cola corporate policies are generally unfair. | 2.60  | 1.453 |
32. I believe that Coca-Cola corporate policies are unfair to the workers. | 3.28  | 1.224 |
33. I believe that Coca-Cola corporate policies are the only for the company profit. | 3.78  | 1.269 |
34. I believe that corporate policies are related with supporters’ political convictions. | 4.11  | 1.087 |
35. I believe that my political convictions are related with the campaign’s characteristics. (variable) | 3.34  | 1.242 |
36. How old are you? | 2.69  | 1.263 |
37. Please choose your gender. | 1.50  | .501 |
38. Which of the followings are your educational level? | 1.84  | .810 |
39. Please select your region. | 4.20  | .996 |
40. Please cycle your income level. | 2.17  | .798 |
Collective efficacy (composed variable) | 3.3981 | .96989 |
Perception of Coca-Cola campaign (composed variable) | 3.2127 | 1.03823246 |
Personal efficacy (composed variable) | 2.7879 | .84111 |
Third person perception (composed variable) | 2.1818 | .93248 |

**Table 5.1 Total of Means & Std. deviation of the responses**

*Created by researcher with Microsoft word*

5.2 Figures of results
Figure 5.2.1 Right Awareness for Non-members of Facebook Boycott Groups
Figure 5.2.2. Right Awareness for members of Facebook Boycott Groups

Figure 5.2.3 Perception of boycott participants about COCA-COLA campaign

Figure 5.2.4 Participants evaluation about COCA-COLA campaign
Figure 5.2.5. Participants perception about Corporate Social Responsibility perception of company’s activity

Figure 5.2.6 Facebook group participants opinion about Political characteristics of boycott campaigns
Figure 5.2.7 Facebook group non-participants opinion about political characteristics of boycott campaigns

Figure 5.2.8 Facebook group participants opinion about Political conviction of boycott supporters
Figure 5.2.9 Facebook group non-participants opinion about Political conviction of boycott supporters

The questionnaire
As already has been mentioned the questionnaire, which was disseminated online to the users, consists of 40 questions. The template, which the questionnaire was structured, was separated into thematic parts depending on the variables, which are included into the hypotheses (Appendix 1). It is important to mention that after the gathering of the responses, we realized that not all the questions serve the goals of the survey. There are questions which are not included variables for investigating, but just information for further study and approach of the present case.

5.3 Questions reliability: Cronbach's Alpha (α)
For the measurement of internal consistency or reliability of the questions in the survey, we use the Cronbach’s Alpha (α) measure. It is used in multiple Likert questions commonly and following there are the results of them. We tested the reliability of the questions, separated them regarding the variables that we investigated.
To understand the high reliability of the questions we need to check if the Cronbach’s Alpha is close or more than 0.7. In case is less than 0.6 the reliability of the correspondences is not strongly enough.

- For the **Corporate Social Responsibility perception**, we investigate the question number 9 & 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.569</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3.1* Reliability Statistics of Corporate Social Responsibility perception variable

- For the variable **Online Activity** of the correspondents, we examined the Cronbach’s Alpha of four questions (no.12, 14, 15, 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.441</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3.2* Reliability Statistics of Online Activity variable

The N=four (4) signify that the number of questions that we tested. As we can see the Cronbach’s Alpha is less than 0.6 and if we deleted from our examination the question number 15 the Cronbach’s Alpha is increased.

However, even in this case the reliability is not strongly enough. As a result, for the following correlations and hypotheses test for the variable of online activity, we will consider only the **question number 11** that is measured the total number of the total time each user spends on Facebook.

- Cronbach’s alpha test of **Third Person Perception** variable
Table 5.3.3 Reliability Statistics of Third Person Perception variable

Looking carefully the above table, we agree that if we avoid the test of question 17, the Cronbach’s Alpha index will be increased. As a result, for the variable of **third person perception** we refer the reliability with N of items: three (3) and Cronbach’s Alpha if question 17 will be deleted is 0.691. The reliability of the data is now strongly enough.

- Cronbach’s test Alpha for **Personal efficacy** variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.498</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3.4 Reliability Statistics of Personal Efficacy variable

The reliability of the above questions will be increase from 0.787 to 0.842 if we avoid the test of question number 21. As a result, for N= five (5), Cronbach's Alpha of Personal Efficacy: 0, 842.

- Cronbach's Alpha of **Collective Efficacy** variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.787</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3.5 Reliability Statistics of Collective efficacy variable
- Cronbach's Alpha test for **Perception of Coca Cola campaign** variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.695</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.3.6** Reliability Statistics of Perception of Coca Cola campaign variable

Table created by IBM SPPS program

If we don’t compute the question, number 31 the reliability of the variable Coca-Cola perception of the correspondents is increased. However, even now we keep the reliability strongly enough (0, 695), taking into consideration all the questions which calculate the composed variable of perception of action Coca-Cola campaign.

5.4 **Transforming new variables**

To proceed with the test of the hypotheses and following the reliability test of the questions we need to transform new composed variables, which investigate all the categorized questions. Using the IBM SPSS program, we computed variables, with the use of mean of questions, which measure the same variable. Specifically:

1. **Collective efficacy** is a reliable combination of questions 27, 28, 29 and describes the motivational power that a participant/ user has in participating in boycott campaign.

2. **Perception of Coca cola campaign** is the reliable combination of the 31, 32, 33, which measure the opinion that the correspondents have about the content, and the goal of the Coca-Cola campaign: Ούτε γουλιά.

3. **Personal efficacy** is the compact variable, which measures reliably (questions no. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26) the self- esteem and self- efficacy that a participant has through their participation in boycott campaigns.

4. **Third-person perception** (questions no. 17, 18, 19, 20) measures the perception that the participant-user has about his “image” when participates actively on Facebook boycott support groups or share his statements about the campaign.
5.5 Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation

For our deep analysis we use Pearson’s product-moment correlation which measures “the strength and the direction of association that exists between two variables measured on at least an interval scale.” ("Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation in SPSS Statistics - Procedure, assumptions, and output using a relevant example.", 2017).

