

Consumers' Perception of Responsibility for Climate Change

Rahul Gupta**

The call for move to a lower-carbon economy is pressing strategic challenge widely accredited by policymakers. Poignant to a lower-carbon economy requires measures, including hi-tech innovation, stringent regulation, investments, financial incentives, organisational change, and education. Climate change is also linked to the consumption of private households their choices and behaviours for products. Like all environmental markets, the global 'carbon market' is a creation of regulations. In this paper we have tried to find out consumers perception of responsibility for factors responsible for climate change, and the relation between their behaviour towards their uses of products responsible for climate change and weather their some demographic profile influence their behaviour towards these factors.

Key Words: Climate change, Consumers, Environmental behaviour

INTRODUCTION

Scientific consensus is that economic growth has placed an indefensible burden on the environment. Over-consumption, use and the creation of pollution and waste are degrading the 'ecosystem services', and disturbing survival and well-being (WRI, 2005). The most pressing environmental challenge is to preventing and responds to disruptive climate change; which significantly impacts the global economy. Review by the Nicholas Stern (2006) states that unless 1% of GDP is invested in responding to the climate challenge its consequence could shrink economy by 20% by year 2035. The call for move to a lower-carbon economy is pressing strategic challenge widely accredited by policymakers. Poignant to a lower-carbon economy requires measures, including stringent regulation, hi-tech innovation, investments, financial incentives, education, and organisational change. Climate change is also linked to the consumption of households and their choices and behaviours of products they consume. It has therefore become a focus for academic research, much of which was comprehensively synthesised by Tim Jackson (2005) in his research, *Motivating Sustainable Consumption*. Jackson's synthesis, as such consumer behaviour is multidimensional experience. Influence by their demographics,

values, knowledge, emotions, attitudes, and circumstances.

Scientifically climate change refers to any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity. However, from the regulatory perspective, as defined by United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) climate change refers to "A change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climatic variability observed over comparable periods".

Climate change is an extreme case of externality its origin is in global human activities for production as well as for consumption and its implications is global and long term. Responding to climate change is therefore a global venture governed by international legal, regulatory and institutional framework and includes business response through fast emerging carbon market globally. Like all environmental markets, the global 'carbon market' is a creation of regulations. The dynamics of global carbon market results from institutions, and specific measures agreed periodically by the nations which are party to the UNFCCC.

There are many dimensions to the climate change-corporate accounting of greenhouse gas emissions (Carbon foot prints), business strategies to include climate change challenges and opportunities in corporate business plan, mitigating greenhouse gas emissions by business.

Various other factors influences consumer behaviour like attitude, perceived self efficacy, and situations. (Bagozzi, et.al. 2002) also researched unconventional, as well as sustainable, consumption contexts. Grob's (1995).

REVIEW LITERATURE

Sustainability-orientated consumer research encompasses a variety of concepts of more sustainable consumption using a range of labels for consumers and their behaviour (including green, greener, sustainable, pro-environmental, ethical, environmentally conscious, ecological Jackson, 2005). Consumers in relation to sustainability concerns to enable markets to be meaningfully segmented (Straughan & Roberts, 1999); types of consumer to understand how they are motivated to consume more sustainably (Jackson, 2005); testing the acceptability of price premiums for more sustainable products (Laroche, Bergeron, & Barbaro-Forleo, 2001); and exploring why there is frequently a significant gap between consumers' reported willingness to consume more sustainably and actual behaviour (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). One contentious issue affecting early attempts at profiling consumers and segmenting markets for sustainability were that they were often largely based on sociodemographic variables (Straughan & Roberts, 1999). However, as Schlegelmilch, Bohlen, and Diamantopoulos (1996) the value of using sociodemographic variables became increasingly contentious, particularly given the tendency for different studies to produce inconclusive and contradictory results for particular demographic variables (Kilbourne & Beckman, 1998; Robinson & Smith, 2002). Diamantopoulos et al. 2003 provides a critical review of the literature linking sociodemographics to environmentally orientated consumer attitudes and behaviours and concluded that sociodemographics alone are of limited value for profiling, but are more potentially useful when used in combination with other influences such as values, attitudes, or knowledge. This study builds on this insight by testing the value of sociodemographic variables when used with other sociopsychological variables. Research profiling consumers and segmenting them in terms of sustainable consumer behaviour also has another acknowledged weakness, which is a tendency to focus on individual behaviours (such as recycling or purchasing of a particular type of product) and on specific impacts such as energy usage (Spangenberg & Lorek, 2002). This is problematic because the research literature

