

Online shopping for a cause: social marketing in second-hand fashion stores

Compras online por una buena causa: marketing social en las tiendas de moda de segunda mano

Irene García Medina

Glasgow Caledonian University

Irene.Garcia2@gcu.ac.uk

0000-0003-4424-3357

María Salinas Vázquez

Universidad Nebrija

msalinav@nebrija.es

0009-0005-7508-563X

Abstract

This study examines existing literature on the use of online platforms in influencing social consumer behaviour, engagement, and purchase intentions, particularly in the context of non-profit sectors like second-hand fashion shops. In this regard, academic perspectives on this topic are explored. The aim is none other than to highlight the gaps in current understanding, as well as to denounce the need for more in-depth studies. To this end, the methodology used was the bibliographical technique. The results point to the fact that consumer behaviour in the fashion sector does not yet have a beneficent orientation, which is why further work needs to be done on this approach.

Keywords

Communication; consumption; fashion; marketing; second-hand, shopping; social; stores.

Resumen

Este estudio examina la bibliografía existente sobre el uso de plataformas en línea para influir en el comportamiento del consumidor social, su compromiso y sus intenciones de compra, especialmente en el contexto de sectores sin ánimo de lucro como el de las tiendas de segunda mano de moda. En este sentido, se exploran las perspectivas académicas sobre esta temática. El objetivo no es otro que poner de manifiesto las lagunas existentes en la comprensión actual, así como denunciar la necesidad de estudios más profundos. Para ello, la metodología utilizada ha sido la técnica bibliográfica. Los resultados apuntan a que el comportamiento del consumidor en el sector de la moda no tiene, aún, una orientación benéfica, por lo que hay que seguir trabajando en este enfoque.

Palabras clave

Comunicación; consumo; marketing; moda; tiendas, segunda mano, social.

1. Introduction

Social consumer behaviour is widely studied in Internet marketing research (Pomirleanu et al., 2013). This study begins by exploring online social consumer behaviour and presents academic perspectives on the topic.

It then shifts to the concept of social consumer engagement, reviewing the literature on its strategic use as a competitive tool and for value co-creation.

The study continues by examining how social consumer engagement and value co-creation influence social purchase intention.

Finally, the study discusses online social donor behaviour, starting with a broader understanding of pro-social behaviour and charitable giving. It reviews various motivations for charitable donations and the academic debate around them. The study concludes with a review of fashion and charity.

2. Literature review

2.1. Social consumer behaviour

Online selling became a significant industry in 1998 (Lohse et al., 2000) and sparked academic interest, particularly around the profile of online social consumers (Constantinides, 2004). Understanding the needs and motivations of these consumers is vital for developing effective social marketing strategies (McGoldrick, 2002). Research shows that online consumers differ from traditional shoppers in areas such as education level, socio-economic status, computer literacy, and age (Dennis et al., 2009; Li et al., 1999; Swinyard & Smith, 2003). However, demographic factors alone are not sufficient to profile online consumers as they do not fully explain social behaviours (Hernandez et al., 2011).

Studies have suggested that online and offline consumers share similar social purchase orientations (Jayawardhena et al., 2007). While some scholars see no difference between traditional and online consumer behaviour (Constantinides, 2004), others argue that online buying is influenced by trust and confidence (Lee, 2002; Liebermann & Stashevsky, 2002). Dennis et al. (2009) emphasized the importance of attitude, trust, past experiences, and learning in shaping social consumer behavior.

Constantinides and Fountain (2008) also noted that social online consumers' purchase intentions are influenced by peer reviews, blogs, and social networks, which are beyond marketers' control. Despite these challenges, trust is widely recognized as a key factor in online purchases. Online shopping is seen as risky due to the need to share personal and financial information (Einwiller & Will, 2001; Grabner-Krauter & Kaluscha, 2003), but it also offers consumers access to hard-to-find products and important purchase information (Alba et al., 1997).

In terms of motivations, research highlights both utilitarian and hedonic factors (Childers et al., 2001; Brown et al., 2003; Bridges & Florsheim, 2008). Utilitarian motivations focus on the functionality and convenience of shopping, while hedonic motivations reflect the enjoyment of the shopping experience (Childers et al., 2001). Initially, utilitarian factors were believed to drive online purchasing (Benjamin & Wigand, 1995), but Bridges & Florsheim (2008) argued that as consumers become more experienced, they seek hedonic value online. Childers et al. (2001) suggested that while utilitarian factors like convenience are important, they need to be complemented by the enjoyable aspects of the online shopping environment.

2.2. Social Consumer Engagement (SCE)

Social consumer engagement is considered a strategic tool to develop a competitive advantage (van Doorn et al., 2010; Brodie et al., 2013), and, most importantly, to create and enhance relationships between fashion brands and customers (Brodie et al., 2013). Social consumer engagement was first studied from psychological and behavioural perspectives (Boardman et al., 2020; Hollebeek et al., 2014; Dessart et al., 2015). As noted by Islam and Rahman (2016), however, since 2005 it has transpired into the discipline of marketing and consequently attracted the academic interest in the field.

Islam & Rahman (2016), the authors of the first systematic review of SCE in the social marketing area, have found that there were 66 published articles with SCE central in the discussion and closely reviewed these studies, which justifies the growing interest of the academic body in the subject. Moreover, it is apparent that scholars began to take different approaches in their research; it has been argued by Mollen and Wilson (2010) that most articles are conceptual. It appears, however, that their call for more empirical studies has been heard; as found, conceptual papers constituted 69% of all articles in the years 2005-2010, while their percentage has decreased to approximately 17% between 2011 and 2024 (Islam & Rahman, 2024).

The considerable academic interest in SCE can also be justified by the Marketing Science Institute (MSI, 2023), which declared consumer engagement a "key research priority." Nevertheless, as argued by Jaakkola and Alexander (2024), the academic understanding of how social consumer engagement contributes to value co-creation is still in its infancy.

2.3. Purchase intention

Social purchase intention refers to the likelihood that customers will buy a product (Grewal et al., 1998) and a mental stage where they become willing to purchase (Rosilawati & Najhalidi, 2021). It is influenced not only by the product's value but also by other consumers' recommendations (Schiffman

& Kanuk, 2009; See-To & Ho, 2014). Other moderating factors include perceived informativeness, product popularity (Paço et al., 2021), and scepticism (Sher & Lee, 2009). Research also highlights the positive effect of social media engagement on purchase intention (Hutter et al., 2013; Kamal et al., 2013; Balakrishnan et al., 2014).

