CHINESE NEW ZEALANDERS' PARTICIPATION IN LIFESTYLE POLITICS AND LIVED EXPERIENCE OF POWER

Yu Du
Department of Political Science, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
ydu859@aucklanduni.ac.nz

Abstract: This paper explores how Chinese New Zealanders participate in lifestyle politics. It also uses Mark Haugaard's four dimensions of power framework to explore how power operates when they participate in lifestyle politics. Based on an interpretive analysis of 38 Chinese New Zealanders' in-depth interviews, I found that interviewees' paths to and motivations for lifestyle politics varied. They constructed and disclosed unique political identities through their participation. Additionally, they all experienced the first, second, third, and fourth dimensions of power, even though they participated in lifestyle politics for various reasons. Their interpretations of power also varied. This study deepens our understanding how power and politics are embedded in everyday life.

Keywords: Chinese New Zealanders, four dimensions of power, lifestyle politics, political participation

Submission	:	March, 13th 2023
Revision	:	June 24th 2023
Publication	:	August 30th 2023

INTRODUCTION

A vibrant democracy relies on citizens' political participation (de Tocqueville, 2003). Scholars have observed that people engage in diverse activities outside government institutions to articulate political demands and advance political interests (Gundelach, 2020a; Stolle and Micheletti, 2013; Wang et al., 2019; Wang and Shi, 2018). Lifestyle politics has received increasing scholarly attention among various forms of extra-institutional political activities (Bennett, 2017; Bossy, 2014; Gundelach, 2020b; Holzer, 2006; Zhang, 2015). Lifestyle politics refers to people politicizing everyday practices to express their political values and goals (Leissner, 2020). Portwood-Stacer (2013, p. 6) interprets lifestyle politics as "a cultural formation around individuals' use of everyday choices as a legitimate site of political expression." Political consumerism is a representative form of lifestyle politics. Individual consumers boycott certain products to convey their political demands for protecting the environment or animal rights (Stolle et al., 2005). Lifestyle politics can also be practiced collectively. For example, Brown and Miller (2008) observed that farmers and a group of consumers in the United States established community agriculture-based farmer markets to reduce the ecological impact of consumption. At those markets, farmers sold their products directly to consumers

bypassing retailers. Their establishment of farmer markets manifested their pursuit of a particular lifestyle based on local food systems.

People engage in lifestyle politics for various reasons (Holzer, 2006; Schudson, 2007). Some use it to practice their ethical values. Many vegetarians belong to this type. They adopt vegetarianism to manifest their moral beliefs regarding animal rights protection (Micheletti and Stolle, 2011). Others use it to pressure governments to change public policies. Bossy (2014) observed that French and British activists successfully persuaded local governments to promote the lifestyle changes they pursued. However, participants in lifestyle politics do not always achieve their political goals (Micheletti et al., 2008). Therefore, most scholars believe lifestyle politics supplements rather than substitutes conventional political participation (Stolle et al., 2005; Strømsnes, 2009).

Although empirical studies have explored how New Zealanders generally practice lifestyle politics (Craig, 2007; Gundelach, 2020a; Watkins et al., 2015; Zhang, 2015), we know little about how ethnic minorities in New Zealand engage in this form of political activity. This paper first aims to fill the gap by exploring Chinese New Zealanders' engagement in lifestyle politics. Existing studies on Chinese New Zealanders' political participation primarily focused on their electoral and political activities in civic associations (Barker and McMillan, 2017; Park, 2006). Therefore, the findings of this paper enrich our knowledge of Chinese New Zealanders' political participation.

Power is an integral theme of politics. Studies have found that people participate in politics to reverse, maintain, or strengthen specific power relations (Flanagan, 2009; Hooghe and Dejaeghere, 2007). However, scholars have interpreted the concept of power differently (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; Dahl, 1957; Haugaard, 2010; Lukes, 2005), leading to their different understanding of how power operates in people's political participation. This paper uses the four dimensions of power proposed by Haugaard (2012) as a conceptual framework to analyze how Chinese New Zealanders experience various forms of power when participating in lifestyle politics. Haugaard's theory of power has the advantage of integrating scholars' previous discussions about power into a holistic framework, which allows me to analyze power dynamics from various aspects and at different levels.

This paper explores how Chinese New Zealanders engage in lifestyle politics. They will likely experience different power relationships when participating in lifestyle politics. Therefore, the second objective of this paper is to explore what specific power relations Chinese New Zealanders experience through their lifestyle politics engagement. To address the two research objectives, I structure this paper as follows. The following (second) section explains the two core concepts of this research – lifestyle politics and power. It lays the conceptual framework for my analysis. The third section explains the case selection and research methods. The discussion section presents how Chinese New Zealanders participated in diverse lifestyle politics-oriented activities and explores how they experienced different dimensions of power during their participation. The

conclusion briefly summarizes the key findings and lists the implications for future studies.

Integrating Politics into Daily Life through Lifestyle Politics

Lifestyle politics aims to initiate social changes by promoting politically or ethically inspired lifestyle choices (Micheletti and Stolle, 2011). Participants in lifestyle politics politicize their daily choices, believing that their everyday decisions can generate broader societal implications (Bennett, 1998). Adherent to this belief, people participate in politics by politicizing their everyday choices of what to eat, dress, and consume. Therefore, lifestyle politics is also known as a politics of choice (Giddens, 1991). People's engagement in lifestyle politics demonstrates that they integrate politics into their daily lives (Jones, 2002).

Although lifestyle politics is individuals' use of everyday choices to express political values and goals, not every lifestyle choice is political. Individuals' motivations determine whether or not their daily choices belong to lifestyle politics. "Self-regrading" activities that primarily concern the well-being and interests of oneself are not lifestyle politics (de Moor, 2017). Therefore, those who adopt a vegetarian lifestyle for personal health concerns are not participants in lifestyle politics. On the contrary, vegetarians who endorse this lifestyle to protect animal rights participate in lifestyle politics because their choices are "other-regarding" motivated (Micheletti and Stolle, 2011).

Forming and disclosing personal identity is a central characteristic of lifestyle politics (Grigsby, 2012). Social constructivists believe that individual identity is dynamic, multifaceted, and under constant construction. People can always renovate, replace, and revise identities if they wish (Breakwell, 2011; Breakwell and Jaspal, 2014). Lifestyle politics enables participants to construct their identities from three aspects. First, people participate in lifestyle politics to distinguish themselves from the prevailing cultural practices and codes. A primary motivation for those who adopt a minimalist lifestyle is to reject the prevalent consumerist culture in society (Druică et al., 2023). Second, people find meaning and purpose for their existence by participating in lifestyle politics. They realize their capacities as ordinary people to either inspire others or foster social changes (Fernandes- Jesus et al., 2018). Last, people sometimes formulate collective identities by persuading others to adopt similar lifestyles. For example, some vegetarians promote their lifestyle widely, hoping to develop a global community to defend animal rights (Maurer, 2002).