indicates that while some types of sustainable behaviour are influenced by factors such as values, others are not. Even amongst those behaviours influenced by values, particular values influenced different behaviours in different ways (Barr, 2007; Corraliza & Berenguer, 2000; Pepper, Jackson, & Uzzell, 2009). Another problem with the overemphasis on individual behaviours and impacts is that it is the cumulative impact of all a consumer's behaviour that is significant. This is demonstrated by the 'rebound effect' associated with behaviours such as energy saving. Reducing domestic energy use apparently lessens a consumer's environmental impact, but if the resulting financial savings are spent on energy intensive goods and services, this may not be the case (Herring, 1999). This paper seeks to gain insight into overall consumer lifestyles and their perception by considering a range of behaviours and by evaluating their effect in relation to climate change.

EVOLVING NOTIONS OF CONSUMER RESPONSIBILITY

CSR has received significant attention academically (Peng, 2009, Jenkins, 2009), an equivalent concept of 'consumer social responsibility', have received relatively little attention (Brinkmann & Peattie, 2008). The marketing literature consider the social responsibility of consumers, it has restricted to the behaviour of the consumer rather than the company, and of consumer deceit rather than positive behaviours (Brinkmann & Peattie, 2008). However, there is an emerging normative concept of the 'citizen consumer', which Gabriel and Lang (1995) define as 'a responsible consumer, a socially-aware consumer, a consumer who thinks ahead and tempers his desires by social awareness, a consumer whose actions must be morally defensible and who must occasionally be prepared to sacrifice.', such a concept of consumer responsibility is still immature in marketing, but other disciplines of social-science such as health, personal responsibility tend to be more prevalent (Attell-Thompson, 2005; Bricas, 2008). Williams (2005) discusses roles consumers play, suggesting an increasing role for consumer social responsibility to complement CSR. Williams suggests, since 66% of consumers believe they can influence a company's environmental and ethical behaviour, they might therefore be prepared to accept some responsibility for how companies behave. He urges the development of a proactive notion of consumer social responsibility that encourages more socially and environmentally

* Assistant Professor Amity Business School, Amity University
Uttar Pradesh

favourable behaviour by companies. This could include information relating to companies' practices and policies (Peters, 2005) and to the consequences of consumers' choices. Consumer response also depends on their ability to understand the information. Shaw and Clarke (1999) note, individuals are often confused about environmental issues and are inconsistent in making connections between an issue like climate change and aspects of their own lifestyles and consumption (Anable, Lane, & Kelay, 2006). Ability to act on relevant information will also depend on the consumer's sense of perceived behavioural control (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Giles & Cairns, 1995) and their wider sense of self-efficacy (Terry & O'Leary, 1995). Rodrigues et al. (2008) and Lenzen et al. (2007) use ecological economics to frame responsibility in terms of ascribing who is accountable for (a) environmental pressure and (b) the environmental impacts of producers or consumers respectively. Munksgaard and Pedersen (2001) sought to ascribe responsibility for CO2 emissions from a policy perspective. From a marketing perspective, what is more significant is the consumer's sense of responsibility, and how they perceive and ascribe responsibilities for the environmental consequences of products, production impacts, purchase behaviour, and consumption and disposal behaviours. For companies and policymakers seeking to develop more sustainable systems of consumption and production, the role that consumers' sense of responsibility plays in their willingness to engage in pro-environmental behaviour (PEB) is potentially vital and needs to be researched and understood. Kaiser and Shimoda (1999) in discussing the psychology of PEBs stress the need to develop personal responsibility, stating that 'If a person is aware of the consequences of certain behaviour, the ascription of personal responsibility becomes crucial'. Despite the growing emphasis on consumer responsibility, it remains under researched (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001), and is mostly discussed normatively and theoretically (Caruana & Crane, 2008). Relatively little empirical work has been done on these ideas, and that which does exist explores the idea with a relatively narrow focus (Wray-Lake et al. 2010). There is an irony that 'environmentally responsible' is one of the more commonly used labels for more sustainable consumer behaviour, when consumer environmental responsibility remains a comparatively under-researched and poorly understood concept.