Purchase characteristics further shape purchase intention; items that require physical interaction, like touch or smell, lower online purchase intent (Monsuwé et al., 2004). Positive past online shopping experiences also increase the likelihood of continued online shopping (Borusiak et al., 2020). Trust in online shopping plays a key role, as consumers rely on trust in unfamiliar situations (Rotter, 1971).

2.4. Donor behaviour

Murillo and Yoon (2016) observed that many individuals use the Internet to support charity organizations and assist others. This section will first explore the motivations for charitable giving to highlight the social factors driving helping behaviour in a broader, offline context. It will then shift to the online environment, reviewing studies on pro-social consumer behaviour and the strategies organizations use to attract new donors and strengthen relationships with existing ones.

2.4.1. Pro-social behaviour

Pro-social behaviour, defined as actions performed to benefit others rather than oneself (Murillo & Yoon, 2016, p. 627), is linked to helping or showing positive attitudes toward organizations focused on social causes (Basil & Weber, 2006). Margolis (1982) defined help as behaviour that involves a sacrifice, where the costs exceed the benefits, implying that true helping requires some form of cost or loss.

Pro-social behaviour is often driven by individuals' sense of justice for others, even when costs are involved (Borusiak et al., 2020; Murillo & Yoon, 2016). Previous studies have recognized that pro-social behaviour is rational; for example, Twenge et al. (2007) found that people are more inclined to live within cultural frameworks and social groups rather than in isolation. However, pro-social behaviour is seen more in the actions performed than in the underlying motives (Basil & Weber, 2006). Early literature has discussed the motivations for such behaviour, suggesting that both altruistic (Coke et al., 1978; Batson et al., 1981; Toi & Batson, 1982) and egoistic (Archer et al., 1981; Cialdini et al., 1987) reasons drive pro-social actions, although these motives likely go beyond this simple dichotomy (Basil & Weber, 2006).

Helping behaviour has been found to provide individuals with symbolic meaning, allowing them to express values related to caring for others (Clary et al., 1998), which motivates pro-social activities. Additionally, individuals may enhance or protect their egos through such behaviour. Previous studies have shown that social factors strongly influence pro-social behaviour (Basil & Weber, 2006), with people helping others to conform to social norms and avoid negative judgment (Krebs, 1970; Archer et al., 1981). More recent research supports these views, noting that concern for others' opinions enhances support for social causes (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). Bekkers (2010) also highlighted that giving and volunteering are motivated by social incentives, as donors seek social approval from others. Thus, the benefits of charitable giving are both social and psychological.

Several studies have shown that pro-social values and orientations are positively linked to philanthropy (Van Lange et al., 2007; Bekkers, 2006, 2007). Therefore, charitable giving will be explored further as a form of pro-social behaviour (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). To avoid confusion, the terms "charitable giving" and "philanthropy" will be used interchangeably in the following sections, following the work of René Bekkers and Pamala Wiepking (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a; 2011b; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012).

2.5. Fashion and charity

2.5.1. Fashion and social movements

According to Pine (2014), fashion is the usage, mode or custom in vogue during a particular time or place. It is a mass social phenomenon that is engaged by imitation, conscious or unconscious; and it is a way of externalising what we feel and what we carry inside. The type of clothes we choose speaks of the historical moment in which we find ourselves, what urban tribe we belong to and what kind of people we identify with. Ochoa (2007, p. 6) states, "Fashion is a reflection of a society: its very existence is a way of understanding the nature of a moment in history." Similarly, Cristófol et al. (2022) say that fashion continually evolves, reflecting social movements.

For his part, Blanco (2015, p.3) points out that "to situate fashion within the field of culture, we can begin to think about how this discipline is influenced by the social and political movements of a given historical stage" and, also, proposes "to demonstrate how social and political changes are closely related to changes in the development of fashion." On the other hand, Martínez (1998) states that fashion is a sociological phenomenon, and highlights the limitations that previously prevented the understanding of fashion as a sociological phenomenon. All the research and books mentioned above share the variable of fashion with social movements and point out how both variables are directly related and are of great importance to each other.

On the other hand, when discussing social movements, the following references were found: Social movements and urban tribes, social movements and collective action, social movements and their fashion, and social sciences, political science, and social movements. About the type of study and type of design of the research that could be found on the subject, it was noticed that the vast majority of these are of a qualitative order since none of the research found used numerical data. This is evidenced in the work of Mair (2018), who, through interviews with university students, found a direct relationship between the theories of identity and self-concept with social groups, the way of dressing, the fashion industry and urban tribes.

Pine (2014) tried to demonstrate how we dress affects how we think, feel and act and found a direct relationship with the way we dress and our feelings, cognitive abilities and social skills through different experiments conducted on college students. In another order of ideas, Castaño (2019), in an explanatory study on the Hardcore Punk movement, states that "This is where it is stated that all this is culture, it is music, art and subway movement are collective phenomena, that is why the phenomenon is not separated from social life."

Other investigations also took a descriptive approach. Jiménez-Marín and Checa (2021), by means of bibliographic compilations, intend to understand the society's behaviour and its acquired patterns

without leaving aside the production-distribution-consumption relationship of which we are a part (Salazar, n.d.). Regarding the participating subjects, it can be concluded that they are mostly ordinary people and usually belong to university communities in order to understand how what people wear affects their cognitions and thoughts (Mair, 2018; Pine, 2014) and common people related to the Punk social movement in Medellin (Castaño, 2019). However, in other investigations, the subjects analysed were characters linked to fashion and textile makers (Ochoa, 2007; Echavarria, 1943).

In reference to some data, it is defined "social movements as collective challenges posed by people who share common objectives and solidarity in a sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities." Tarrow (1994) and Vélez (2015) state that "Social movements are an object of study for history, considering that they represent actors generating referents and ruptures that affect the conventional models of interpretation on the State and on the government." On the other hand, it is proposed that fashion is not a matter of minorities, nor of exclusivity, since it is not only on the catwalks or in the designer's workshop but also on the street. It affects everyone, although unequally, and is assumed by different groups and classes as part of their project of conformation as a group and affiliation of its members (Ryding et al., 2019; Medina, 2008).