Lifestyle politics can be practiced individually or collectively. Individual-based lifestyle politics refers to "an individual's choice to use his or her private life sphere to take responsibility for allocating common values and resources" (Micheletti and Stolle, 2011, p. 128). For example, individuals bought locally-produced fruits and vegetables to limit their carbon footprint (Klintman and Boström, 2013). Collective-based lifestyle politics refers to "collectives who consciously promote a lifestyle as their primary means to foster social changes" (Haenflter et al., p. 2). An example is the *Adiopizzo* initiative in Italy.

Participants of this initiative collaborated to advocate for consumers to buy "Mafia-free" products in their daily shopping routines for ethical considerations (Forno, 2015).

Collective lifestyle politics differs from social movements, even though they both aim to foster social changes (Haenfler et al., 2012). First, social movements are organized, change-oriented collective activities (Snow2004). In contrast, collective lifestyle politics are more diffuse, style-oriented activities (Haenfler et al., 2012). For example, many lifestyle feminists do not claim membership in feminist organizations. Nor do they engage in any feminist protests. They support feminism by boycotting sexist media, avoiding sexist language in daily conversations, and rejecting dominant beauty norms (Groeneveld, 2009). Similarly, although voluntary simplifiers and green lifestyle advocates aim to change the world, they care most about cultivating personally gratifying lifestyles corresponding to their beliefs. Second, scholars have observed that social movements often experience cycles where movement participation grows and declines based on external political opportunities (Haenfler et al., 2012). Instead, lifestyle politics develops based on the idea of continuity. It is an ongoing process where participants practice movement values in every aspect of their lives (Micheletti, 2003).

While lifestyle politics and social movements are distinct forms of political participation, they are closely related. On the one hand, social movements can incorporate elements of lifestyle politics into their strategies. In the past, African-Americans used boycotts to facilitate civil rights movements (Friedman, 2002). Activists worldwide also used boycotts to pressure the apartheid regime in South Africa to change its racist institutions (Seidman, 2003). Holzer (2005) observed that social movement organizations sometimes influenced consumers' decisions and borrowed their purchasing power to achieve their political goals. Dubuisson-Quellier (2015) also noticed that the environmental movement urged consumers to use boycotts to pressure companies to change their modes of production. On the other hand, lifestyle politics may lead to social movements. For example, Fernandes-Jesus and her colleagues (2018) found that some people initially adopted a vegetarian lifestyle to reject animal exploitation but actively engaged in many environmental movements several years later. They believed these social movements manifested their belief in animal protection.

Based on the above discussion, this paper explores three aspects of Chinese New Zealanders' participation in lifestyle politics. First, it explores how and why people participate in politics. It then interrogates how people construct and disclose their identities when participating in lifestyle politics. Last, it explores the relationship between lifestyle politics and social movements. Whether people's changed lifestyles lead them to engage in relevant social movements? Or do they change lifestyles because they are part of social movements?

The Four Dimensions of Power Embedded in Everyday Life

Power is a vital theme of politics. People often participate in politics to reverse, maintain, or strengthen the existing power relations (Ortensi and Riniolo, 2020; Postmes and Brunsting, 2002). Allen (1999) distinguishes three types of power, power-to, power-over, and power-with, to explore its capacity to achieve outcomes in societies. Most scholars of power studies agree on this distinction; however, they interpret differently how these three types of power function in societies (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; Dahl, 1957; Haugaard, 2010; Lukes, 2005; Pettit, 1997). Their different interpretations of how power works may explain people's experiences of power differently when investigating the same political activity. Haugaard's (2012) four dimensions of power theory is one of many frameworks that systematically examine how power functions in societies. I use his theory to explore Chinese New Zealanders' experience of power when participating in lifestyle politics.

Haugaard develops his four dimensions of power theory based on Lukes' (2005) three dimensions of power but differs from Lukes' theory. The first dimension (1-D) of power focuses on the momentary exercise of power. It derives from Dahl's (1957, pp. 202-203) understanding of power as "the ability of A to make B do something B would not otherwise do." A common misunderstanding of this power view is that it is a zero-sum game. However, Haugaard (2012) argues that the 1-D power can be either zero-sum or positive-sum. Additionally, Haugaard (2021, p.154) points out the necessity to distinguish between the exercise of power and power resources. He thinks resources are potential power waiting to be activated. Violence, coercion, political institutions, organizations, and economic resources all have potential power. For example, environmentalists who reject plastic products activate their economic resources (money) to a manifested power, pressuring manufacturers to reduce plastic packaging.

The second dimension (2-D) of power derives from Bachrach and Baratz's (1962) analysis of power. They shift analytical attention from agents to structures, noticing that the existing social and political systems include specific issues and exclude others. However, they believe what is excluded from the systems is often as important as what is included. Giddens' (1984) structuration theory helps us understand the 2-D power better. He believes individuals both create and are constrained by social structures. On the one hand, social structures consist of norms and values that shape individuals' behavior. These norms and values regulate whether people's actions are felicitous or infelicitous. On the other hand, when individuals are aware of these norms and values and seek to change them, social structures are under reproduction. Therefore, according to Giddens (1984), social change may happen at two levels: to modify existing structures or redefine and reshape existing norms and values that constitute social structures. The 2-D power focuses on the first level of social change. Most studies on the 2-D power focused on eliminating structural biases and making existing structures more inclusive (Chaney, 2015; Haylock et al., 2016; Pereira et al., 2009; Saalfeld and Bischof, 2013). However, Haugaard (2012) reminds us again that the 2-D power does not necessarily entail domination. It may also be positive-sum power.

People often experience the 2-D power when participating in lifestyle politics. For example, animal rights advocates appeal to boycott products tested on animals in their routine shopping. Their political participation involves both the 1-D and the 2-D power. On the one hand, consumers sometimes successfully pressure cosmetic producers to give up animal testing by exercising their purchasing power (Friedman, 2017), which reflects their exercise of the 1-D power. On the other hand, animal welfare and ethics were not significant concerns for producers and consumers in the past. However, animal rights defenders raise societal attention to this issue by adopting and promoting a specific shopping habit that protects animal welfare and ethics. It shows that people exert the 2-D power to introduce a new agenda (animal welfare and ethics) into market consideration.