UNDERSTANDING CONSUMER SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Webster's (1975) early extensive exploration of the 'socially conscious consumer' used as the dependent variable a measure of social responsibility, based on a scale developed by Berkowitz and Lutterman (1968) and refined by Anderson and Cunningham (1972). A weakness in the literature is a tendency to consider 'social responsibility' as a broad construct, and to assume that concepts like social responsibility, environmental responsibility, and altruism are interrelated and can be used interchangeably. Tucker, Dolich, and Wilson (1981) sought to break down the differences between general social responsibility and specific individual responsibility. They suggested that individual environmental responsibility was a subset of social responsibility, and the term individual social responsibility can be used interchangeably with altruism or prosocial behaviour. Anderson and Cunningham's (1972) Social Responsibility Scale, the working assumption within marketing scholarship has been that the socially and environmentally concerned consumer will be much the same thing. Another weakness is the tendency for research to focus on consumer perceptions of their personal responsibility in relation to an issue without attempting to understand the perceived allocation of responsibility to others, if consumers feel that others, such as governments or businesses, are more responsible than they are for causing climate change, how would this affect their own behaviour and attitudes? Zacca (2006) observed that the attitude-behaviour gap often noted amongst consumers with strong pro-environmental attitudes was linked to uncertainty about consumer effectiveness combined with an expectation that government should tackle sustainability issues through regulation.

Objective of the Study

The present study will try to explore, examine the following objective:

- To analyze the consumers' environmentally related behaviours
- To analyze Demographic variables and their role in consumers' responsibility orientations

Research Hypothesis

- For analyzing the awareness of environmentally related behaviours among Indian Customers, we attempt to identify the association between consumers' awareness for

environmentally related behaviours, their preference for the purchase with their demographics characteristics.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data for the present study was collected from the respondents from different respondents at Mall at Bareilly, U.P. India, through a structured undisguised questionnaire, using mainly the questions based on the 5-point Likert scale (e.g. 1. Strongly Disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Do not know, 4. Agree, 5. Strongly Agree).

Our population area is the Mall at Bareilly city, since they attract customers from different places and constitute of all age groups, educational background and different income classes for their purchases. The sample size for the present study is 248 respondents; the questionnaires were administered personally to the respondents.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The questionnaire was reviewed by experts in the field and suggestions given by them were incorporated. The result of pilot testing among 50 respondents was studied and necessary amendments were done in order to make questionnaire more valid. The present study had adopted internal consistency analyses, to conduct reliability testing Cronbach's alpha came out to be .692, and the value is high enough to proceed with the questionnaire.

DATA ANALYSIS AND METHODS

Information gathered from different sources after filtration generates relevant data, which is edited and coded subsequently. The data was analyzed and interpreted with the help of SPSS. Hypothesis framed for the research work have been tested with the help of t-test and Chi-square test.

As far as respondents are concerned Service class were 87 (35.2%), Self Employed were 69 (27.9%), Business Class were 91 (36.8%), 11 (4.5%) were in age group of 25 yrs to 35 Yrs, 131 (53%) were 36 yrs to 45 Yrs, 62 (24.7%), 44 (17.8%) were 56 Yrs and above, 160 (64.8%) were male and 87 (35.2%) were female respondents.

Table 1 Independent Samples Test

| | | t-test for Equality of Means | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| Act on climate change | Equal variances assumed | 245 | .113 | -.401 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | 184.164 | .109 | -.401 |

H01: Demographic variables do not have any role in consumers' environmentally related behaviours and climate change

For gender of respondents as far as t value is concerned value of p is greater than .05, (Table 1) and so we may conclude that there is no significant difference between the means of the two values. For Age group and Profession Anova (Table 2.a and Table 2.b) was performed and we could not find any significant difference among means of different age groups and different professions. Hence we may conclude age, gender and profession has no role to play in consumers' environmentally related behaviours and climate change.

H02: There is no correlation among awareness and act on consumers' responsibility orientations on climate change

The value of correlation among Belief in Climate change and act on climate is .797 and it is highly correlated and we may conclude that respondents who are aware about climate change and they feel that they shall act in their behaviour for their purchase as far as climate change matters are concerned.

CONCLUSION

Research demonstrates a relationship between a consumers' environmental responsibility and their environmentally related consumption behaviours. Respondents those who are aware about climate change and they feel that they shall act in their behaviour for their purchase as far as climate change matters are concerned. Consumer environmental attitudes and knowledge are two of the most common factors for concern. Consumers' socio demographic variables can still be useful in understanding and predicting pro environmental behaviours, as far as our study is concerned age, gender and profession is concerns, we could not find role to play in their environmentally related behaviours and climate change. But certainly consumers can help reduce the impact of climate change if they can change what they buy on a regular basis as they are aware about the consequences to the damage to the environment.