Likewise, Salazar (s.f) illustrates that fashion speaks of society and its idiosyncrasy; it shows us how the elements that are important in a culture are mixed and how its people live and develop in each social-historical context. It also highlights the relationship between theories of identity and self-concept with social groups, how we dress, the fashion industry, urban tribes and how other people see us, our feelings, cognitive abilities and social capabilities (Mair, 2018; Pine, 2014). In turn, Larrin and Arrieta (2010) highlight that when talking about identity and adolescence, fashion plays a crucial role because it becomes the language of the adolescent. And with it, all other retail strategies, including those of charities (Jiménez-Marín et al., 2018).

2.5.2. Fast fashion and the circular economy

Textile waste is one of the most polluting items globally and is heavily affected by fast fashion (FF) products. Public pressure has led many FF companies to voluntarily collect a small fraction of their second-hand items (Palomo-Domínguez, 2023) and export them to developing countries for reuse. However, some developing countries are implementing import bans on second-hand clothing. In addition, FF companies may soon be forced by extended producer responsibility legislation to collect more pre-owned items for reuse and recycling (Pinson, 2012). To date, they do not have sufficient capacity to do so. Charities have been the main collectors and recyclers of used clothing (Henninger et al., 2022), so these charities could help FF companies increase their capacity in this reverse supply chain (CS).

However, following Zanjirani et al. (2022), we are unlikely to see such collaboration for two main reasons:

- Charities prefer to sell high-quality second-hand items in the primary market to generate as much revenue as possible, and FF companies may fear cannibalisation.
- Many charities believe that FF companies generate quantities of low-quality items that require collection and sorting and are difficult to sell in the primary market.

Charities also face competition from many small for-profit organisations selling second-hand FF items. Although volunteers support charities, they are often less efficient. This paper urges Operations Management (OM) researchers to suggest innovative business models to help:

- Fast fashion companies and charities to collaborate to solve the above problems.
- Charities to improve their traditional practices to become competitive.

3. Objectives and hypotheses

The main objective of this research is to examine academic literature on social consumer behaviour, particularly in the context of non-profit sectors like second-hand fashion shops. The idea is to understand if it would be possible to increase the sustainable consumption of textile products through charitable organisations.

In this line, we start with three main hypotheses:

- H1: The social purpose of fashion recycling from a circular economy directly affects on consumer behaviour.
- H2: A new (circular) economy emerges from non-profit second-hand organisations.
- H3: Social, reputational and business benefits are generated for second-hand fashion stores as well as for society.

4. METHODOLOGY

Regarding the instruments for information collection and analysis, methods such as bibliography analysis on the relationship between thoughts and clothing were used (Mair, 2018; Pine, 2014). The bibliographic compilation is a frequent instrument. Echavarría (1943) conducted it to answer the question about how this industry continued to develop through the years, as well as Martínez (1998) to unveil the new role of fashion in the new societies.

We followed a research method based on bibliographic analysis to collect the necessary arguments and claims (Saunders et al. 2019).

For the textual analysis, grey literature was used, such as company sustainability reports and parliamentary documents, which are therefore used as secondary data sources to familiarise the operations community with the garment supply chain and identify areas for improvement. The procedure used in the textual analysis followed the method of:

1. Word frequency (word count).
2. Word grouping (or word combination).
3. Sentiment analysis.
4. Tagging/Categorisation of feedback comments.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Philanthropy

Philanthropy, defined as the voluntary donation of money to organizations benefiting others beyond one's own family (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b, p. 337), has been widely studied across multiple disciplines, including economics, social psychology, neurology, sociology, anthropology, and marketing (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a). However, recent research has become more specialized, with scholars primarily focusing on individual disciplines rather than treating philanthropy as a multidisciplinary field of social sciences (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a).

Rothschild (1979) was one of the first to recognise the use of marketing tools in the public sector for philanthropic shops, including charities. He argued that non-profit organisations face unique challenges such as the intangibility of their offerings, low purchase frequency, and a diverse target audience, which differentiate them from for-profit organizations.

Many literature reviews have been published on philanthropy in fields like social psychology (Batson, 1998), marketing (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007), economics (Andreoni, 2006; Meier, 2007), and sociology (Wilson, 2000). However, Bekkers & Wiepking (2011a) conducted one of the most extensive reviews, examining over 500 articles, which spans a broader range of sources and categories.

The donor decision-making process has been broken down into four stages: perception of need, motivation, behaviour, and consequences (Krebs & Miller, 1985). Bendapudi et al. (1996, p. 34) defined charitable giving as "behaviour that enhances the welfare of a needy other, by providing aid or benefit, usually with little or no commensurate reward in return." Several factors have been identified as predictors of charitable giving, including age, gender, income, religion, and occupation (Radley & Kennedy, 1995; Sargeant & Lee, 2004; Hall, 2006).

Bekkers & Wiepking (2011a) identified different key mechanisms driving philanthropy: (1) perceived need, (2) requesting donations, (3) costs and benefits, (4) altruism, (5) reputation, (6) psychological benefits, (7) values, and (8) efficacy. These mechanisms are explored to understand better what motivates people to donate.

Perceived need is a crucial prerequisite, as individuals must be aware of the cause to consider donating. Previous studies on donations demonstrated this relevance (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964; Schwartz, 1975). Research confirms that perceived need correlates positively with donations (Lee & Farrell, 2003). Studies on the age of organizations suggest mixed findings about whether longer-established charities receive more donations, with some supporting this view (Olsen & Eidem, 2003), while others do not (Khana & Sandler, 2000; Callen, 1994).

Requesting donations. Bekkers & Wiepking (2011a, p. 931) argue that how requests occur determines its success, with studies showing that solicitation precedes approximately 85% of donations (Bryant et al., 2003; Bekkers, 2005). However, too many requests can lead to donor fatigue and reduce the likelihood of donations (Van Diepen et al., 2009).