The third dimension (3-D) of power focuses on the second level of social change, exploring how individuals redefine social norms and values to reproduce new social structures. Haugaard (2012) introduces two concepts, discursive consciousness and practical consciousness, to illustrate how the 3-D power operates. "A specific theory or model of discipline or social science is discursive consciousness knowledge, while the more taken-for-granted order of things that structures a system of thought constitutes practical consciousness knowledge" (Haugaard, 2012, p. 43). In other words, practical knowledge instructs individuals to determine whether specific actions are deviant or normal. It is the tacit social knowledge people use to construct social structures. The norms and values mentioned above in the 2-D power are part of practical knowledge. Although individuals cannot wholly escape the influence of practical knowledge, they are not entirely trapped in it. They can use their discursive knowledge to challenge whether or not existing social structures are felicitous and reasonable. When individuals realize the conflicts between practical and discursive knowledge and attempt to change practical knowledge, they are experiencing Giddens' (1984) mentioned the second level of social change – redefining and reshaping social norms and values.

The 3-D power addresses two general phenomena. First, it allows scholars to interrogate how practical knowledge of specific social structures regulates certain activities as felicitous, which is closely related to studies on the 2-D power. Second, it enables scholars to question practical knowledge itself. Scholars can examine to what extent people's discursive knowledge conflicts with practical knowledge and in what direction people try to reshape social structure with their own discursive knowledge (Haugaard, 2012, pp. 42-47). Although Lukes (2005) often associates the 3-D power with domination, Haugaard (2012) believes it has both positive and negative potential.

People who live a feminist lifestyle realize the current social system disadvantaging, oppressing, and marginalizing women and want to dismantle it. The practical knowledge of the system they live in is often based on traditional gender roles and stereotypes. However, their discursive knowledge embraces diversity and inclusivity and supports women's empowerment. When their discursive knowledge conflicts with the practical knowledge, they question the reasonableness of the practical knowledge. They attempt

to replace it with their discursive knowledge by adopting a feminist lifestyle (Groeneveld, 2009; Valk, 2002). From this perspective, feminist lifestyle followers simultaneously experience 1-D, 2-D, and 3-D power to reshape the current gender-biased and exclusive system into a more diverse and inclusive one.

The fourth dimension (4-D) of power derives from Foucault's (1979) disciplinary power. It targets the process of subjectification, where individuals are made into social subjects (Haugaard, 2012). "Subjects" here have two meanings. First, individuals are subject to others through control and dependence. Being subject to others' control and dependence means that people in society observe how others behave and regulate their actions based on others' behavior. The shared social norms and values (or practical knowledge in Haugaard's term) often regulate people's behavior. Meanwhile, people's actions need recognition and acceptance from others. Actions neglected or denied by others are infelicitous (Foucault, 1982, p. 212). This type of subjectification involves the 3-D power where individuals are socialized in specific cultures and societies. Second, individuals are subject to their identities by constantly practicing their beliefs. Foucault (1982) believes that when individuals routinely discipline themselves to compline with the existing norms and values, they internalize these regulations and make them part of their identities. This type of subjectification involves the 4-D power. In other words, the 4D power examines how individuals internalize external social norms and values and adopt them to self-discipline their daily behavior (Haugaard, 2021). The abovementioned feminist lifestyle followers also experience the 4-D power because they use feminist values and principles to discipline their daily behavior.

Noticing that participants in lifestyle politics may experience various types of power, I use Haugaard's four dimensions of power as a guiding framework to examine how Chinese New Zealanders exercise power when participating in lifestyle politics. The findings will deepen our understanding of how power operates daily and its relationship to political participation.

METHOD

This research was designed as an interpretive case study based on semi-structured in-depth interviews of 38 Chinese New Zealanders in Auckland, New Zealand. Although interpretive case studies have limited validity and weak generalizability (Yin, 2003), they are good at revealing detailed information and nuances of Chinese New Zealanders' participation in various forms of lifestyle politics.

Chinese New Zealanders are diverse according to their age, socioeconomic status, and length of residence in New Zealand. The 2018 Census shows that mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong were the top three sources of Chinese New Zealanders' intake (StatsNZ, 2020). Therefore, I restricted my target group to Chinese New Zealanders from these three places.

Participants were recruited by various means, including sending invitation emails to Chinese association members, posting recruitment advertisements on social media, and

asking respondents to invite their friends and families to join the project. The goal was to include people from all walks of life. Altogether 38 individuals were interviewed about their participation in lifestyle politics, 17 women and 21 men of various ages.[1] The research was approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee. All participants read the *Information Sheet* and signed the *Consent Form*.

I asked participants questions about their general history of political participation, whether or not they changed their actions to support specific values, how these changed actions further influenced their lives, and whether they experienced specific types of power when acting.[2] If participants stated they experienced power, I asked them to elaborate on how they thought they exercised power.

I transcribed and translated these interviews into English because most interviews (37/38) were in Mandarin. Data collection and analysis were conducted simultaneously. Secondary data collection from conference reports, journal papers, and books started before interviews and continued until the end of the data analysis. I used the secondary data for four purposes. First, I extracted theories of lifestyle politics and power from the existing literature before conducting the interviews to develop the conceptual framework and formulate interview questions. Second, unexpected viewpoints and perspectives emerged during semi-structured interviews. After reviewing the literature, I refined and included new questions in the subsequent interviews. Third, the secondary data helped identify concepts and themes that reflected interviewees' lifestyle politics participation during the data analysis phase. Last, it helped connect my research findings with the existing literature on lifestyle politics.

I used thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) to process the data collected. The data analysis process was data-driven inductive analysis (Boyatzis, 1998), consisting of three stages. First, I listened to interview recordings and closely read interview transcripts while taking notes and reflecting on their responses. It helped me develop an overall perception of their lifestyle politics participation and power experiences. I explored the Chinese and English transcripts line-by-line to construct initial codes that I believed were relevant to my research questions. This initial coding stage enables me to explore possible relationships between each code, preparing for the next stage of abstracting codes into themes. After developing the initial codes, I moved to the second stage of transforming them into themes. I attempted to abstract the long descriptive codes into a higher level of concise and abstract themes based on the existing literature on political participation and power. The materials I analyzed at this stage were the initial codes generated at the first stage. The annotated transcripts and the existing literature on political participation served as supplementary materials. I found that interviewees participated in lifestyle politics for various reasons at this stage. The last stage was to cluster themes into topics and connect these topics with existing theories of lifestyle

[1] I present their detailed information in Appendix I.

