

Demographic and Value Orientations as Predictors of Social Responsible Consumption Behavior among Indian Consumers

Monica Bedi

University Business School, Punjab University, Chandigarh 160 014, India
Telephone: 09815741220, E-mail: monica@pu.ac.in

KEYWORDS Collectivism. Locus of Control. Idealism. India. Sustainable Development

ABSTRACT Sustainable development and ecological issues have gained the attention of policy makers, practitioners and consumers at local, national and global level. India, with 1.34 billion people, is the second most populous country and sixth largest economy measured by nominal GDP in the world. Rapid industrialization, population growth, poverty, vehicle emissions, usage of hazardous chemicals have given birth to great number of environmental problems and continue to put tremendous pressure upon the country's land and natural resources. Rapid economic growth rate has severely degraded environment in the form of deforestation, pollution and threats to endangered species. The emphasis of sustainable development demands substantial changes of human behavior at individual level. Indian population, therefore, needs to be convinced to behave in a socially responsible manner for its sustainable development. It is crucial for the citizens to have enough environmental knowledge, supporting social atmosphere to develop positive attitudes for socially responsible behavior. The paper aims to study Indian consumers in terms of their socially responsible consumption behavior. Also, to explore the extent of the relationship between socially responsible behavior and the demographics of Indian consumers. The study also investigates the influence of collectivism, idealism, locus of control and economic status on socially responsible consumption behavior. The research will help the marketers and policymakers to formulate and implement well-structured strategy to motivate socially responsible consumption behavior.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of sustainable development (SD) has gained significant importance amongst marketers, *practitioners* and consumers in the twenty-first century (Antil 1984; Cornwell and Drennan 2004; Kumar et al. 2013; Mohr et al. 2001; Sharma and Jha 2017; Uddin and Khan 2016; Hasford and Famer 2016; Webb et al. 2008). The focus of sustainable development is to balance different, interconnected and competing needs of human, animals and plants species by creating awareness of the environmental, social and economic limitations in a society. In recent times, the role of consumption factor in sustainable consumption research (SCR) (Cojuharenco et al. 2016; Su and Swasan 2017; Lin and Chang 2017; Sharma and Jha 2017; Reisch and Thøgers-

en 2015). Sustainability focuses on consuming less, about achieving more with less, improving for longer duration to attain balance with long term social welfare. The goal of sustainable development with the help of consumption factor can be attained by three ways; encouraging green products and production, transferring demand to low-involvement consumption categories, and reducing material requirements (Hertwich 2005; Tukker et al. 2006). It implies that individuals as consumers have to share the responsibility and are required to take action towards positive and lasting change by adopting responsible consumption behavior. According to Crilly et al. (2008), socially responsible consumption behaviors are "measures taken by individuals to augment societal well-being by avoiding harmful consequences purchase by taking into account the public/societal consequences of his/her private consumption." However, scholarly arguments continue around the issue on how consumer actions and behavior changes will help to achieve sustainable development (Kunchambo et al. 2017; Kaufmann-Hayoz et al. 2012).

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Monica Bedi
Assistant Professor
University Business School,
Arts Block 3,
Panjab University, Chandigarh 160 014, India
Phone: 09815741220
E-mail: monica@pu.ac.in

India accounts for eighteen percent of the world population and livestock. Rapid rise in population growth, industry led urbanization and consumerist culture among different income groups is resulting into depletion of natural resources and severe damage to the environment, thus, putting unsustainable stress on the natural resources and the environment ecosystem. This led the government to realize that the issues of sustainability and sustainable development can no longer be sidestepped. A comprehensive National Action Plan has been developed emphasizing on areas of solar energy, energy conservation and efficiency, sustainable agriculture, water management, increasing area under the forest cover to achieve sustainable development. The Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17) highlights that economic growth and development must be able to address sustainable consumption issues in order to survive in harmony with the planet. Institutional and regulatory framework have been carved out in the light of judicial pronouncements and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAS). However, it was apprehended that environmental changes cannot be managed without public awareness and concern. Individuals should accept sustainable development as a shared responsibility and would be required to take actions towards understanding their own role, responsibilities and lifestyles for sustainable world. In review of literature mainly ecological consumption has been widely investigated. Socially responsive consumption behavior has received modest attention in research and hence an approach to measure the consumer's propensity and motivation to engage in such consumption is missing, especially, in Indian context. The purpose of this present research is to study the level of social consciousness in consumption among Indian consumers. This study sets out to explore the extent of the relationship between socially responsible behavior and the demographics of Indian consumers. It also attempts to investigate the influence and role of collectivism, idealism, locus of control and economic status on socially responsible consumption behavior.