Costs and benefits are the tangible consequences of donating, and the lower the perceived costs, the higher the likelihood of giving (Eckel & Grossman, 2004; Karlan & List, 2006). Studies show seasonal variations, with donations often peaking in December (Pharoah & Tanner, 1997; Banks & Tanner, 1999). The benefits of giving may include access to events (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a) or participation in lotteries (Landry et al., 2006). Although direct-mail gifts are commonly thought to increase donations, evidence for this relationship is inconclusive (Chen et al., 2006).

Altruism, as described by Andreoni (2006), is a significant motivator for giving, as individuals may donate to support the organization's cause or beneficiaries. However, studies have shown mixed findings on the crowding-out effect, where donations may decrease if people perceive others' contributions (Ek & Mariani, 2020; Kropf & Knack, 2003), while other studies suggest a crowding-in effect (Khanna & Sandler, 2000; Brooks, 2003).

Reputation plays a key role in charitable giving, as individuals seek social approval for their donations (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a). Social norms around giving influence people's decisions: donors receive approval, while those who do not donate risk social disapproval (Soeteven, 2005; Bateson et al., 2006). Fear of social embarrassment may be a key driver for giving (Samek & Sheremeta, 2014).

Psychological benefits include the joy of giving and a positive self-image. Neuropsychological studies have shown that donations trigger brain activity related to reward processing (Harbaugh et al., 2007). Generosity can also be influenced by thoughts about one's mortality (Jonas et al., 2002), forgiveness (Karremans et al., 2005), or gratitude (Soeteven, 2005). Additionally, people tend to overestimate their own generosity (Bekkers, 2006), and asking people if they are willing to donate increases the likelihood of actual donations (Cialdini, 2001).

Values such as pro-social and altruistic values, spiritual beliefs, and a sense of social justice are strongly linked to charitable giving (Bekkers, 2006; Van Lange, 2007). Individuals who prioritize these values are more likely to donate.

Finally, efficacy refers to the belief that one's donation will make a difference. Individuals are less likely to contribute if they do not perceive their donation as impactful (Arumi et al., 2005).

These mechanisms are grounded in extensive research, making them reliable indicators of the factors that drive philanthropy.

5.2. Online fundraising

The rise of the Internet, mainly social media platforms, has significantly impacted how charity organizations engage with donors (Das & Sahoo, 2012). According to Mano (2014), the Internet has accelerated information tracking, shopping, and social interaction, which has influenced fashion charity organizations, too. Online fundraising has become a major income source for many fashion second-hand shops (Smith et al., 2015).

Aldridge and Fowles (2013) noted a decline in charitable giving across generations since a significant percentage of donations comes from individuals over 75. This shift has prompted charities to explore

new fundraising avenues, such as online giving, to engage younger audiences. Treiblmaier and Pollach (2008) emphasized that the Internet offers not only fundraising opportunities but also a platform for charity organizations to foster relationships with their stakeholders. This aligns with Day & Montgomery's (1999) assertion that relationship marketing applies to all types of organizations, not just businesses.

The profile of online donors has been widely studied, though opinions on the topic vary. Bøg et al. (2012) argued that online giving is driven by the same motivations as offline giving, while Shier & Handy (2012) suggested that the factors influencing online and offline donations differ. Mano (2014) proposed that the Internet complements offline giving.

Research indicates that people need to feel connected to a cause before donating, as a distant relationship between the donor and recipient negatively impacts the likelihood of giving (Lee et al., 1999; Bekkers, 2009). This is especially true online, where the connection can feel more impersonal (Shier & Handy, 2012). Handy (2000) highlighted that trust in a charity and its reputation are crucial for online donations. High-performing organizations are more likely to attract donors, as demonstrated by research from Sargeant & Hudson (2008) and others (Berman & Davidson, 2003; Shier & Handy, 2012).

Trust, a key factor in both offline and online giving (Bekkers, 2003; Sargeant & Lee, 2004; Briones et al., 2010), is critical in online transactions, where concerns about payment security are prevalent (Einwiller & Will, 2001). Mayer et al. (1995) define trust as the willingness to be vulnerable to another party's actions based on the expectation that they will act in the trustor's interest. Trust can be viewed from two angles: trust in the charity itself and trust in the security of online transactions (Dennis et al., 2009). Donors are unlikely to contribute if they do not trust the charity or feel the online payment process is secure (Sargeant & Lee, 2004).

Privacy concerns are strongly linked to trust, and individuals are often hesitant to share personal data online (Phelps et al., 2001; Dinev & Hart, 2006). For charity organizations, this presents challenges in online fundraising, but clear privacy policies and privacy seals can help build trust with potential donors (Kimery & McCord, 2006; Pollach, 2005).

Website design also plays a crucial role in fostering trust, especially the donation button's design. Burt & Gibbons (2011) found that the design of the donation button can influence transactional trust by reassuring donors about the security of their donation. Incorporating images of the charity's work on the website can also enhance trust (Burt & Dunham, 2009), with studies showing a positive correlation between donation amounts and visual elements that build trust (Burt & Gibbons, 2011).

Despite the insights provided by these studies, a comprehensive model of online donor behaviour is still lacking. This highlights a significant gap in the current literature on online donations.

5.3. Social media fundraising

The rapid growth of social media networks has created new opportunities for charity organizations (Saxton & Wang, 2014). Briones et al. (2011) found that social media not only helps build relationships but also strengthens them, allowing users to engage with causes. It also enhances organizations' ability to reach large audiences and attract new, younger demographics strategically (Flannery et al., 2009).

Existing research shows that social media not only enables users to expand their social circles (Kent et al., 2003) and participate in communities (Mesch & Talmud, 2010) but also exposes them to social causes (Waters, 2007) and enhances information flow between non-profit organizations and their audiences (Burt & Taylor, 2003; Gandia, 2011). Hur (2020) supported this, noting that social media platforms promote cooperation by facilitating interactions with both small (Mesch & Talmud, 2010) and large groups or institutions (Capece & Costa, 2013). Social networks also increase funding opportunities by reducing information asymmetry (Liu et al., 2013; Freedman & Jin, 2014) and have proven effective for stakeholder dialogue (Waters et al., 2009) and community building (Briones et al., 2011).