[2] I offered three alternative types of power, power-over, power-to, and power-with, for participants to consider.

politics and power. I connected diverse themes, clustered them into various topics based on their similarities, and categorized them into three aspects to analyze their lifestyle politics participation: various paths to lifestyle politics, identity construction and disclosure, and power experiences.

Analysis of interviewees' power dynamics was embedded in their participation in lifestyle politics. Sometimes, interviewees could identify their involvement in various types of power, and I positioned their power experiences into Haugaard's (2012) four-dimensional power framework. Sometimes, interviewees were not aware of their involvement in power. In this situation, I used my professional knowledge to find power involvements in their narratives and placed them in Haugaard's framework. Using NVivo facilitated the whole data analysis process. I found that all four dimensions of power operated in the interviewees' participation in lifestyle politics. The following discussion section will explain it in detail.

The research has some limitations. First, as mentioned above, I recruited all interviewees in Auckland because of COVID-19-enforced travel restrictions.[3] Although more than half of Chinese New Zealanders lived in Auckland, they also lived in other cities, such as Wellington (8%) and Canterbury (8%) (StatsNZ, 2019). Non-Aucklanders might participate in more diverse lifestyle politics-oriented activities not identified in this research. Second, individuals in different places often experience various political socialization processes, further affecting their forms of political participation (Bilodeau, 2014). Chinese New Zealanders from other places might engage in lifestyle politics differently from interviewees from mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. Future studies could overcome these limitations and might have more diverse findings by interviewing Chinese New Zealanders outside Auckland and beyond the three cohorts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Lifestyle politics was one of the many political activities interviewees participated. Twenty-six interviewees engaged in lifestyle politics before. Twelve interviewees either did not participate in lifestyle politics or insisted that their changes in daily behavior had nothing to do with politics. For example, Interviewee 17 transited to a vegan lifestyle three years ago. She stated that she first changed her diet habit to lose weight. She found that a vegan lifestyle was good for her health and continued it. She never intentionally persuaded others to adopt a vegan lifestyle. Nor did she connect her vegan lifestyle with animal welfare protection. She changed her lifestyle purely for "self-regarding" reasons. Therefore, based on de Moor's (2017) suggestion, she did not participate in lifestyle politics.

[3] At first, I planned to conduct online and phone interviews, which would allow me to interview participants outside Auckland. However, after three online interviews, I found participants were more willing to share their participatory experiences face-to-face rather than online. It was probably because interviewees would have a deeper sense of trust in me when communicating with me in person.

Interviewees participated in lifestyle politics for various reasons, and Table 1 reports these reasons in detail. Some interviewees engaged in various forms of lifestyle politics for different reasons simultaneously. For example, Interviewee 28 participated in lifestyle politics both to practice her feminist ideology and her beliefs in protecting animal welfare. The first part of this section analyzes interviewees' participation in lifestyle politics in detail. Additionally, the four dimensions of power operated in the interviewees' lifestyle politics participation. The second part of this section discusses it.

Table 1: Motivations for interviewees' participation in lifestyle politics

Numbers of interviewees	Motivations for lifestyle politics
Eighteen interviewees (Interviewee 16 withdrew from lifestyle politics later)	Slowing down climate change
Six interviewees	Protecting animal welfare and rights
Three interviewees	Fighting against labor exploitation
Eight interviewees	Advocating feminism
One interviewee	Embracing a minimalist living philosophy
One interviewee (Interviewee 10 withdrew from lifestyle politics later)	Expressing patriotism

Diverse Lifestyle Politics Participation

Interviewees' paths to lifestyle politics varied. Seventeen interviewees voluntarily participated in lifestyle politics and attempted to affect their friends and family members. Seven changed their lifestyles due to external influence. Two interviewees had participated in lifestyle politics before but quit when I interviewed them. Interviewee 10 used to boycott goods produced by Japan because of the Diaoyu Island dispute in 2012. However, he gave up his boycotting behavior one year later. He thought this behavior was irrational because boycotting Japanese products did not help solve the Sino-Japanese disputes. Interviewee 16 used to be a follower of green living. She commuted to work by public transport. However, she admitted that this lifestyle brought her lots of unexpected trouble, and she finally gave up. She complained that public transport in Auckland was horrible. Buses were canceled randomly and often late, severely interrupting her timetable. Riding was also risky in Auckland. Therefore, she was forced to drive to work and abandoned her green lifestyle. These two interviewees' choice of giving up specific lifestyles due to practical difficulties was understandable. However, few studies have investigated possible impediments people encounter when participating in lifestyle politics (Micheletti and Stolle, 2011). The finding might encourage scholars to conduct research in this aspect.

Among those who voluntarily participated in lifestyle politics, six interviewees changed their daily behavior before getting involved in social movements. They first adopted certain lifestyles and engaged in lifestyle politics to manifest their values, beliefs, and ideologies. They obtained a deeper understanding of their values and ideologies through lifestyle politics participation and joined broader social movements to spread these

values and ideologies. For example, Interviewee 7 intentionally bought eco-friendly products and avoided using plastic items as much as possible. She believed her purchasing habit would contribute to environmental protection. It indicates that Interviewee 7 relied on a positive aspect of power-to to make a difference in the world when participating in lifestyle politics. She first engaged in environmental consumerism due to her commitment to protecting the Earth, and at that stage, she only focused on her behavior. She then actively participated in several environmental protection movements. She explained, "by joining those movements, I can recruit more people to adopt an eco-friendly lifestyle." Therefore, social movement for her was an instrument to spread her green lifestyle, and her engagement in social movements conveys her belief in power-with to generate social changes at a large scale.

Similarly, Interviewee 28 noticed the animal exploitation issue and decided to lead a lifestyle to protect animal welfare and rights. She became a vegan and boycotted products using animal testing. One year later, she joined SAFE for Animals, a New Zealand-based animal rights charity. She thought joining this group was an extension of her adopted lifestyle. Empirical studies on social movements have found that many people engage in large-scale collective movements because they interpret social movements as extensions of their lifestyle politics (Dobernig and Stagl, 2015; Forno and Gunnarson, 2010).

Another eight interviewees who voluntarily changed their daily behavior also mobilized others to accept their values and change lifestyles based on their values. Their attempt to change others' values and lifestyles indicates a power-over relation in their interaction with others. Unlike Bachrach and Baratz's (1962) negative interpretation of power-over, these interviewees' envision of power-over in this situation is positive. For example, Interviewee 18 said, "yes, we want to change others' beliefs and actions, but we do not force them to change. Instead, we hope we can improve our society by persuading them to make relevant changes." Furthermore, this group of interviewees did not use social movement as a recruitment tool. They occasionally joined social movements simply to express their political attitudes. They often used personal networks to promote their values and lifestyles.