The correlated variables are the new composed which analyzed above, splitting in two categories, membership and no membership in Coca-cola boycott campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group efficacy</th>
<th>Third Person Perception</th>
<th>Personal Efficacy</th>
<th>Perception of Coca-Cola campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group efficacy Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.805**</td>
<td>.900**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person perception Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal efficacy Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.805**</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.758**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Coca-Cola campaign Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.900**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.758**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
a. Μέλος σε ομάδα μποϊκοτάζ = yes

**Table 5.5.1** Correlations results Facebook Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group efficacy</th>
<th>Third Person perception</th>
<th>Personal efficacy</th>
<th>Perception Of Coca-Cola campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person perception</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Coca-Cola campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.094 .430**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

a. Μέλος σε ομάδα μποϊκοτάζ = no

**Table 5.5.2** Correlations results Facebook Group Non-Membership

The results are presented in the two matrix such these, as can be seen above, the correlations are replicated. The correlation between the variables, in other words the strength and the direction of the association that between the variables is interpreted if it is statistically significant (p = 0.01).
Upon analyzing the case of participating in boycott campaigns (Facebook group membership=yes) a Pearson product-moment correlation was run to determine the relationship between the variables **Group Efficacy** and **Perception of Coca-Cola campaign**. There was a strong, positive correlation between these two variables, which was statistically significant. \( r = .900, p = .000 \). Moreover, the similarly strong, positive correlation is between **Personal Efficacy** and **Perception of Coca-Cola campaign** \( r = .758, p = .000 \). **Personal Efficacy**, furthermore, has strongly positive correlation with **Group Efficacy** \( r = .805**, \( p = .000 \). Less strongly, but important enough, is correlation between **third person perception** and **personal efficacy** \( r = .661**, \( p = .000 \).

The results of the Pearson correlation analyses of the variables by the responses of non-members in Boycott campaigns are interesting in comparison with the first matrix of boycott members responses. We noticed a positive correlation **Group Efficacy** and **Personal Efficacy** \( r = .582**, \( p = .000 \). Moreover, there is a positive correlation between **third person perception** and **Personal efficacy** \( r = .402**, \( p = .000 \). Important positive correlation also is between **Perception of Coca-Cola campaign** and **Group Efficacy** \( r = .466**, \( p = .000 \) and between **Perception of Coca-Cola campaign** and **Personal efficacy** \( r = .430**, \( p = .000 \).

5.6 Hypotheses t-tests

The independent-samples t-test (or independent t-test, for short) compares the means between two unrelated groups on the same continuous, dependent variable. Based on the above bibliography references, we use an independent variable to understand whether there is a different between variables of each hypothesis. ("Independent t-test in SPSS Statistics - Procedure, output and interpretation of the output using a relevant example | Laerd Statistics", 2017)

**Hypothesis test 1: Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s online activity**

- Independent-samples t-test: **Group Membership / online activity**

Independent Variable: Membership in Facebook group
Table 5.6.1 Group statistics of Group Membership/ online activity variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much time do you spend online on Facebook? (variable)</th>
<th>Μέλος σε ομάδα μποϊκοτάζ</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6.2 Independent Samples Test of Group Membership / online activity variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the sample members in Facebook groups (M= 3, 8, SD=1, 25) report to spend almost the same time on Facebook with the non-members in Facebook groups (M=3, 56, SD= 1, 36). Mdf=70, 3, t (247) =1, 11, p=0.265. The difference between Facebook membership and the online activity on Facebook is not significant enough (sig. > 0.213).

**Hypothesis test 2: Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s third person perception**

- Independent-samples t-test: **Membership/ third person perception**

  Independent Variable: Membership in Facebook Group
  Dependent variable: third person perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third person perception</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.9079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6.3** Group statistics of Group Membership/ third person perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person perception</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>47.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the sample members in Facebook groups (M=3.44, SD=1.11) report to believe they care about the opinion of co-user or other members about his statement of the campaign than the non-members in Facebook groups (M=1.09, SD=0.60). The two variables are significant different as the sig is less than 0.05.

**Hypothesis test 3: Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s perception of Coca-Cola Campaign**

Independent-samples t-test: **Membership/ Perception of Coca-Cola Campaign**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Coca-Cola campaign</th>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.7348</td>
<td>1.17154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0990</td>
<td>.97344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6.5 Group Statistics of Group Membership / perception of Coca-Cola Campaign variables**

**Independent Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6.6 Independent Samples Test of Group Membership / perception of Coca-Cola campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Coca-Cola campaign</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,385</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,63584</td>
<td>,16822</td>
<td>,30448</td>
<td>,96720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56,632</td>
<td>,001</td>
<td>,63584</td>
<td>,18943</td>
<td>,25646</td>
<td>1,0152</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the sample members in Facebook groups (M=3, 73, SD=1, 17) report to support more the goals and the content of the boycott campaign of Coca-Cola: Ούτε γουλιά than the non-members in Facebook groups (M=3, 357, SD= 56, 63). The difference between the participation in Boycott campaigns and perception of the Coca-Cola campaign is significant enough (sig. < 0.05) and that means that every of the members in Facebook groups support and empathize the goals of the boycotters and the campaign. Mdf=56, 6, t (244) =3, 7, p=0.

Summarizing the above tests, we conclude to the fact that the intention for participation in collective movements via the online activity depends on the grade of participant awareness about the content and the goals of the movement. Moreover, according the t-test it does not matter the time and the reason that a participant spends on Facebook but significant is the fact that the way that the co-users, friends, user network members react, comment and behave online, influencing in this way the intention for boycott participation.