However, despite the growing body of research on the benefits of social media for fashion charity organizations and the importance of adopting such strategies (Dillon, 2016), there has been limited academic focus on social media donors and community engagement in this sector. As Young (2017) suggested, "future research should examine community perceptions of non-profit organizations that use social media to engage and promote the organization" (p. 54). Exploring the relationship between charities and their supporters from the donor's perspective may offer valuable insights for improving social media strategies (Young, 2017). This aligns with Saxton & Wang (2014), who emphasized the importance of understanding the motivations of the "Facebook generation" for charity engagement in order for organizations to remain relevant in the social media landscape.

6. Conclusions

Social consumer behaviour, engagement, and purchase intention have been extensively researched from a commercial standpoint. However, this focus is lacking in the fashion charity sector. Despite the increasing use of digital social channels and social media by fashion charity organizations, academic literature remains limited in depth. Studies indicate that fashion charities often lack clear goals for their social media use (Young, 2017), struggle to utilize social media as a strategic tool (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012), and miss opportunities to build valuable relationships (Bortree & Seltzer, 2009). As a result, there is a need for further research into social media adoption in the fashion charity sector, particularly in relation to donor engagement, which has been overlooked by scholars. Academic research on digital social marketing and social media adoption within non-profit organizations is still in its early stages. The results point to the fact that consumer behaviour in the fashion sector does not yet have a beneficent orientation, which is why further work needs to be done on this approach.

7. Limitations of the study (and possible lines of future research)

Regarding the limitations of this study, the sample size does not cover the numerous publications in the area. Therefore, there is room for gathering more research from a more extensive sample in the future. For future research, the topic of social consumer behaviour has numerous opportunities to expand. For example, consumer behaviour can differ greatly depending on different demographics. Therefore, research findings can provide new notions when done in various countries. Lastly, there are opportunities to update the research in the future through different means of methodology, as well as with the emergence of new theories and trends.

8. Specific contribution of each signatory

- Conception and design of the work: I.G.M.; M.S.V.
- Desk research: I.G.M.; M.S.V.
- Data collection: I.G.M.; M.S.V.
- Data analysis and critical interpretation: I.G.M.; M.S.V.
- Review and approval of versions: I.G.M.; M.S.V.

9. Acknowledgements to collaborators

We are grateful to the second-hand stores that collaborate with this study.

10. Funding

Not applicable.

11. Responsible declaration of use of artificial intelligence

No AI tools have been used in the development of this research.

12. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest.

13. References

- Alba, J., Lynch, J., Weitz, B., Janiszewski, C., Lutz, R., Sawyer, A., & Wood, S. (1997). Interactive home shopping: consumer, retailer, and manufacturer incentives to participate in electronic marketplaces. *The Journal of Marketing*, 61(3), 38-53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299706100303>
- Andreoni J. (2006). Philanthropy. In Gerard-Varet L.-A., Kolm S.-C., Ythier J. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of giving, reciprocity and altruism*. Elsevier.
- Archer, R. L., Diaz-Loving, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., Davis, M. H., & Foushee, H. C. (1981). The role of dispositional empathy and social evaluation in the empathic mediation of helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(4), 786-796. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.40.4.786>

- Arumi A. M., Wooden R., Johnson J., Farkas S., Duffett A., & Ott A. (2005). *The charitable impulse*. Public Agenda.
- Balakrishnan, B. K., Dahnil, M. I., & Yi, W. J. (2014). The impact of social media marketing medium toward purchase intention and brand loyalty among generation Y. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 148, 177-185.
- Banks, J., & Tanner, S. (1999). Patterns in household giving: Evidence from UK data. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 10(2), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.032>
- Basil, D. Z., & Weber, D. (2006). Values motivation and concern for appearances: the effect of personality traits on responses to corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 61-72. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/nvsm.38>
- Bateson M., Nettle D., Roberts G. (2006). Cues of being watched enhance cooperation in a real world setting. *Biological Letters*, 2, 412-414. [10.1098/rsbl.2006.0509](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2006.0509)
- Batson C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In Gilbert D. T. (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 282-316). New York: Random House.
- Batson, C. D., Duncan, B. D., Ackerman, P., Buckley, T., & Birch, K. (1981). Is empathic emotion a source of altruistic motivation?. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 40(2), 290. [10.1037/0022-3514.43.2.281](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.43.2.281)
- Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and health-related philanthropy: The role of resources and personality. *Social psychology quarterly*, 69(4), 349-366. [10.1177/019027250606900404](https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250606900404)
- Bekkers, R. (2009). Who gives what and when? A scenario study of intentions to give time and money. *Social Science Research*, 39(3), 369-381. [10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.08.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.08.008)
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving part one: religion, education, age and socialisation. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365. [10.1332/204080511X6087712](https://doi.org/10.1332/204080511X6087712)
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011a). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973. [10.1177/0899764010380927](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927)
- Bendapudi, N., Singh, S. N., & Bendapudi, V. (1996). Enhancing helping behavior: An integrative framework for promotion planning. *The Journal of Marketing*, 33-49. [10.2307/1251840](https://doi.org/10.2307/1251840)
- Benjamin, R., & Wigand, R. (1995). Electronic markets and virtual value chains on the information superhighway. *Sloan Management Review*, 36(2), 62.
- Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L. R. (1964). Affecting the salience of the social responsibility norm: effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68(3), 275. [10.1007/s10551-016-3106-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3106-x)
- Blanco, A. (2015). *La influencia de la política y los movimientos sociales en la evolución de la moda en España: La movida madrileña*. Universidad de Sevilla. <https://goo.su/zl7hD>
- Boardman, R., Blazquez, M., Henninger, C. E., & Ryding, D. (Eds.). (2019). *Social commerce: Consumer behaviour in online environments* (1a ed.). Springer.
- Boardman, R., Parker-Strak, R. and Henninger, C. (2020). *Fashion Buying and Merchandising*. Routledge.