For example, Interviewee 9 was a feminist. She fought against online and offline sexist language whenever she faced it. She wrote online articles telling women to be independent and showing diverse forms of life that women could lead. When she saw her female friends and colleagues who were trapped in traditional gender roles, she encouraged them to break away from these stereotypes. She stated, "traditional Chinese culture expects women to take good care of their families and sacrifice their personal lives for the good of the families. I met many well-educated women who have lived in New Zealand for decades but are still trapped in this cultural tradition. I feel I have an obligation to help them." Similarly to Interviewee 18, Interviewee 9 understood power-over positively to rescue women trapped in traditional gender roles and guide them to promising lives. She did not actively join feminist movements because of her busy life and work. "I do not have spare time to volunteer for feminist organizations or join

demonstrations. I integrate feminism into every aspect of my life and do not need particular activities to show I am a feminist."

Three interviewees only practiced their values and ideologies by engaging in lifestyle politics. They refused to join social movements. Interviewee 22 and Interviewee 15 stated that many social movements intentionally politicized specific social affairs to generate antagonism between different social groups. By claiming their support for particular values, leaders of these movements utilized people for their political interests and goals. Interviewee 38 intentionally distinguished herself from social activists. She explained, "you always see people enthusiastically joining demonstrations to support feminism. However, I suspect that most only have a superficial understanding of feminism. Some males unconsciously take advantage of their gender, even though they show up in the demonstrations to support women fighting against gender inequality." Interviewee 38's psychological distinction was not unique. Fernandes-Jesus and her colleagues (2018) also found similar psychological distinctions in their study of lifestyle politics participation. Additionally, Interviewee 38's rejection of joining social movements indicates a possible negative power-over relationship underlying social movements. The leaders of social movements may dominate other participants and use them as a means to achieve self-interest.

Seven interviewees engaged in lifestyle politics under external influence. Five of them first joined social movements, accepted the values that social activities promoted, and integrated these values into their routine behavior. For example, Interviewee 27 became aware of the devastating consequences of climate change after being involved in climate change movements. To mobilize more people to engage in climate actions, he made and uploaded videos on YouTube and Bilibili.[4] In those videos, he explained the urgency of combating climate change and showed viewers how to slow it down by changing their daily behavior. He hoped his channels could raise people's consciousness of environmental protection and unite them to fight against climate change globally. He understood lifestyle politics as an effective strategy to combat climate change. Other studies have also found that social activists use lifestyle politics to expand their influence and achieve their goals (Dubuisson-Quellier, 2015; Forno and Graziano, 2014).

Interviewee 26 and Interviewee 21 were persuaded by their friends to adopt a green lifestyle. They used public transport, recycled their waste, and bought second-hand items. However, unlike Interviewee 27, they never considered convincing other people to accept their green lifestyle. Interviewee 21 explained, "I think each individual has the autonomy to determine what kind of life (s)he wants to lead. I do not want to intervene, and I do not have the right to do so." His explanation indicates he thought persuading others to accept specific values and ideologies was a form of exercising domination power over others. The comparison between Interviewee 21 and Interviewee 21 indicates that when interviewees persuaded others to change their values and actions, they interpreted the

[4] Bilibili is a popular video-sharing website where users can create, watch, and share videos.

power-over relationships involved differently, even though in both cases, others often voluntarily changed their actions, and they did so for the greater good of society.

As mentioned earlier, constructing and disclosing identity is a defining characteristic of lifestyle politics (Fernandes-Jesus et al., 2018). Interviewees' narratives of their participation in lifestyle politics echo this point. All twenty-six interviewees mentioned they achieved self-worth by participating in lifestyle politics. They realized their capacity as ordinary people to make a difference in society and found their social roles that others did not have. It shows they positively experienced power-to capacity when participating in lifestyle politics. Interviewee 28 stated, "I often doubt the usefulness of voting because I am only one of five million New Zealanders. I also suspect contacting politicians will solve our problems. We all know those politicians serve the interests of the rich and powerful people. So, I feel powerless when participating in conventional political activities. However, I feel powerful when participating in lifestyle politics. My actions generate tangible outcomes." Other studies also reported participants' feelings of empowerment when engaging in lifestyle politics (Bennett, 2017; Micheletti and Stolle, 2011).

Those who mobilized others to adopt specific values and change daily behavior according to these values pointed out the significance of developing communities based on shared values. For example, Interviewee 27 stated that only when most people in the world adopted an environmentally friendly lifestyle could we effectively slow down climate change. These people's desire to construct collective identities suggests their eagerness to launch societal changes by collaborating with others. Their lifestyle politics participation relies on the positive aspect of power-to and power-with to foster changes.

Furthermore, many interviewees expressed their distinctiveness when describing their participation in lifestyle politics. First, they distinguished themselves from those who led other lifestyles. The specific lifestyles they endorsed become their unique identity tags, differentiating them from others. Second, some values that interviewees adopted differed from the mainstream cultural practices and codes, such as Interviewee 32's embrace of minimalist philosophy, which contradicts the prevailing consumerist culture. Interviewee 32 distinguished herself from the dominant cultural practices by leading a minimalist lifestyle. It reflects Interviewee 32's courage to resist the dominant culture. Last, a few interviewees intentionally distinguished themselves from social activists. Their self-distinction was based on the premise that they clearly understood the meanings and differences of lifestyle politics and social movements. Unlike social activists, they integrated politics into their daily choices and performed as responsible citizens. As Interviewee 7 commented on her activities, "politics is everywhere in my life, and I practice citizenship every moment."

To conclude, interviewees followed different paths to participate in lifestyle politics, which shows complex relationships between lifestyle politics and social movements. Interviewees participated in lifestyle politics for various reasons. Constructing and disclosing distinctive identities was a core element of interviewees' lifestyle politics

participation. They believed their political participation differentiated them from others who followed different lifestyles and insisted that their particular lifestyles were part of their identities. Furthermore, interviewees experienced power-over, power-to, and power-with when participating in lifestyle politics. However, their interpretations of these power dynamics varied. Some viewed it positively, while others understood it negatively.