Review of Literature

Unmonitored consumption practices in era of capitalism and globalization would lead to irreparable environmental, economic and social

degradation. The onus of developing sustainable practices is not limited to government and society but it has become a responsibility of stakeholders including companies and citizens (Longhurst 2006; Humes 2010). Past studies have found that consumers have shown increased concern by the effects of environmental sustainable practices on both human beings and ecosystem and therefore, prefer to purchase sustainably produced products over conventionally produced products (Antil 1984; Webb et al. 2008). The socially responsible consumer (SRC) describes "the behavior of consumer to purchase products and services which have positive (or less negative) impact on the environment by avoiding products that harm the environment" (Webster 1975). Ulusoy (2016) defined socially responsible consumption behaviour as "the consumption that has a lesser amount of harmful impact and more positive impact on the environment, society, and human beings." Sustainable consumption would help to create equilibrium between time and monetary expenditure, at the same time satisfying basic needs of life and the future needs of generations (Robins 1999; Roberts 1995). Mohr et al. (2001) defined socially responsible consumer (SRC) as "a person whose acquisition, usage, and disposition of products is based on a desire to minimize or eliminate harmful effects in order to maximize the long-run beneficial impact on society." Going green, socially responsible investments, purchasing organic products, making energy conservation efforts, recycling, are all examples of socially responsible behavior. The above definitions assumes that socially responsible consumption behavior has two dimensions/factors that is, environmental concern and greater social concern. Sustainable consumption is closely associated to quality of life and consumer overall well-being issues (Cornwell and Drennan 2004). The United Nations Climate Change Conferences in Mexico (2010) and South Africa (2011) have raised the need for a paradigm shift towards building a low-carbon sustainable society. Study by Grunert (1995) found that consumer purchases were responsible for forty percent of the environmental damage. Consumers and their purchases have a major impact on green growth when it comes to sustainable production because they account for more than sixty percent of final consumption in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Devel-

opment countries (OECD 2008, 2016). The encouragement of sustainable consumption behavior is an arduous chore. Undoubtedly, the population has become more concerned for sustainable development but this concern has been translated into decisions of not very large percentage of consumers and buyers for goods and services (Pieters et al. 1998). Few studies found that the use of sustainably produced electronic products, household devices, and cars is restricted more because of financial restrictions of many consumers rather than by an ecological responsiveness and concern (Schafer et al. 2012). Study by Peattie (1995) indicated that if consumers were offered environment friendly products in same price range and technical performance in comparison to conventionally produced products, majority of consumers would prefer to buy environment friendly products (Singh 2011; Hume 2010; Uddin and Khan 2016). A survey conducted by DEFRA (2005) established that while thirty percent of consumers indicated their concern about companies' environmental and social record, only three percent translate the awareness in their purchase decisions suggesting that sheer knowledge and awareness will not change current consumption patterns. Many studies in recent years have been directed at trying to understand socially responsible consumption behavior in the Indian context. A recent study conducted by Nielsen (2014) revealed that sixty-four percent of online consumers show a greater affinity towards buying socially responsible brands. Uddin and Khan (2016) in their study concluded that their exists positive signs of pro-environmental behavior and environment involvement was the most important predictor of green purchasing behavior. Researchers have provided empirical evidences about the green buying behaviour of consumers revealing positive inclination towards environment-friendly products (Jain and Kaur 2004; Punyatoya 2014). It is evident from studies that social concerns to some extent have started influencing consumer decisions to purchase sustainably produced products (Chaklader and Gulati 2015; Kumar et al. 2013; Singh 2011). Singh (2009) found that urban consumers and amongst them younger female urban population was more socially responsible in their consumption behavior than the rural ones. Moreover, the cause-related marketing supported advertising campaigns by companies and media coverage on

programs focused on environmental issues has also played a vital role in reviving the public interest. Many studies indicate that consumers prefer to buy products of companies that donate part of the earnings from the sale of the products to charities and causes. Despite these sentiments, studies had also suggested that the green movement is significantly less developed in Indian market compared to overseas markets (Keegan and Green 2000). Consumers professed their willingness to buy for environment sustainable products but Indian markets are overstocked with conventionally produced products. According to study conducted by Nielsen's Global Online Environment and Sustainability Survey (2011), India is among the top three countries within Asia Pacific where environmental and sustainability consciousness prevails among consumers. According to the survey, eighty-six percent of Indian consumers prefer to buy energy efficient products and appliances, followed by products using recyclable packaging material (79%). However, when it comes purchase decision, only forty-four percent buys eco-friendly products since they feel that they are very expensive. Quality and price trade-off are main hurdles in adopting SRCB among Indian consumers (Mandese 1991). A study by Economic Times (2014) found that switching to environmentally friendly products is not really the main concern for many consumers. It was also found that consumers primarily place environmental responsibility on brands, and not particularly on themselves.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The objectives of the study are to:

- 1) Measure level of socially responsible consumer behaviour.
- 2) Investigate the efficacy of demographics (age, sex, education, occupation, income) as predictors of socially responsible consumer behaviour.
- 3) Explore the relationship of collectivism, idealism, locus of control, economic status with socially responsible consumer behaviour.