- Borusiak, B., Szymkowiak, A., Horska, E., Raszka, N., & Żelichowska, E. (2020). Towards building sustainable consumption: A study of second-hand buying intentions. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 875. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12030875>
- Bøg, M., Harmgart, H., Huck, S., & Jeffers, A. M. (2012). Fundraising on the Internet. *Kyklos*, 65(1), 18–30. [10.1111/j.1467-6435.2011.00525.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6435.2011.00525.x)
- Bridges, E., & Florsheim, R. (2008). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping goals: The online experience. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(4), 309–314. [10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.06.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.06.017)
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer engagement: conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 252–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094427X11418001>
- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 105–114. [10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.029)
- Brown, M., Pope, N., & Voges, K. (2003). Buying or browsing? An exploration of shopping orientations and online purchase intention. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(11/12), 1666–1684. [10.1108/03090560310495401](https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560310495401)
- Bryant W. K., Slaughter H. J., Kang H., & Tax, A. (2003). Participating in philanthropic activities: Donating money and time. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 26(1), 43–73. [10.1023/A:1022626529603](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022626529603)
- Burt, C. D., & Dunham, A. H. (2009). Trust generated by aid agency web page design. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 14(2), 125–136. [10.1002/nvsm.338](https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.338)
- Burt, C. D., & Gibbons, S. (2011). The effects of donation button design on aid agency transactional trust. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(2), 183–194. [10.1002/nvsm.412](https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.412)
- Burt, E., & Taylor, J. A. (2003). New technologies, embedded values and strategic change: Evidence from U.K. voluntary sectors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(1), 115–127. [10.1177/0899764002250009](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764002250009)
- Capece, G., & Costa, R. (2013). The new neighbourhood in the internet era: network communities serving local communities. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 32(5), 438–448. [10.1080/0144929X.2011.610825](https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2011.610825)
- Castillo, M., Petrie, R., & Wardell, C. (2014). Fundraising through online social networks: A field experiment on peer-to-peer solicitation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 114, 29–35. [10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.01.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.01.002)
- Chen Y., Li X., MacKie-Mason J. K. (2006). Online fund-raising mechanisms: A field experiment. *Contributions to Economic Analysis & Policy*, 5(2). [10.2202/1538-0645.1477](https://doi.org/10.2202/1538-0645.1477)
- Childers, T. L., Christopher L. C., Peck J., & Carson S., (2001) Hedonic and utilitarian motivations for online retail shopping behavior, *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 511–535. [10.1016/S0022-4359\(01\)00056-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(01)00056-2)
- Cialdini R. B. (2001). *Influence*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Cialdini, R. B., Schaller, M., Houlihan, D., Arps, K., Fultz, J., & Beaman, A. L. (1987). Empathy-based helping: Is it selflessly or selfishly motivated?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(4), 749. [10.1037/0022-3514.52.4.749](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.4.749)

- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: a functional approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74(6), 1516. [10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516)
- Coke, J. S., Batson, C. D., & McDavis, K. (1978). Empathic mediation of helping: A two-stage model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 36(7), 752. [10.1037/0022-3514.36.7.752](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.36.7.752)
- Constantinides, E. (2004). Influencing the online consumer's behavior: the Web experience. *Internet research*, 14(2), 111-126. [10.1108/10662240410530835](https://doi.org/10.1108/10662240410530835)
- Cristófol, C.; Villena-Alarcón, E., & Domínguez García, A.C. (2022). Pasarelas de moda, año cero: cambio y percepciones tras la Covid-19. *IROCAMM-International Review Of Communication And Marketing Mix*, 5(1), 72-82. <https://dx.doi.org/10.12795/IROCAMM.2021.v05.i01.06>
- Das, B., & Sahoo, D. S. (2012). Social networking sites - A critical analysis of its impact on personal and social life. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(14), 222-229. [10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01580.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01580.x)
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS quarterly*, 319-340. [10.2307/249008](https://doi.org/10.2307/249008)
- Day, G. S., & Montgomery, D. B. (1999). Charting new directions for marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 3-13. [10.2307/1252096](https://doi.org/10.2307/1252096)
- Dennis, C., Merrilees, B., Jayawardhena, C., & Tiu Wright, L. (2009). E-consumer behaviour. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(9/10), 1121-1139. [10.1108/03090560910976393](https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560910976393)
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015). Consumer engagement in online brand communities: a social media perspective. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 24(1), 28-42. [10.1108/JPBM-06-2014-0635](https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-06-2014-0635)
- Echavarría, L. (2019). *Lecciones de estilo*. Planeta
- Eckel C. C., & Grossman P. (2004). Giving to secular causes by the religious and nonreligious: An experimental test of the responsiveness of giving to subsidies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33, 271-289. [10.1177/0899764004263423](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764004263423)
- Ek Styvén, M.; & Mariani, M. M. (2020). Understanding the intention to buy secondhand clothing on sharing economy platforms: The influence of sustainability, distance from the consumption system, and economic motivations. *Psychology & Marketing*, 37(5), 724-739. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21334>
- Flannery H., Harris R., Rhine C. (2009). *2008 Donor Centrics Internet giving benchmarking analysis*. Target Analytics.
- Grewal, D., Monroe, K. B., & Krishnan, R. (1998). The effects of price-comparison advertising on buyers' perceptions of acquisition value, transaction value, and behavioral intentions. *The Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 46-59. [10.2307/1252160](https://doi.org/10.2307/1252160)
- Harbaugh W. T.; Mayr U.; & Burghart D. R. (2007). Neural responses to taxation and voluntary giving reveal motives for charitable donations. *Science*, 316, 1622-1624. [10.1126/science.1140738](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1140738)
- Henninger, C. E.; Niinimäki, K.; Blazquez, M.; & Jones, C. (2022). *Sustainable fashion management*. Routledge.