The Four Dimensions of Power Embedded in Lifestyle Politics

Interviewees participated in lifestyle politics primarily with two goals, to change the current systems or introduce alternative lifestyles. This section chooses an example from these two lifestyle politics activities to explore the power dynamics involved. Take Interviewee 12's persuasion of her friend to divorce, for example, to illustrate how interviewees experienced power when participating in lifestyle politics to reverse the current system. Her friend used to be a homemaker. She had suffered from domestic violence but hesitated to divorce. She was afraid she could not find a job to support herself and her children after the divorce since she had been disconnected from society for years. Additionally, she used to believe in the traditional Chinese view of marriage, thinking divorce was shameful. Witnessing her friend's struggle, Interviewee 12 first helped her analyze her situations in her family and society, showing possible jobs she could take. She also convinced her friend that divorcing was not shameful. Eventually, her friend divorced her husband, found a well-paid job, accepted a feminist view of marriage, and realized her new roles as a woman and a mother.

Using Haugaard's (2012) framework to analyze the interaction between Interviewee 12 and her friend, I found that their interaction involved four dimensions of power. First, Interviewee 12's persuasion of her friend to divorce and accept a feminist view of marriage manifests the 1-D power. By exercising power-over, Interviewee 12 made her friend do something (getting divorced and accepting a new marriage view) that she would not do otherwise. Second, when Interviewee 12 helped her friend examine the structural constraints she faced in an abusive relationship and in society as a homemaker, they experienced the 2-D power. On the one hand, her friend realized how an unhealthy marriage exploited her and how society discriminated against a homemaker. In this aspect, her friend self-realized the structural constraints she encountered. On the other hand, Interviewee 12 pointed out an alternative way of life as a mother and a woman. She presented possible jobs her friend could take as a single mother and showed her friend another marriage view. Through this interaction, Interviewee 12 used her discursive knowledge to challenge her friend's discursive knowledge. Additionally, her friend used to construct her world based on practical knowledge rooted in traditional Chinese culture. Interviewee 12's discursive knowledge also challenged that type of practical knowledge. The confrontation between Interviewee 12's discursive knowledge and her friend's old practical and discursive knowledge involves the 3-D power. Her friend's acceptance of a feminist view of marriage indicates that her friend reconstructed her world based on Interviewee 12's introduced discursive knowledge.

The interaction between Interviewee 12 and her friend also involves the 4-D power from two aspects. On the one hand, her friend used to follow the traditional Chinese view of marriage to lead her life and then shifted to a feminist attitude to organize her life. On the other hand, Interviewee 12 practiced her feminist lifestyle when interacting with her friend. Both Interviewee 12 and her friend absorbed particular life attitudes and internalized these attitudes to self-discipline their behavior. It is how the 4-D power manifests in their daily lives.

Interviewees who participated in lifestyle politics to follow alternative lifestyles rather than reverse the current systems also experienced the four dimensions of power. Take Interviewee 32's adoption of a minimalist living philosophy, for example. Unlike Interviewee 12, she did not want to spread her lifestyle and convinced others to lead a simple life. After reading *A Philosophy of Simple Living*, she embraced a minimalist lifestyle. She experienced the 1-D power when she abandoned her previous consuming habits and embraced a minimalist lifestyle. The content of the book and the following research she conducted on the minimalist philosophy exercised power over her to change her lifestyle. It shows that both individuals (in Interviewee 12's case) and non-individuals (in Interviewee 32's case) could exert 1-D power to change people's behavior. Additionally, Interviewee 32 mentioned she realized the potential adverse effects caused by the current prevalent consumerism after reading the book. The process reflects how she noticed structural biases underlying the prevailing consumerism culture, manifesting the 2-D power. Furthermore, the book introduced a form of discursive knowledge challenging the practical knowledge upon which the prevailing consumerist culture was constructed. The book-introduced discursive knowledge replaced the practical knowledge Interviewee 32 used to believe in. The process of challenging and replacement demonstrates how the 3-D power operated in Interviewee 32's adoption of a minimalist lifestyle. Her endorsement of simple living also involves the 4-D power because she used that minimalist philosophy to discipline her daily actions.

Comparing and contrasting the two examples, I argue that interviewees' participation in lifestyle politics involves four dimensions of power. Their participation involves the 1-D power because they all experienced a change from one specific lifestyle to another under external influence. The external influence could result from other individuals or non-individuals, such as books, particular events, or videos. Without external influence, they might keep their old lifestyles. Their lifestyle politics participation also involves 2-D power through which they realized structural constraints or biases caused by the existing systems. Those who participated in lifestyle politics to change the current systems realized the structural constraints imposed upon them by the current systems. Therefore, their adoption of new lifestyles empowered them to get rid of the structural constraints. Those who engaged in lifestyle politics to embrace alternative lives also noticed the structural biases of the current systems. Although they did not strongly oppose these biases, they realized the possibility of leading other ways of life.

The 3-D power also operates in their lifestyle politics participation. Some interviewees obtained new discursive knowledge from external influence and used it to challenge the practical knowledge upon which the current systems were constructed. Some spread their discursive knowledge to change others' discursive knowledge, persuade others to accept their discursive knowledge, and use it as their new practical knowledge to construct their new worlds. The two situations both involve the 3-D power. Last, interviewees experienced the 4-D power when participating in lifestyle politics because they disciplined their daily behavior according to their adopted values and ideologies.

CONCLUSION

This paper presented how Chinese New Zealanders participated in lifestyle politics and analyzed the possible power dynamics underlying their lifestyle politics participation. I found that interviewees' paths to lifestyle politics varied. Some engaged in lifestyle politics before joining social movements, while others were the other way around. Few interviewees' participation in lifestyle politics had no relationship with social movements. Two interviewees withdrew from lifestyle politics. Constructing and disclosing distinctive identities was central to interviewees' lifestyle politics participation. Additionally, whether interviewees participated in lifestyle politics to change the existing systems or to embrace alternative lifestyles, they all experienced the four dimensions of power. Although interviewees experienced power-over, power-to, and power-with when participating in politics, their interpretations of these power dynamics varied. Some interpreted these power dynamics positively, while others understood power negatively.

This research has some implications for future studies. First, it enriches the knowledge of Chinese New Zealanders' political participation. The existing literature on Chinese New Zealanders' political participation primarily analyzed their electoral participation and their political activities in Chinese associations (Barker and McMillan, 2017; Park, 2006). We have limited knowledge of their participation in lifestyle politics. This paper fills the gap. It reveals another aspect of Chinese New Zealanders' political participation and explains how they integrate politics into their daily lives.