**Hypothesis test 4: Collective efficacy in boycott campaigns varies based on the membership in Facebook Boycott Groups**

- Independent-samples t-test: **Membership/ Group efficacy**
  
  Independent Variable: Group efficacy
  
  Dependent variable: Membership in Facebook group
Table 5.6.7 Group Statistics of Group Membership / Group Efficacy variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Efficacy</th>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,8636</td>
<td>1,14643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,2972</td>
<td>.89909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6.8 Independent Samples Test of Group Membership / Group Efficacy variables

In the sample members in Facebook groups (M=3, 86, SD=1, 46) report to believe almost the same with the non-members in Facebook groups (M=3, 29, SD= 0, 89). The difference between group membership and group efficacy is significant enough (sig. < 0, 05) signifying that a user-consumer who participates in a boycott campaign as a
member of Facebook group believes that if we participate collectively, the campaign will succeed. Mdf = 55, t (245)3.59, p = 0

**Hypothesis test 5: Personal efficacy in boycott campaigns varies based on the membership in Facebook Boycott Groups**

- **Independent-samples t-test: Membership / personal efficacy**
  
  Independent Variable: Personal efficacy

  Dependent variable: Membership in Facebook group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3,3943</td>
<td>1,02994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2,6642</td>
<td>,74133</td>
<td>,05229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6.9** Group Statistics of Group Membership / Personal Efficacy variables

Table created by IBM SPSS program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Std. Error Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy variances assumed</td>
<td>10,354</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.13653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the sample members in Facebook groups (M=3.39, SD=1.07) report to believe that they can contribute to the campaign of Coca-Cola: Ούτε γουλιά than the non-members in Facebook groups (M=2.66, SD=0.74). The difference between the Facebook group membership and personal efficacy is also significant as the Sig, is less than 0.005. Mdf=48.79, t (240) =5.348.

Mentioning the theoretical reference about the collective efficacy, our results come to prove the fact that if there is the perception of common goal and collective effort in a group then the willingness for boycotting is increased. Continuity of the that, self-esteem and self-confidence are crucial variable for the collective activism as the feeling of acceptance by the co-users consists a important component for the successful user contribution.

**Hypothesis test 6: Membership in Facebook Boycott Campaigns differed based on consumer right awareness**

- **Independent-samples t-test 1: Membership / Right awareness**

Independent Variable: Membership in Facebook group
Dependent variable: Right Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.6.10 Independent Sample test of Group Membership / Personal Efficacy variables*
### Table 5.6.11 Group Statistics of Group Membership / Right awareness variables

| How much do you think that you know your rights? | No | 2.78 | .933 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.6.12 Independent Sample test of Group Membership / Right awareness variables

In this sample, members in Facebook groups (M = 2.87, SD = 1.128) report to know better their rights than the no participants in Facebook groups (M = 2.78, SD = 0.93). However, the difference between membership in Facebook groups and right awareness was not significant, (Sin. (2-tailed) column more than 0.05) and that means that right awareness of boycott participants does not consist of initiatives for increasing the boycotting incentives. \( Mdif = 59, 8 t (246) = 0, 582, p = 0.561. \)
That should confute our hypothesis that we agree that if a consumer-user knows his rights then he is more willing to participate into boycott campaigns and be active in online collective movements. However, according to the group statistic table even the correspondents who are members agree that they have not full awareness of the capability of their action as consumers.

**Hypothesis test 7: Membership in Facebook Boycott Groups differed based on user’s Corporate Social Responsibility perception.**

- **Independent-samples t-test 7: Membership / CSR perception**
  
  Independent Variable: Membership in Facebook group
  
  Dependent variable: Corporate Social Responsibility Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that the way a company works and is managed affect your product’s preference?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3,79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6.13 Group Statistics of Group Membership / Corporate Social Responsibility perception variables**

In the sample in Facebook groups (M= 3,96, Sd= 1,41) accounts to have almost the same opinion with the non-members that (M= 3,79, Sd=.987) that the corporate policies influence their preferences of a product.
### Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that the way a company works and is managed affect your product’s preference?</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>9,441</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-1,177 - .516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-.271 - .610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6.14** Independent Sample test of Group Membership / Corporate Social Responsibility perception variables

The above matrix indicates that the variables of corporate social responsibility perception is not significant enough with the participation in Facebook Boycott Groups (sig>0.005). The awareness of corporate activities in conclude, does not consist of incentive to become a boycotter.

**Hypothesis test 8:** Membership in Boycott Facebook Group varies based on political convictions of boycott campaign members

- Independent-samples t-test 2: Membership/Political convictions
Independent Variable: Membership in Facebook group
Dependent variable: Political Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook Boycott Group Membership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my political convictions are related with the campaign’s characteristics. yes</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6.15. Group Statistics of Group Membership / Political convictions perception variables

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowerr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-test for Equality of Means

Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference

(2-tailed)
I believe that my political convictions are related with the campaign’s characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equal variance assumed</th>
<th>4,487</th>
<th>,035</th>
<th>245</th>
<th>,000</th>
<th>,197</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>,607</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6.16** Independent Samples Test of Group Membership / Political convictions perception variables

In statistics table shows us that member in Facebook groups (M=2, 52, SD=1, 35) report to believe a bit less than the no-participants (M=3, 52, SD= 1, 14). The difference between membership in Facebook groups and political conviction of the members is significant enough and (sig. (2-tailed) less than 0.05) signifyinhg that a user-consumer who participates in a boycott Facebook group believe that the participation in a political campaign has relationship with the political statements.

Mdf=57, 03 t (245) 5,050, p=0

6. Discussion

This paper explores the behavior of the consumers in the digital area and tries to identify the way that the status of a common consumer- social media user is sketched through collective movements.