- Hollebeek, L. (2011). Exploring customer brand engagement: definition and themes. *Journal of strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 555-573. [10.1080/0965254X.2011.599493](https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2011.599493)
- Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of interactive marketing*, 28(2), 149-165. [10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002)
- Hur, E. (2020). Rebirth fashion: Secondhand clothing consumption values and perceived risks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 273, 122951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122951>
- Hutter, K., Hautz, J., Dennhardt, S., & Füller, J. (2013). The impact of user interactions in social media on brand awareness and purchase intention: the case of MINI on Facebook. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 22(5/6), 342-351. [10.1108/JPBM-05-2013-0299](https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-05-2013-0299)
- Islam, J. U., Islam, J. U., Rahman, Z., & Rahman, Z. (2024). The transpiring journey of customer engagement research in marketing: A systematic review of the past decade. *Management Decision*, 54(8), 2008-2034. [10.1108/MD-01-2016-0028](https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-01-2016-0028)
- Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2024). The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation: a service system perspective. *Journal of Service Research*, 17(3), 247-261. [10.1177/1094670514529187](https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670514529187)
- Jayawardhena, C., Wright, L.-T. and Dennis, C. (2007), "Consumers online: intentions, orientations and segmentation", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 35(6), 515-26. [10.1108/09590550710750377](https://doi.org/10.1108/09590550710750377)
- Jiménez-Marín, G.; & Checa, A. (2021). *Teoría y práctica del consumo*. Síntesis.
- Jiménez-Marín, G., Elías-Zambrano, R., & García-Medina, I. (2018). El modelo de Hulten, Broweus y Van Dijk de marketing sensorial aplicado al retail español. Caso textil. *Revista Mediterránea de Comunicación*, 9(1), 401-409. <https://doi.org/10.14198/MEDCOM2018.9.1.25>
- Jonas E., Schimel J., Greenberg J., Pyszczynski T. (2002). The scrooge effect: Evidence that mortality salience increases prosocial attitudes and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1342-1353. [10.1177/014616702236834](https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702236834)
- Kamal, S., Chu, S. C., & Pedram, M. (2013). Materialism, attitudes, and social media usage and their impact on purchase intention of luxury fashion goods among American and Arab young generations. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 13(1), 27-40. [10.1080/15252019.2013.768052](https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2013.768052)
- Karlan D., & List J. A. (2006). *Does price matter in charitable giving? Evidence from a large-scale natural field experiment*. Working paper, Yale University. [10.1257/aer.97.5.1774](https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.97.5.1774)
- Karremans J., Lange P. A. M. V., & Holland R. W. (2005). Forgiveness and its associations with prosocial thinking, feeling, and doing beyond the relationship with the offender. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1315-1326. [10.1177/0146167205274892](https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205274892)
- Kent M., Taylor M., & White W. (2003). The relationship between website design and organizational responsiveness to stakeholders. *Public Relations Review*, 29, 63-77. [10.1016/S0363-811\(02\)00194-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-811(02)00194-7)
- Khanna J., Sandler T. (2000). Partners in giving: The crowding-in effects of UK government grants. *European Economic Review*, 44, 1543-1556. [10.1016/S0014-2921\(99\)00007-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921(99)00007-0)

- Kim, A. J., & Ko, E. (2010). Impacts of luxury fashion brand's social media marketing on customer relationship and purchase intention. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 1(3), 164-171. [10.1080/20932685.2010.10593068](https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2010.10593068)
- Krebs, D. L. (1970). Altruism: An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. *Psychological bulletin*, 73(4), 258-302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028987>
- Krebs, D. L., & Miller, D. T. (1985). Altruism and aggression. In Lindzey, G. (ed.). *The handbook of social psychology*. Oxford. (pp. 1-71).
- Landry C., Lange A., List J. A., Price M. K., & Rupp, N. G. (2006). Toward an understanding of the economics of charity: Evidence from a field experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121, 747-782. [10.1162/qjec.2006.121.2.747](https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2006.121.2.747)
- Lee B. A., & Farrell C. R. (2003). Buddy, can you spare a dime? Homelessness, panhandling, and the public. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38, 299-324. [10.1177/1078087402238804](https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087402238804)
- Liebermann, Y., & Stashevsky, S. (2002). Perceived risks as barriers to Internet and e-commerce usage. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 5(4), 291-300. [10.1108/13522750210443245](https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750210443245)
- Lohse, G. L., Bellman, S., & Johnson, E. J. (2000). Consumer buying behavior on the Internet: Findings from panel data. *Journal of interactive Marketing*, 14(1), 15-29. [10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6653\(200024\)14:1<15::AID-DIR2>3.0.CO;2-C](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6653(200024)14:1<15::AID-DIR2>3.0.CO;2-C)
- Mair, C. (2018). *The psychology of fashion*. Routledge.
- Mano, R. S. (2014). Social media, social causes, giving behavior and money contributions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31, 287-293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.044>
- Margolis, H. (1982). *Selfishness, Altruism, and Rationality*. Cambridge University Press
- Martínez, A. (1998). La moda en las sociedades avanzadas. *Revista Papers*, 54, 129-137. [10.5565/rev/papers.1915](https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/papers.1915)
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*, 20(3), 709-734. [10.5465/AMR.2007.24348410](https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.24348410)
- McGoldrick, P. J. (2002). *Retailing marketing*. McGraw Hill.
- Medina, F. (2008). La moda, el sentido del vestir y la posmodernidad. *Revista Iconofacto*, 4(5), 11-26. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11912/7158>
- Mollen, A., & Wilson, H. (2010). Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online consumer experience: Reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives. *Journal of business research*, 63(9), 919-925. [10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.014)
- Monsuwé, T. P., Dellaert, B. G., & de Ruyter, K. (2004). What drives consumers to shop online?: a literature review. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(1), 102-121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0954230410523358>
- Ochoa, L. (2007). *Colombia es moda*. Planeta.
- Olsen, J. A., & Eidem, J. I. (2003). An inquiry into the size of health charities: the case of Norwegian patient organisations. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 32(4), 457-466. [10.1016/S1053-5357\(03\)00051-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-5357(03)00051-9)