Second, this paper broadens the understanding of lifestyle politics. Although scholars have conducted rich studies on lifestyle politics, most focus on why and how people politicize their daily choices (Micheletti et al., 2008; Schudson, 2007; Stolle and Micheletti, 2013). I incorporate power into the analysis of people's participation in lifestyle politics and show how they experienced different dimensions of power during participation. It shows another perspective to analyze lifestyle politics. Scholars interested in this topic will have more diverse findings.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Stephen Winter and Katherine Smits for reading an earlier draft and providing insightful comments.

Disclosure statement

The author reports no potential conflict of interest.

Ethics Approval

This research was approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 15 May 2020, ref. number 024522.

REFERENCES

Allen, A. (1999). The power of feminist theory. Westview Press.

Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Decisions and nondecisions: An analytical framework. American Political Science Review, 57(3), 632-642.

Barker, F., & McMillan, K. (2017). Factors influencing the electoral participation of Asian immigrants in New Zealand. Political Science, 69(2), 139-160.

Bennett, L. W. (1998). The uncivic culture: Communication, identity, and the rise of lifestyle politics. Political Science Politics, 31(4), 741-761.

Bennett, L. W. (2017). Branded political communication: Lifestyle politics, logo campaigns, and the rise of global citizenship. In M. Micheletti, A. Follesdal, & D. Stolle (Eds.), The politics behind products (pp. 101-125). Transaction Books.

Bilodeau, A. (2014). Is democracy the only game in town? Tension between immigrants' democratic desires and authoritarian imprints. Democratization, 21(2), 359-381.

Bossy, S. (2014). The utopias of political consumerism: The search for alternatives to mass consumption. Journal of Consumer Culture, 14(2), 179-198.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development. SAGE.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101.

Breakwell, G. M. (2011). Empirical approaches to social representations and identity processes: 20 years on. Papers on Social Representations, 20(2), 171-174.

Breakwell, G. M., & Jaspal, R. (2014). Identity process theory: Identity, social action, and social change. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, C., & Miller, S. (2008). The impacts of local markets: A review of research on farmers markets and community supported agriculture (CSA). American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 90(5), 1296-1302.

Chaney, P. (2015). Manifesto discourse and the substantive representation of ethnic minorities: Analysis of UK state-wide and meso elections, 1964-2011. Parliamentary Affairs, 68(1), 154-181.

Craig, G. (2007). Power to the people? Lifestyle politics and public communication in New Zealand electricity grid protests. Cultural Politics, 3(2), 231-248.

Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 2(3), 201-215.

De Moor, J. (2017). Lifestyle politics and the concept of political participation. Acta Politica, 52(2), 179-197.

de Tocqueville, A. (2003). Democracy in America. Penguin.

Dobernig, K., & Stagl, S. (2015). Growing a lifestyle movement? Exploring identity work and lifestyle politics in urban food cultivation. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 39(5), 452-458.

Druică, E., Ianole-Călin, R., & Puiu, A. I. (2023). When less is more: Understanding the adoption of a minimalist lifestyle using the theory of planned behavior. Mathematics, 11(3), 696-714.

Dubuisson-Quellier, S. (2015). From targets to recruits: The status of consumers within the political consumption movement. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 39(5), 404-412.

Fernandes-Jesus, M., Lima, M. L., & Sabucedo, J. M. (2018). Changing identities to change the world: Identity motives in lifestyle politics and its link to collective action. Political Psychology, 39(5), 1031-1047.

Flanagan, C. (2009). Young people's civic engagement and political development. In A. Furlong (Ed.), Handbook of youth and young adulthood: New perspectives agendas (pp. 293-300). Routledge.

Forno, F. (2015). Bringing together scattered and localized actors: Political consumerism as a tool for self-organizing anti-mafia communities. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 39(5), 535-543.

Forno, F., & Graziano, P. R. (2014). Sustainable community movement organizations. Journal of Consumer Culture, 14(2), 139-157.

Forno, F., & Gunnarson, C. (2010). Everyday shopping to fight the Italian mafia. In M. Micheletti & A. MacFarland (Eds.), Creative participation: Responsibility-taking in the political world (pp. 103-126). Paradigm.

Foucault, M. (1979). Discipline and punish. Harmondsworth.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics (pp. 208-226). Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Friedman, M. (2002). Consumer boycotts: Effecting change through the marketplace and media. Routledge.

Friedman, M. (2017). Using consumer boycotts to stimulate corporate policy changes: Marketplace, media, and moral considerations. In M. Micheletti, A. Follesdal, & D. Stolle (Eds.), Politics, products, and markets (pp. 45-62). Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuralism. University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age. Standford University Press.

Grigsby, M. (2012). Buying time and getting by: The voluntary simplicity movement. State University of New York Press.

Groeneveld, E. (2009). Be a feminist or just dress like one? BUST, fashion, and feminism as lifestyle. Journal of Gender Studies, 18(2), 179-190.

Gundelach, B. (2020a). Political consumerism as a form of political participation: Challenges and potentials of empirical measurement. Social Indicators Research, 151(1), 309-327.

Gundelach, B. (2020b). Political consumerism: A comparative analysis of established and developing democracies. International Political Science Review, 41(2), 159-173.

Haenfler, R., Johnson, B., & Jones, E. (2012). Lifestyle movements: Exploring the intersection of lifestyle and social movements. Social Movement Studies, 11(1), 1-20.

Haugaard, M. (2010). Power: A "family resemblance" concept. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 13(4), 419-438.

Haugaard, M. (2012). Rethinking the four dimensions of power: Domination and empowerment. Journal of Political Power, 5(1), 33-54.

Huagaard, M. (2021). The four dimensions of power: Conflict and democracy. Journal of Political Power, 14(1), 153-175.

Haylock, L., Cornelius, R., Malunga, A., & Mbandazayo, K. (2016). Shifting negative social norms rooted in unequal gender and power relationships to prevent violence against women and girls. Gender & Development, 24(2), 231-244.

Holzer, B. (2005). Private choice and public influence: Political consumers behind the mirror of the market. In M. Boström, A. Føllesdal, M. Klintman, M. Micheletti, & S. P. Sørensen (Eds.), Political Consumerism: Its Motivations, power, and conditions in the nordic countries and Elsewhere (pp. 183-202). TemaNord.

Holzer, B. (2006). Political consumerism between individual choice and collective action: Social movements, role mobilization, and signaling. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 30(5), 405-415.

Hooghe, M., & Dejaeghere, Y. (2007). Does the "monitorial citizen" exist? An empirical investigation into the occurrence of postmodern forms of citizenship in Nordic countries. Scandinavian Political Studies, 30(2), 249-271.

Jones, E. (2002). Social responsibility activism: Why people are changing their lifestyles to change the world (PhD thesis).