Example of consumer’s collective movement defined by Delacote (2006, p.21) as “as a war of attrition between a firm and a group of consumers”. For the present manuscript, our incentives came by the local market and the case of Greek Coca Cola boycott campaign “Όχι γουλίμα” as one of the most famous worldwide Greek boycott
campaigns not only for the brand strength of the insulted company but also for the provocative, according to boycotters, decisions to proceed with the layoff of great number of employee’s Greek factories. The boycott duration, also and the promotional activity of campaign in the local market led us to concentrate and analyze their behavior online. As social media consists an important tool for the successful launch of any new campaign, we concentrated on Facebook user’s activity through the campaign. We thought at the very beginning of our research that there is pluralism of Facebook groups with content related to Greek crisis and ethical issues, it was an easy way to investigate the boycott supporter’s activity in the online environment. Surprisingly, as it is indicated by the total amount of two group’s correspondents, the online population which reacts for or with the excuse of a boycott campaign is low. For our present research, lasting one month, from the 250 total amount correspondents only the 50 are they who supports obviously the campaign. This cannot be generalized as the difficulty to approach and contact with boycotters was surprisingly high (see more in the limitations description). For this reason, the whole research was supported by the assumption that the members of Facebook groups with title Greek keywords as “boycott”, “Coca cola boycott” are supporters of the boycott campaigns.

The findings in this study are constrained by the characteristics of the sample. Only 250 responses were collected. This make this sample homogenous in term of nationality which is associated with the origin of the boycott campaign which we refer extensively in the manuscript and in term of common characteristic of social media familiar.

Our questions were split into a theoretical framework where different variables were investigated. Indented and depended variables matched and frame our hypotheses which follow the research rationale. We created new variables to create reductive terms to understand the term of consumer rights, their activism and it is related with the newborn digital activity.

We investigated 8 different hypotheses. Matching them we could conclude to results related with the campaign status on Facebook (perception of Coca Cola campaign variable), the user status on Facebook (third person perception) and the contribution of social network as Facebook to the campaign success (user’s online activity). Moreover,
we investigated how efficacious an online user could be through participating in Boycott Campaigns and lastly, we asked for opinions about the consumer right awareness and the correspondent’s point of view regarding the corporate policies as motives of becoming members in boycott campaigns.

We hypothesized that the user online activity consists an important factor for participating in boycotting. User generated platforms as Facebook give the ability to the user builds identity-driven content in the same time when companies create business-to-consumer dialogue, engaging users to become active consumers. As Keller mentioned (2009) customers define the rules of brand engagement and can protect themselves. Upon testing the time users spend on Facebook with the membership in boycott campaigns, we concluded to the fact that the time does not influence the incentives to become members in online boycott campaigns.

However, the quality of the brand engagement in online environment creates the desire for the user to share his/her experience as well as incentives based on which consumers post their comments (Kantanoleon, 2015). As Schau and Gilly come to add, consumers choose the brands they will discuss in online communications to construct positive self-images (Schau & Gilly, 2003). Third person perception is one composed variable which confirmed our hypothesis that the user behavior and the motivation for online engagement though campaigns connected significant with the influence of the visible co-user’s opinion or comment. The “influence impression” as Li and Bernoff (2009) characterized the comments sharing to person’s network and has brand mention user activity many times influence the user’s network if is socially desirable. Through our research, referring the local example of Coca Cola, we confirm the assumption that of Schweisberger, Billinson and Chock (2014) that if a comment has to do with a personal relevant story, opinion or experience has more possibilities for impact. Coca cola example and the brand frame which is built by the users’ opinion relates to the Nike example. As the comment or the issue is about a noticeable issue (unethical, violent, pornography) then the strength of conscientious consumer’ interactions through online network is huge. Biharie outbid our hypothesis that people can easily assemble a crowd to join them in the protest.
Nevertheless, the users’ ardor to participate into Facebook groups as tool for collective movements depends, according to our opinion, on the quality and the content of the campaign. Through the questionnaire dissemination, we asked the boycotters and non-boycotters their opinion about the content of the Coca cola campaign. According to statistics results, 28.8% of correspondents claimed that they have no idea about the Coca Cola campaign while the 32% are complete aware of campaign’s presence and actions. Correspondents as boycotters declared that they were informed about the campaign by traditional promotional methods as flyers or posters around the city (30%) or via random sharing post on Facebook. Only 30% of the boycotters-users visit frequently the group on Facebook about boycott which are members in. boycotters believe that the content of the Facebook group more informative than head-fake, while the majority declare that the content is not attractive. T-test of the hypothesis that Membership in Facebook group boycott campaigns differed based on user’s perception of Coca-Cola Campaign came to support the previous correspondent’s answers. Coca cola campaign lasts from 2012 and still now, has not enough appeal to cross over to the local community and market. Discussing with the admins of the official Facebook page of the campaign, the know-how and the time they invest to promote the platform to promote and make public the campaign is not important enough. As a result, for the potential boycotters – Facebook users the goals and the actions of the campaign is cleared or appealing enough and that is an inhibitory factor which we, as researches, suggest enhancing.

Correlation analysis indicates a strong relation between user’s perception of Coca Cola campaign and the collective efficacy that the present campaign has. And this correlation derived from the fact that the content and the goals from a campaign need to be clear to create trust and solidarity spirit through the members. Facts show us that there is strong correlation between boycotter’s perception about the current campaign in contrast with nonmembers campaign’ perception. Hypothesis t-test certificated the accusation that collective efficacy is strongly enough in intentional participation in boycott campaigns. Collegiality and courage for defense of campaign commonweal for Coca cola campaign described as not sufficient for its success. (m= 3.4. Std=0,96)
Correspondents as boycotter’s collectivism is strongly related with their self-efficacy. How efficacious a member feels in a boycott campaign tested by questions which consist the variable of personal efficacy. We investigated how important a boycotter believe his/her contribution is for the fulfillment of boycott goal. The feeling of self-esteem and self-confidence of every user could contribute to the Facebook group compact. Personal efficacy is related with the opinion that the users have about their contribution to the campaign. If their comments or posts on platforms are collectively acceptable then the willingness for participation and interaction is increased.