- Paço, A.; Leal Filho, W.; Ávila, L. V.; & Dennis, K. (2021). Fostering sustainable consumer behavior regarding clothing: Assessing trends on purchases, recycling and disposal. *Textile Research Journal*, 91(3-4), 373-384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040517520944524>
- Palomo-Domínguez, I., Elías-Zambrano, R., & Álvarez-Rodríguez, V. (2023). Gen Z's motivations towards sustainable fashion and eco-friendly brand attributes: The case of Vinted. *Sustainability*, 15(11), 8753. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15118753>
- Pine, K. (2014). *Mind what you wear. The psychology of fashion*. Kindle.
- Pinson, M. (2012). *Elements of sustainability governance & applications of sustainability*. University.
- Pomirleanu, N., Schibrowsky, J. A., Peltier, J., & Nill, A. (2013). A review of internet marketing research over the past 20 years and future research direction. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 7(3), 166-181. [10.1108/JRIM-01-2013-0006](https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-01-2013-0006)
- Radley, A., & Kennedy, M. (1995). Charitable giving by individuals: A study of attitudes and practice. *Human relations*, 48(6), 685-709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800605>
- Ryding, D., Henninger, C. E., & Blazquez Cano, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Vintage luxury fashion: Exploring the rise of the secondhand clothing trade*. Springer Nature.
- Rosilawati, Y.; & Najhalidi, A. D. (2021). Gili Gili Eco Trust's Social Marketing Strategy in Building Community Awareness in Realizing Gili Trawangan Zero Waste in 2019/2020. *IROCAMM-International Review Of Communication And Marketing Mix*, 2(4), 46-54. <https://dx.doi.org/10.12795/IROCAMM.2021.v02.i04.04>
- Rothschild, M. L. (1979). Marketing communications in nonbusiness situations or why it's so hard to sell brotherhood like soap. *The Journal of Marketing*, 11-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297904300202>
- Rotter, J.B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. *American Psychologist*, 26(5), 443-452. [10.1037/h0031464](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0031464)
- Samek, A. S., & Sheremeta, R. M. (2014). Recognizing contributors: an experiment on public goods. *Experimental Economics*, 17(4), 673-690. [10.2139/ssrn.2378406](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2378406)
- Salazar, J. (s.f.) Moda, identidad y cambio social. Tres aspectos importantes del estudio de la industria cultural. Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Donor trust and relationship commitment in the UK charity sector: The impact on behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-202. [10.1177/0899764004263321](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764004263321)
- Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Trust and relationship commitment in the United Kingdom voluntary sector: Determinants of donor behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(8), 613-635. [10.1002/mar.20021](https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20021)
- Sargeant, A., Hudson, J., & West, D. C. (2008). Conceptualizing brand values in the charity sector: the relationship between sector, cause and organization. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28(5), 615-632. [10.1080/02642060801988142](https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060801988142)
- Saunders M., Lewis P., & Thornhill A. (2019). *Research Methods for Business Students*. Wiley.

- Saxton, G. D., & Wang, L. (2014). The social network effect: The determinants of giving through social media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5), 850-868. [10.1177/0899764013485159](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013485159)
- Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to nonprofit organizations' informational, promotional, and community-building messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 26(3), 280-299. [10.1080/1062726X.2014.908721](https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2014.908721)
- Schwartz S. H. (1975). The justice of need and the activation of humanitarian norms. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(3), 111-136. [10.1111/j.1540-4560.1975.tb00999.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1975.tb00999.x)
- See-To, E. W., & Ho, K. K. (2014). Value co-creation and purchase intention in social network sites: The role of electronic Word-of-Mouth and trust-A theoretical analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31, 182-189. [10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.013)
- Sher, P. J., & Lee, S. H. (2009). Consumer skepticism and online reviews: An elaboration likelihood model perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 37(1), 137-143. [10.2224/sbp.2009.37.1.137](https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2009.37.1.137)
- Shier, M. L., & Handy, F. (2012). Understanding online donor behavior: the role of donor characteristics, perceptions of the internet, website and program, and influence from social networks. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17(3), 219-230. [10.1002/nvsm.1425](https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1425)
- Swinyard, W. R., & Smith, S. M. (2003). Why people (don't) shop online: A lifestyle study of the internet consumer. *Psychology & marketing*, 20(7), 567-597. [10.1002/mar.10087](https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10087)
- Tarrow, S. (1994). *El poder en movimiento Los movimientos sociales, la acción colectiva y la política*. Alianza
- Toi, M., & Batson, C. D. (1982). More evidence that empathy is a source of altruistic motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 43(2), 281. [10.1037/0022-3514.43.2.281](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.43.2.281)
- Treiblmaier, H., & Pollach, I. (2008). Drivers and inhibitors of online donations to nonprofit organizations. *Journal of International Technology and Information Management*, 17(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.58729/1941-6679.1110>
- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Bartels, J. M. (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92(1), 56. [10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56)
- Van Diepen M., Donkers B., Franses P. H. (2009). Does irritation induced by charitable direct mailings reduce donations? *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 26, 180-188. [10.1016/j.ijresmar.2009.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2009.03.007)
- Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 253-266. [10.1177/1094670510375599](https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375599)
- Van Lange, P. A., Bekkers, R., Schuyt, T. N., & Vugt, M. V. (2007). From games to giving: Social value orientation predicts donations to noble causes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(4), 375-384. [10.1080/01973530701665223](https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530701665223)
- Waters, R. D. (2007). Nonprofit organizations' use of the internet: A content analysis of communication trends on the internet sites of the philanthropy 400. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 18(1), 59-76. [10.1002/nml.171](https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.171)

Varey, R.J. (2015). Marketing for sustainable living. In: Mitchell, R.C., Moore, S.A. (eds) *Planetary Praxis & Pedagogy*. SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-214-1_3

Vélez, R. (2015). Ciencias sociales, movimientos sociales y políticas públicas. *El Ágora USB*, 15(2), 515-533. <https://goo.su/5eTYgVj>

Wiepking P. (2008). For the love of mankind. A sociological study on charitable giving. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. VU University. <https://goo.su/wsUP0>

Wilson J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 215-240 [10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.215](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.215)

Wood, S. L. (2002). Future fantasies: a social change perspective of retailing in the 21st century. *Journal of retailing*, 78(1), 77-83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(01\)00069-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(01)00069-0)

Zanjirani Farahani, R., Asgari, N., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2022). Fast Fashion, Charities, and the Circular Economy: Challenges for Operations Management. *Production and Operations Management*, 31(3), 1089-1114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.13596>

Citación: García Medina, I., & Salinas Vázquez, M. (2025). Online shopping for a cause: social marketing in second-hand fashion stores. *IROCAMM - International Review Of Communication And Marketing Mix*, 8(1), 23-42. <https://dx.doi.org/10.12795/IROCAMM.2025.v08.i01.02>



4.0

© Editorial Universidad de Sevilla 2025

IROCAMM- International Review Of Communication And Marketing Mix | e-ISSN: 2605-0447

IROCAMM

VOL. 8, N. 1- Year 2025

Received: 16/08/2024 | Reviewed: 23/10/2024 | Accepted: 25/10/2024 | Published: 31/01/2025

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.12795/IROCAMM.2025.v08.i01.02>

Pp.: 23-42

e-ISSN: 2605-0447