Klintman, M., & Boström, M. (2013). Political consumerism and the transition towards a more sustainable food regime: Looking behind and beyond the organic shelf. In G. Spaargaren, P. Oosterveer, & A. Loeber (Eds.), Food practices in transition (pp. 127-148). Routledge.

Leissner, L. (2020). Green living and the social media connection: The relationship between different media use types and green lifestyle politics among young adults. Journal of Environmental Media, 1(1), 33-57.

Lukes, S. (2005). Power: A radical view. Palgrave Macmillan.

Maurer, D. (2002). Vegetarianism: Movement or moment? Temple University Press.

Micheletti, M. (2003). Political virtue and shopping: Individuals, consumerism and collective action. In M. Micheletti (Ed.), Shopping with and for virtues (pp. 149-168). Springer.

Micheletti, M., Follesdal, A., & Stolle, D. (2008). Politics, products, and markets: Exploring political consumerism past and present. Economic Geography, 84(1), 123-125.

Micheletti, M., & Stolle, D. (2011). Vegetarianism – A lifestyle politics. In M. Micheletti & A. S. McFarland (Eds.), Creative participation: responsibility-taking in the political world (pp. 125-145). Paradigm.

Ortensi, L. E., & Riniolo, V. (2020). Do migrants get involved in politics? Levels, forms, and drivers of migrant political participation in Italy. Journal of International Migration Integration, 21(1), 133-153.

Park, S. J. (2006). Political participation of "Asian" New Zealanders: A case study of ethnic Chinese and Korean New Zealanders (PhD thesis).

Pereira, A., Monteiro, M. B., & Camino, L. (2009). Social norms and prejudice against homosexuals. The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 12(2), 576-584.

Pettit, P. (1997). Republicanism: A theory of freedom and government. Oxford University Press.

Portwood-Stacer, L. (2013). Lifestyle politics and radical activism. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Postmes, T., & Brunsting, S. (2002). Collective action in the age of the internet: Mass communication and online mobilization. Social science Computer Review, 20(3), 290-201.

Saalfeld, T., & Bischof, D. (2013). Minority ethnic MPs and the substantive representation of minority interests in the House of Commons, 2005-2011. Parliamentary Affairs, 66(2), 305-328.

, M. (2007). Citizens, consumers, and the good society. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 611(1), 236-249.

Seidman, G. W. (2003). Institutional dilemmas: Representation versus mobilization in the South African gender commission. Feminist Studies, 29(3), 541-563.

Snow, D. A. (2004). Social movements as challenges to authority: Resistance to an emerging conceptual hegemony. Research in Social Movements, Conflict, and Change, 25, 3-25.

StatsNZ. (2019). 2018 Census. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/2018-census/ [Accessed 16 December 2022].

StatsNZ. (2020). Chinese ethnic group. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/tools/2018-census-ethnic-group-summaries/chinese [Accessed 18 December 2022].

Stolle, D., Hoogeh, M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the supermarket: Political consumerism as a form of political participation. International Political Science Review, 26(3), 245-269.

Stolle, D., & Micheletti, M. (2013). Political consumerism: Global responsibility in action. Cambridge University Press.

Strømsnes, K. (2009). Political consumerism: A substitute for or supplement to conventional political participation? Journal of Civil Society, 5(3), 303-314.

Valk, A. M. (2002). Living a feminist lifestyle: The intersection of theory and action in a lesbian feminist collective. Feminist Studies, 28(2), 303-332.

Wang, H., Cai, T., Xin, Y., & Chen, B. (2019). The effects of previous and current instrumental involvement and expressive involvement on online political participation among Chinese college students. Sociological Inquiry, 89(2), 214-238.

Wang H., & Shi, F. (2018). Weibo use and political participation: The mechanism explaining the positive effect of Weibo use on online political participation among college students in contemporary China. Information, Communication & Society, 21(4), 516-530.

Watkins, L., Aitken, R., Hinder, C., Lawson, R., Mather, D., Paul, A., … Williams, J. (2015). The New Zealand consumer lifestyle segments. New Zealand Sociology, 30(1), 111-130.

Yin, R. (2003). Applications of case study research. SAGE.

Zhang, X. (2015). "Voting with dollars": A cross-polity and multilevel analysis of political consumerism. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 39(5), 422-436.

Appendix I: Information of Interviewees

No.	Age	Gender	Place of Origin	Length of Residence	Occupation	Immigrant Identity
1	83	Female	Hong Kong	61	Retired business manager	NZ Citizen
2	72	Male	Taiwan	50	Retired professor	NZ Citizen
3	70	Male	Taiwan	47	Retired civil servant	NZ Citizen
4	76	Male	Hong Kong	51	Retired engineer	NZ Citizen
5	45	Male	Taiwan	30	Self-employed	PR
6	46	Male	PRC	8	Lawyer	PR
7	42	Female	PRC	8	Homemaker	PR
8	45	Male	PRC	11	NGO worker	PR
9	30	Female	PRC	4	Engineer	PR
10	39	Male	PRC	10	Self-employed	PR
11	48	Female	Taiwan	26	Manager	PR
12	36	Female	PRC	18	Homemaker	PR
13	79	Male	PRC	6	Retired worker	PR
14	73	Male	PRC	5	Painter	PR
15	32	Male	Hong Kong	13	Self-employed	PR
16	28	Female	Taiwan	10	White collar	PR
17	67	Female	PRC	5	Retired teacher	PR
18	40	Male	Taiwan	18	Co-founder of a company	PR
19	36	Female	PRC	10	White collar	PR
20	31	Male	PRC	10	Chef	PR
21	34	Male	Taiwan	7	Real estate agent	PR
22	33	Male	PRC	12	Co-founder of a company	PR
23	35	Female	PRC	14	Homemaker	PR
24	39	Female	Hong Kong	8	Manager	PR
25	46	Female	PRC	15	Research fellow	PR
26	37	Female	PRC	7	Homemaker	PR
27	30	Male	PRC	6	Civil servant	PR
28	32	Female	PRC	6	Immigration agent	PR
29	46	Female	Taiwan	19	Homemaker	PR
30	38	Male	Taiwan	8	Businessman	PR
31	38	Female	PRC	6	Homemaker	PR
32	32	Female	PRC	7	Self-employed	PR
33	34	Male	PRC	7	Carpenter	PR
34	58	Male	Hong Kong	27	Artist	PR

35	86	Female	PRC	63	Retired engineer	PR
36	39	Male	Hong Kong	13	NGO worker	PR
37	42	Male	PRC	18	NGO worker	PR
38	37	Male	Hong Kong	10	Manager	PR