For the presence study, it is clear from the literature review’s elaboration that the boycott campaigns consist a consumers’ need to protect their rights. Consumer activism, as this consumer behavior described, was appeared when community started to assert every type of right as labor rights, women interdependence or even political and economy forces (Hilton, 2007). Consumer power has led many times the legislation reformatting. But are the consumers aware of their rights to protect them? Less than the half claim that they are completely aware of their rights (M= 2.79, Std= 0.970). We assumed that if the consumers are aware of their rights then, as Alabama A&M and Auburn Universities’ research refers they have the right to speak up and support themselves. We supported our research to Biharie’s research as the collective action and movements are effect of “a lack of access to representative institutions, which challenge authorities by raising unaccepted conditions, collective action becomes contentious” (Biharie, 2012, p 12). In the question of how satisfied the correspondents are by the way governments and corporate policies, most of the answers were “not enough” (M= 2.44, Std=0.717). Moreover, upon asking the awareness of Greek consumer support call 15-22, surprising were the results of their ignorance (M= 1.74). Taking the above into account, we composed our hypothesis that membership in Facebook Boycott Campaigns differed based on consumer right awareness. However, the results confound our assumptions. According to t-test methods membership in Boycotts campaigns does not differed based on consumer right awareness. The ignorance of consumer rights according to our responses, does not consist of deciding factor to create intension for boycotting. However, as Farah mentioned on his research,
boycott participation is a collective movement for corporate behavior change. (Farah, 2017) Coca cola campaign indicates a “micro-Boycotting” campaign, focusing directly on companies.

According to Papadopoulos’s research (2011), Greek consumer’s perceptions about corporate policies are negative as result of the increasing apathy for ethical issues, the products overpricing and corporate politics involvement. As already has been mentioned in the literature review, the assumption that the company has increased by 3% spending on social purposes, have a positive impact on perceptions of Greek consumers against big Greek companies which slightly improves the interest to the community and its employees and factor "honesty and transparency", while, in contrast worsen consumer perceptions of the contribution of large enterprises to economic prosperity. The social image of a company, described by the care for the natural environment, budget direction to donations and social projects favoring minorities or the support for the development of society by funding social and cultural activities and generally the concern to improve the general welfare of society, affect critically the overall image of a company. Consumers who are involve into ethical purchasing, many times they do not care only for their personal satisfaction but also for the social and environmental well-being of others (Engel & Blackwell, 1982). In the present study, we asked our correspondents how clear are the corporate policies of Coca Cola for them and if they are obvious for their company-based purchasing. More than the half of corporate policies were most of answers (M=3.2, Std= 1.078) while through the t-test method we tried to investigate if the consumer corporate policies perception consists a factor for boycotting. The results disprove this hypothesis. However, results of the last t-test come to validate our assumption about the strong relation between the consumer’ political conviction and membership in boycott campaigns. Membership in Boycott Facebook Group varies based on political convictions of boycott campaign members. The correspondents both boycotters and non-boycotters believe firmly with the fact that boycott campaigns are linked with the political convictions of the campaign supporters (chart 6-7) while remarkable is the fact that the correspondents who believe most that they do not agree at all are from the boycotter’s part.
6.1 Future Recommendations

In conclusion of all the above analysis, it is remarkable to mention that the main personal purpose of conducting the present survey is to find ways to improve the quality of the collective movement increasing the number of participants and fulfilling the goals. All the above was a first approach of how a scientific research can contribute to an existent phenomenon. There are not any other researches that specialized in the Greek market. The present manuscript is a very first, amateur approach to investigate how the consumers in the Greek market behave through collective movements. Future researches should examine more extensively the implementation of social media in a boycotting campaign. The tools and services that could be provided to contribute to a successful communication campaign. Also, the example of Coca cola boycott campaign: Οὔτε Γοηλμα consists of two players. The workers who incite the campaign and the employers who provoke the campaign. It could be interesting if a future survey examines the boycotting and the participants’ behavior by the employers’ scope of view and the worker’s. In the end, a comparative future approach could analyze characteristics of a collective movement until the Web revolution and how these movements have been framed and influenced by the new digital era. In any case, collective movements related with consumers’ behavior consist a white canvas, in which every contemporary scientist could find outlets for further research.

7. Limitations

The present manuscript was composed and was conducted during the academic year 2017-2018. The most remarkable limitation is the fact that there was an unpredictable accessibility to the target group. The first approach by our side was to connect with the strikers - workers as an easy approach to educate information and questionnaires by the direct influenced target group. Our kind proposal was the permission of uploading the general questionnaire on the Coca - Cola boycott official Facebook page (Coca Cola apergia). Taking into consideration the thousands of followers that the page has, our plan was by the uploading of the questionnaire on the official page to gather as many responses as it could. However, after a long negotiation and meeting with the Boycott
Facebook page administrators, they reject to upload the questionnaire, excused that the objectivity of the questionnaire does not represent the goals and the content of the Facebook page. Explaining us that the power of Coca-cola colossus, many times in the past they faced down the threats and the unethical actions via government’s decisions to put mobilizations on hold.

As a result, a need for searching other groups with related content was created. We orientated to Greek Facebook groups with common keywords as boycott, protest etc. Nevertheless, the difficulty to motive the Facebook users was importantly large. The questionnaire was uploaded first time on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of March. For 15 days, there was a steady flux of responses, approximately 20. As the scheduled duration of the survey was about to be 1 month, the threat of failure was rising. The questionnaire reformattting was a need to broaden the target group and the respondents. Important enough for the smooth survey conduction is the cooperation with the respondents. The last part of the questionnaire was an open answer space to add comments, questions or further information. Surprisingly, the number of negative comments was considerable while the same time in a Facebook group with the title “Fired employees by Coca-Cola” the group administration posted an attention announcement referring to the reliability of our survey and the possibility of aggrieved company support. Moreover, an important limitation in the survey regarding the responses gathering, was that we did not have permission for uploading the questionnaire in all the intended targeted groups. There are post requests which have not been accepted yet even if the content of the specific group was directly related with the questionnaire. Concluding, regarding the way the manuscript investigated the theoretical questions it is true that the results of the research could not be generalized as the sample is small enough to represent all the boycotters.
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Έρευνα για τη δραστηριότητα - συμπεριφορά των καταναλωτών - μελών σε σελίδες κοινωνικής δικτύωσης και την πρόθεσή τους για συμμετοχή σε εκστρατείες Μποϊκοτάζ

Ονομάζομαι Αργυροπούλου Λαμπρινή και είμαι μεταπτυχιακή φοιτήτρια του τμήματος Δημοσιογραφίας & ΜΜΕ του Αριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης.