Table 2. a Multiple ComparisonsDependent Variable: Act on climate change
LSD

| (I) Profession | (J) Profession | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | 2 | -.278 | .307 | .366 | | -.88 |
| | 3 | .042 | .285 | .883 | | -.52 |
| 2 | 1 | .278 | .307 | .366 | | -.33 |
| | 3 | .320 | .304 | .293 | | -.28 |
| 3 | 1 | -.042 | .285 | .883 | | -.60 |
| | 2 | -.320 | .304 | .293 | | -.92 |

Table 2.b Multiple ComparisonsDependent Variable: Act on climate change
LSD

| (I) Age | (J) Age | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---------|---------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | 2 | .348 | .597 | .560 | | 1.52 |
| | 3 | .626 | .623 | .316 | | 1.85 |
| | 4 | .045 | .641 | .944 | | 1.31 |
| 2 | 1 | -.348 | .597 | .560 | | .83 |
| | 3 | .278 | .295 | .347 | | .86 |
| | 4 | -.303 | .331 | .361 | | .35 |
| 3 | 1 | -.626 | .623 | .316 | | .60 |
| | 2 | -.278 | .295 | .347 | | .30 |
| | 4 | -.580 | .376 | .124 | | .16 |
| 4 | 1 | -.045 | .641 | .944 | | 1.22 |
| | 2 | .303 | .331 | .361 | | .96 |
| | 3 | .580 | .376 | .124 | | 1.32 |

Table 3 Correlations

| | | Belief In Climate change | Act on climate change |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Belief In Climate change | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .797** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 247 | 247 |
| Act on climate change | Pearson Correlation | .797** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 247 | 247 |

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Anable, D.J., Lane, B., & Kelay, T. (2006). *A review of public attitudes to climate change and transport behaviour*. London: Department for Transport.

Anderson, W.T., & Cunningham, W.H. (1972). The socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Marketing*, 36, 23-31.

Armitage, C.J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 471-499.

Attell-Thompson, L.M. (2005). Consumer directed health care: Ethical limits to choice and responsibility. *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 3(2), 207-226.

Bagozzi, R., Gurnao-Canli, Z., & Priestler, J. (2002). The social

psychology of consumer behaviour. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Bamberg, S., & Schmidt, P. (2003). Incentives, morality, or habit?: Predicting students' car use for university routes with the models of Ajzen, Schwartz, and Triandis. *Environment and Behavior*, 35(2), 264-285.

Barnett, C., Clarke, N., Cloke, P., & Malpass, A. (2005). The politics of ethical consumerism: Citizenship between individualisation and participation. *Consumer Policy Review*, 15(2), 45-51.

Barr, S. (2007). Factors influencing environmental attitudes and behaviors: A UK case study of household waste management. *Environment and Behavior*, 39, 435-473.

Becken, S. (2007). Tourists' perception of international air travel's impact on the global climate and potential climate change policies. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(4), 351-368.

Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L.R. (1963). Responsibility and dependency. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 429-436.

Berkowitz, L., & Lutterman, K.G. (1968). The traditional social responsible personality. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 32, 169-185.

Bickman, L. (1972). Environmental attitudes and actions. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 87(2), 323-324.

Black, J.S., Stern, P.C., & Elworth, J.T. (1985). Personal and contextual influences on household energy adaptations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 3-21.

Bricas, N. (2008). Attentes et responsabilit es des consommateurs [Consumer expectations and responsibility]. *OCL Oleagineux Corps Gras Lipides*, 15(2), 142-144.

Brugmann, J., & Prahalad, C. (2007). Cocreating business's new social compact. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2), 80-90.

Caruana, R., & Crane, A. (2008). Constructing consumer responsibility: Exploring the role of corporate communications. *Organization Studies*, 29(12), 1495-1519.

Corraliza, J.A., & Berenguer, J. (2000). Environmental values, beliefs and actions: A situational approach. *Environment and Behavior*, 32, 832-848.

Dickinson, R., & Carsky, M. (2005). The consumer as voter: An economic perspective on ethical consumer behavior. In R. Harrison, T. Newholm, & D. Shaw (Eds.), *The ethical consumer* (pp. 25-38). London: Sage.

Downing, P., & Ballantyne, J. (2007). *Tipping point or turning point? Social marketing and climate change*. London: IPSOS MORI.

Follows, S.B., & Jobber D. (2000). Environmentally responsible purchase behaviour: A test of a consumer model. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 723-746.

Foxall, G. (2002). Marketing's attitude problem - And how to solve it. *Journal of Customer Behavior*, 1, 19-48.

Fraj, E., & Martinez, E. (2007). Ecological consumer behaviour: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31, 26-33.

Gabriel, Y., & Lang, T. (1995). *The unmanageable consumer: Contemporary consumption and its fragmentation*. London: Sage.

Giles, M., & Cairns, E. (1995). Blood donation and Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour: An examination of perceived behavioural control. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(2), 173-188.