Το ακόλουθο ερωτηματολόγιο αποτελεί κομμάτι της διπλωματικής μου εργασίας που διεξάγονται αυτό το εξάμηνο. Απευθυνόμαστε σε διαδικτυακούς χρήστες του Facebook που είναι ενεργά μέλη σε σελίδες του Facebook με κύρια θεματολογία την στήριξη στις εκστρατείες Μποϊκοτάζ στην Ελλάδα.

Αν είστε ένας καταναλωτής με προβληματισμούς και ανησυχίες, σας προσκαλούμε να συμμετάσχετε στην έρευνά μας. Οι απαντήσεις σας είναι πολύτιμες για εμάς, συνεισφέροντας στην ανάλυση της ιδιότητας του διαδικτυακού χρήστη ως καταναλωτή στις σελίδες κοινωνικής δικτύωσης.

Με την παρούσα εισαγωγή εγγυάμαστε την επικαιρότητα των στοιχείων σας καθώς και τη διατήρηση της ευπρεπίδοσης σας σε όλη τη διάρκεια της έρευνας. Ωστόσο, έχετε το δικαίωμα να αποχωρήσετε από την διαδικασία του ερωτηματολόγιου ή να αφήσετε κάποια ερώτημα αναπάντητο αν νιώσετε αμοιβή.

Για περισσότερες ερωτήσεις ή διευκρινίσεις σχετικά με την έρευνα, μην διστάσετε να επικοινωνήσετε μαζί μας μέσω email στο: alampriv@gmail.com.

Υπεύθυνη Έρευνας: Αργυροπούλου Λαμπρινή

Σας ευχαριστούμε θερμά εκ των προτέρων για τη συμμετοχή σας στην έρευνά μας!

Τα δικαιώματα του καταναλωτή

Σύμφωνα με το Νόμο για τα Δικαιώματα του Καταναλωτή και το Νόμο περί Προστασίας Καταναλωτή από την Ελληνική Νομοθεσία, τα δικαιώματα του καταναλωτή χωρίζονται στις εξής κατηγορίες:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/13aGYEsQWX-Y16rgismNUo8wdoUP0UZpekZPTvVpp9o/edit
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1. Ως καταναλωτής, σε ποιο βαθμό θεωρείτε πως γνωρίζετε τα δικαιώματά σας;
   Mark only one oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  
   Καθόλου  Αρκά  Δυσαρεστημένος  Πολύ δυσαρεστημένος

2. Πόσο ικανοποιημένοι αισθάνεστε με τον τρόπο που δραστηριοποιούνται οι επιχειρήσεις για να προστατέψουν τα δικαιώματά σας ως καταναλωτές;
   Mark only one oval.

   ○ Πολύ ικανοποιημένος
   ○ Αρκά ικανοποιημένος
   ○ Ούτε ικανοποιημένος, ούτε δυσαρεστημένος
   ○ Αρκά δυσαρεστημένος
   ○ Πολύ δυσαρεστημένος

3. Το 1520 είναι η ελληνική τηλεφωνική γραμμή παραπόνων - καταγγελιών - ερωτήσεων του καταναλωτή. Γνωρίζετε την ύπαρξη του;
   Mark only one oval.

   ○ Ναι
   ○ Όχι

Το κοινωνικό πρόσωπο των επιχειρήσεων

Η Εταιρική Κοινωνική Ευθύνη (Corporate Social Responsibility) αναφέρεται σε πρακτικές και δράσεις με κύριο όφελος την κοινωνία. Τέτοιες πρακτικές είναι:
- Δράσεις προστασίας του Περιβάλλοντος
- Φιλανθρωπία
- Εργασιακά δικαιώματα
- Εθελοντισμός

4. Έχετε ακούσει ποτέ για τις κοινωνικές δράσεις της εταιρείας Coca-Cola 3Ε στην Ελλάδα;
   Mark only one oval.

   ○ Ναι  Skip to question 5.
   ○ Όχι  Skip to question 6.
   ○ Δεν θυμάμαι  Skip to question 6.
1. Αν ναι, πως ενημερωθήκατε για τις δράσεις αυτές;  
Mark only one oval.
- Παραδοσιακά Μέσα Ενημέρωσης (Τηλεόραση, Ραδίοφωνο, Εφημερίδες)
- Μέσα Κοινωνικής Δικτύωσης (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Newsletters)
- Διαφημιστικό υλικό της εταιρείας Coca Cola (φυλλάδια, διαφημιστικά πακέτα, bonus)
- *Έχω ωφεληθεί, καθώς απευθυνόταν σε ομάδες στις οποίες ανήκω*

Την περίοδο των Χριστουγέννων του 2014, η εταιρεία Coca Cola ΕΕ παρέχει καθημερινά στα δύο μεγαλύτερα ξενοδοχεία αστέγων της Αθήνας περίπου 1.400 μερίδες φαγητού ανάμεσα σε 180 απόρους. Επιπλέον, την ίδια χρονιά, προσέφερε ιατρικούς ελέγχους (checkups) σε 3.279 ασθενείς σε συνεργασία με τα τοπικά τμήματα του ελληνικού Ερυθρού Σταυρού.