Herring, H. (1999). Does energy efficiency save energy? The debate and its consequences. *Applied Energy*, 63, 209-226.

Hopper, J.R., & Neilsen, J.M. (1991). Recycling as altruistic behavior: Normative and behavioral strategies to expand participation in a community recycling program. *Environment and Behavior*, 23(2), 195-220.

Jacoby, J. (1984). Perspectives on information overload. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 432-435.

Jenkins, H. (2009). A 'business opportunity' model of corporate social responsibility for small and medium-sized enterprises. *Business Ethics*, 18(1), 21-36.

Kaiser, F.G., & Schimoda, T.A. (1999). Responsibility as a predictor of ecological behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19, 243-253.

Kilbourne, W.E., & Beckmann, S.C. (1998). Review and critical assessment of research on marketing and the environment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 14, 513-532.

Kinnear, T.C., Taylor, J.R., & Ahmed, S.A. (1974). Ecologically concerned consumers: Who are they? *Journal of Marketing*, 38, 20-24.

Laroche, M., Bergeron, J., & Barbaro-Forleo, G. (2001). Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(6), 503-520.

Lenzen, M., Murray, J., Sack, F., & Wiedmann, T. (2007). Shared producer and consumer responsibility - Theory and practice. *Ecological Economics*, 61(1), 27-42.

Moisander, J. (2007). Motivational complexity of green consumerism. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(4), 404-409.

Munksgaard, J., & Pedersen, K.A. (2001). CO2 accounts for open economies: producer or consumer responsibility. *Energy policy*, 29, 327-334.

Niva, M., & Timonen, P. (2008). The role of consumers in product-oriented environmental policy: Can the consumer be the driving force for environmental improvements? *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 25(4), 331-338.

Oom Do Valle, P., Rebelo, E., Reis, E., & Menezes, J. (2005). Combining behavioural theories to predict recycling involvement. *Environment and Behavior*, 37(3), 364-396.

Peng, M. (2009). Current debates in global strategy. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(1), 51-68.

Pepper, M., Jackson, T., & Uzzell, D. (2009). An examination of the values that motivate socially conscious and frugal consumer behaviours. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33, 126-136.

Peters, M. (2005). CSR is a consumer concern. *Consumer Policy Review*, 15(2), 36-37.

Robinson, R., & Smith, C. (2002). Psychosocial and demographic variables associated with consumer intention to purchase sustainably produced foods as defined by the Midwest Food Alliance. *Journal of Nutrition and Education Behavior*, 34, 316-325.

Rodrigues, J., & Domingos, T. (2008). Consumer and producer responsibility: Comparing the two approaches. *Ecological Economics*, 66, (2-3), 533-546.

Schlegelmilch, B., Bohlen, G., & Diamantopoulos, A. (1996). The link between green purchasing decisions and measures of environmental consciousness. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(5), 35-55.

Schwartz, S.H. (1968). Words, deeds and the perception of consequences and responsibility in action situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 232-242.

- Schwartz, S.H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 221–279, Vol. 10). New York: Academic Press.
- Shaw, D., & Clarke, I. (1999). Belief formation in ethical consumer groups: An exploratory study. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 17(2), 109–119.
- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention–behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12, 1–36.
- Stern, N. (2006). *The economics of climate change: The Stern review* (p. 692). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, P.C. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behaviour. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(3), 407–424.
- Stern, P.C., Dietz, T., Abel, T., Guagnano, G.A., & Kalof, L. (1999). A value-belief-norm theory of support for social movements: The case of environmental concern. *Human Ecology Review*, 6, 81–97.
- Sutton, S. (1998). Predicting and explaining intentions and behavior: How well are we doing? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15), 1317–1338.
- Teisl, M.F., Rubin, J., & Noblet, C.L. (2008). Non-dirty dancing? Interactions between ecolabels and consumers. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29(2), 140–159.
- Terry, D.J., & O’Leary, J.E. (1995). The theory of planned behaviour: The effects of perceived behavioural control and self-efficacy. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(2), 199–220.
- Tucker, L.R., Dolich, I.J., & Wilson, D.T. (1981). Profiling environmentally responsible consumer-citizens. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 9(4), 454–478.
- Vermeir, I., & Verbeke, W. (2006). Sustainable food consumption: Exploring the consumer attitude-behavioral intention gap. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 19(2), 169–194.
- Webster, F.E. (1975). Determining the characteristics of the socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2(3), 188–196.
- Williams, A. (2005). Consumer social responsibility? *Consumer Policy Review*, 15(2), 34–35.
- Yates, L. (2009). *Green expectations: Consumers’ understanding of green claims in advertising*. London: Consumer Focus.