2. 6. Πώς αξιολογείτε τις δράσεις αυτές της εταιρείας;  
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αρνητικά</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Θετικά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 7. Έχετε αγοράσει ποτέ κάποιο προϊόν επηρεασμένο από τις κοινωνικές δράσεις της εταιρείας;  
Mark only one oval.
- Ναι
- Όχι
- Δεν θυμάμαι

Δύο (2) μήνες πριν την περίοδο των Χριστουγέννων του ίδιου έτους (Νοέμβριος 2014), η εταιρεία αποφάσισε να μετακινήσει τις εγκαταστάσεις της στη Βουλγαρία όπου το κόστος παραγωγής και οι μισθοί των εργαζομένων είναι χαμηλότεροι από αυτούς της Ελλάδας. Ως αποτέλεσμα, χιλιάδες εργαζόμενοι απολύθηκαν κατά την περίοδο των Χριστουγέννων.

4. 8. Σύμφωνα με τους ακόλουθους χαρακτηρισμούς, παρακαλώ αξιολογείστε την πράξη αυτή της εταιρείας  
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Καθόλου</th>
<th>Ελάχιστα</th>
<th>Ουδέτερα</th>
<th>Πάρα πολύ</th>
<th>Απόλυτα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κατακρίση</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αδιάφορη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Προκλητική</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναστάθεια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναμενόμενη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Θεωρείτε πως οι προηγούμενες δύο δράσεις της εταιρείας είναι αντιφατικές μεταξύ τους; 
Mark only one oval.

2. Θεωρείτε πως ο τρόπος που μία επιχείρηση λειτουργεί και διοικείται επηρεάζει την προτίμησή σας στα προϊόντα και στις υπηρεσίες της; 
Mark only one oval.

Τον Οκτώβριο του 2012, η Coca-Cola Ελληνική Εταιρεία Εμφιαλώσεως (Coca-Cola HBC AG) αποφασίζει να μεταφέρει την έδρα της στην Ελβετία και τις μετοχές της από το Χρηματιστήριο Αθηνών στο χρηματιστήριο του Λονδίνου.

Η μετακίνηση των εγκαταστάσεων της εταιρείας στη Βουλγαρία, τον Νοέμβριο του 2014, οδηγεί σε απολύσεις εκατοντάδων εργαζομένων και μείωση εκατοντάδων θέσεων εργασίας.

Ως αποτέλεσμα, μια μεγάλη εκστρατεία μποϊκοτάζ έχει ξεκινήσει με πολλούς απολυμένους εργαζομένους και υποστηρικτές σε αυτή την εποχή, το μέλος της οποίας διαμαρτύρονται για το νέο εργασιακό καθεστώς και τις ανήθικες αποφάσεις που είναι αντίθετες στους δρόμους εταιρικής και κοινωνικής ευθύνης της επιχείρησης.

Στον απόποικο της μεγάλης αυτής εκστρατείας, πολλές είναι οι ομάδες στο Facebook που έχουν δημιουργηθεί και σχετίζονται με τη Coca-Cola.

3. 11. Πόσο χρόνο αφιερώνετε καθημερινά στο Facebook; 
Mark only one oval.

4. 12. Χρησιμοποιείτε το Facebook για την πληροφόρησή σας σχετικά με τις πολιτικές και κοινωνικές εξελίξεις της εποχής; 
Mark only one oval.
1. 13. Γνωρίζετε για την εκστρατεία μποϊκοτάζ της Coca-Cola: Ούτε Γουλιά;  
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καθόλου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απόλυτα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ανήκετε σε κάποια ομάδα στο Facebook με θέμα τις εκστρατείες boycottage? Ναι ή όχι

2. 14. Πως μάθατε για αυτή την ομάδα του Facebook σχετικά με το μποϊκοτάζ στην οποία είστε μέλος:  
Mark only one oval.

- Από σχετική πρόσκληση ενός φίλου στο Facebook
- Από μία τυχαία δημοσίευση στην αρχική σελίδα μου
- Από κάποιο φυλλάδιο ή αφίσα ή δράση της εκστρατείας μποϊκοτάζ της Coca-Cola
- Από δική μου έρευνα

3. 15. Πόσο συχνά επισκέπτεστε τη σελίδα της ομάδας του μποϊκοτάζ που είστε μέλος στο Facebook:  
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ποτέ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάντα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 16. Σύμφωνα με τους ακόλουθους χαρακτηρισμούς, παρακαλώ αξιολογήστε το περιεχόμενο της σελίδας της ομάδας μποϊκοτάζ στο Facebook.  
Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ενημερωτικό</th>
<th>Ελαχίστα</th>
<th>Ουδέτερα</th>
<th>Πάρα πολύ</th>
<th>Απόλυτα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Χρήσιμο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ελκωτικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παραπλανητικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αδιάφορο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. 17. Έχετε κοινοποιήσει ποτέ σχετική δημοσίευση της ομάδας στο προφίλ σας προφίλ στο Facebook?  
Mark only one oval.

- Ναι
- Όχι

6. 18. Αφιερώνετε χρόνο για να διαβάσετε τα σχόλια των μελών της ομάδας στο Facebook;  
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ποτέ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάντα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. 19. Αφιερώνετε χρόνο ώστε να σχολιάσετε σε κάποια σχετική δημοσίευση της ομάδας;
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ποτέ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Πάντα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 20. Παρακαλώ αξιολογήστε τη σαφήνεια του στόχου της ομάδας μποϊκοτάζ στο Facebook, όπου είστε μέλος.
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καθόλου σαφής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Απόλυτα σαφής</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Παρακαλώ συμπληρώστε το βαθμό που διαφωνείτε ή συμφωνείτε με τις παρακάτω απόψεις

Mark only one oval per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Δεν συμφωνώ</th>
<th>Συμφωνώ Ελάχιστα</th>
<th>Ούτε Συμφωνώ, Ούτε Διαφωνώ</th>
<th>Συμφωνώ Αρκετά</th>
<th>Συμφωνώ Απόλυτα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Πιστεύω ότι οι απόψεις μου ταυτίζονται με τις απόψεις των άλλων μελών της ομάδας στο Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Νιώθω περήφανος που ανήκω σε αυτή την ομάδα του Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Είναι σημαντικό για μένα που ανήκω σε αυτή την ομάδα του Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Η δική μου δραστηριότητα στις ομάδες του Facebook σχετικά με το μποϊκοτάζ επηρεάζει τη συμπεριφορά των άλλων μελών.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Η συμμετοχή μου σε ομάδες του Facebook σχετικά με το μποϊκοτάζ συνεισφέρει στην αποδοτικότητα της εκστρατείας του μποϊκοτάζ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Τα σχόλια των άλλων μελών της ομάδας στο Facebook επηρεάζουν τη στάση μου απέναντι στην εκστρατεία του μποϊκοτάζ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Πιστεύω ότι όλοι μαζί με αυτή τη δράση μπορούμε να κινητοποιήσουμε τον κόσμο με το μέρος μας.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Πιστεύω ότι όλοι μαζί με αυτή τη δράση μπορούμε να ενημερώσουμε τον κόσμο για το ζήτημα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Πιστεύω ότι όλοι μαζί μπορούμε να τα καταφέρουμε.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Πιστεύω ότι όλοι μαζί μπορούμε να τα καταφέρουμε και να επαναφέρουμε τις εγκαταστάσεις της Coca - Cola στην Δεν συμφωνώ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Πιστεύω ότι η δράση της Coca-Cola είναι γενικά άδικη.

22. Πιστεύω ότι η δράση της Coca-Cola είναι άδικη προς τους εργαζόμενους.

23. Η δράση της Coca-Cola είναι μόνο προς όφελος της ιδιοκτησίας.

24. Πιστεύω πως οι εκστρατείες μποϊκοτάζ συνδέονται με τις πολιτικές πεποιθήσεις των υποστηρικτών τους.

25. Πιστεύω πως η συμμετοχή μου σε εκστρατείες μποϊκοτάζ συνδέεται με τις δικές μου πολιτικές.
13β Είστε μέλος σε ομάδες του Facebook που αφορούν κοινωνικά ζητήματα όπως Δράσεις Προστασίας του Περιβάλλοντος, Φιλανθρωπία, Εργασιακά Δικαιώματα?
Ναι ήχα
14β Γνωρίζετε για την εκστρατεία μποϊκοτάζ της COCA COLA : Ούτε Γουλιά;
15β Παρακαλώ αξιολογήστε τη σαφήνεια του στόχου της εκστρατείας μποϊκοτάζ Coca cola: ούτε γουλιά όπως αυτή επικοινωνείτε από τα διάφορα μέσα (κινητοποιήσεις, δελτία τύπου, social media)
16β Γνωρίζετε την ύπαρξη της σελίδας της εκστρατείας στο Facebook με τίτλο: Apergia Coca-cola?
Ναι ήχα
17β Έχετε διαβάσει ποτέ κάποια σχετική δημοσίευση στο Facebook για την εκστρατεία αυτή?
Ναι ήχα
18β Έχετε κοινοποιήσει ποτέ σχετική δημοσίευση για την εκστρατεία στο προσωπικό σας προφίλ στο Facebook?
Mark only one oval.
Ναι
Όχι
19β Αφιερώνετε χρόνο για να διαβάσετε σχετικές δημοσίευσείς ή και σχόλια στο Facebook που αφορούν την εκστρατεία αυτή;?
Mark only one oval.
1 2 3 4 5
Ποτέ Πάντα
20β Αφιερώνετε χρόνο ώστε να σχολιάσετε σε κάποια σχετική δημοσίευση που αναφέρεται στην εκστρατεία αυτή?
Mark only one oval.
1 2 3 4 5
Ποτέ Πάντα
21β Πιστεύω πως η ύπαρξη μια ομάδας στο Facebook για την εκστρατεία του Μποϊκοτάζ είναι απαραίτητη.
22β Είναι σημαντικό για μένα να συμμετέχω και να παρακολουθώ τη δραστηριότητα της εκστρατείας αυτής στο Facebook.
23β Η ενεργή συμμετοχή μου στο Facebook σχετικά με το μποϊκοτάζ, θα συνεισφέρει στην αποδοτικότητα της εκστρατείας του μποϊκοτάζ.
24β Πιστεύω πως η δράση της COCA COLA είναι γενικά άδικη.
25β Πιστεύω πως η δράση της COCA COLA είναι άδικη προς τους εργαζόμενους.
26β Πιστεύω ότι όλοι μαζί με την ενεργή δραστηριότητα στο Facebook μπορούμε να κινητοποιήσουμε τον κόσμο για το ζήτημα.
27β Πιστεύω ότι όλοι μαζί μπορούμε να τα καταφέρουμε και να επαναφέρουμε τις εγκαταστάσεις της COCA COLA στην Ελλάδα.
1. Παρακαλώ επιλέξτε το φύλλο στο οποίο ανήκετε.
Mark only one oval.
- Άνδρας
- Γυναίκα

2. Ποια είναι η ηλικία σας;
Mark only one oval.
- 18-29 ετών
- 30-49 ετών
- 50-64 ετών
- 65 ετών και άνω

3. Ποια είναι η ανώτερη βαθμίδα εκπαίδευσής σας;
Mark only one oval.
- Γυμνάσιο
- Λύκειο
- Τεχνικό/ Επαγγελματικό Λύκειο
- Προπτυχιακό επίπεδο Τριτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης
- Μεταπτυχιακό Επίπεδο Τριτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευση

Ευχαριστώ για τη συμμετοχή σας σε αυτή τη μελέτη!
Οι απαντήσεις σας έχουν καταγραφεί.
Αν υπάρχει κάτι που θέλετε να σχολιάσετε σχετικά με τη μελέτη, παρακαλώ αφήστε το σχόλιο σας στο παρακάτω πεδίο κειμένου.