Hypothesis for the Study are

H1: Demographic variables influence socially responsible consumer behaviour.

H2: Collectivism influences socially responsible consumer behavior.

H3: Idealism influences socially responsible consumer behaviour.

H4: Locus of control influences socially responsible consumer behaviour.

H5: Economic status influences socially responsible consumer behaviour.

METHODOLOGY

The single cross sectional descriptive research design was designed for the research. Systematic random sampling technique was used to select the participants. A self-administered survey method was utilized to collect data from 250 respondents. However, 50 respondents dropped out from the study, giving eighty percent response rate. Respondents participated voluntarily for giving informed consent. Table 1 summarizes the profile of the respondents who had participated in the research study. From the final sample consisted of 200 respondents, 95 males (47.5%) and 105 females (52.5%). Around thirty-four percent of the respondents have attained or pursuing graduate degree whereas fifty-three percent were enrolled or completed post graduate degree. Around twenty-five percent of the respondents ranged in the age group of less than 21 years and forty-six percent were 35 years and above. Around twenty-one percent of respondents had family income between Rs.25,001-50,000. ANOVA and chi-square was applied to test the proposed hypothesis and also for analyzing data. Data were analysed in SPSS.

Research Instrument

Data was collected via an intercept of shoppers using an interviewer administered questionnaire. The standardized questionnaire was developed by Antil and Bennett in 1984. This scale was developed to measure socially responsible consumption behavior (SRCB) and focus on statements which capture societal concerns in consumer decision making and ecological considerations. The questionnaire included six self-report measures, demographics and psychological variables. The study used a forced choice approach, with respondents demonstrating their level of conformity to a series of statements included in a structured questionnaire. The respondents were asked to respond to the statements by using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach's stan-

dardized alpha was calculated to assess the reliability of six measures (Cronbach 1951). All coefficient estimates for six measures incorporated in the research instrument were acceptable at the 0.70 level or higher (Krathwohl 1998).

Table 1: Distribution of respondents

	<i>n=200</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Age (years)</i>		
≤21 years	50	25.0
21 -34 yrs	58	29.0
35- 50 yrs	56	28.0
>50 years	36	18.0
Total	200	100
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	95	47.5
Female	105	52.5
Total	200	100
<i>Education</i>		
Graduation	68	34.0
Post graduate level	106	53.0
Other	26	13.0
Total	200	100
<i>Occupation</i>		
Student	64	32.0
Job	75	37.5
Self employed	35	17.5
Others	26	13.0
<i>Income (monthly)</i>		
Less than Rs. 25,000	70	35.0
Rs. 25,001-50,000	42	21.0
Rs. 50,001-75,000	54	27.0
More than Rs.75001	34	17.0
Total	200	100.0
<i>Family Members</i>		
≤3	42	21.0
4-7	100	50.0
7+	58	29.0
Total	200	100.0

According to the scale, socially responsible consumers can be classified into four types as follows:

Dark Green Consumers

Dark green consumers are those who are caring and ethical and score above 4.5 on SRCB scale. In their purchase they show the socially responsible consumer behaviour and also environmentally concerned consumer behaviour.

Green Consumers

Green consumers are those who are caring and ethical and score in between 3.5 and 4.5 on SRCB scale. In their purchase more often they

show the socially responsible consumer behaviour and also environmentally concerned consumer behaviour, but are not consistent.

Yellow/Middle Consumers

Yellow/middle consumers are those who are cynical and disinterested on the matter of socially responsible consumer behaviour and score between 2.5 and 3.5 on SRCB scale. In their purchase behaviour sometimes they show the socially responsible consumer behaviour and also environmentally concerned consumer behaviour.

Brown Consumers

Brown consumers are those who are oblivious and score in less than 2.5 on SRCB scale. In their purchase they rarely show the socially responsible consumer behaviour and also environmentally concerned consumer behaviour, but are not consistent.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 provides a summary of descriptive statistics that is, mean and standard deviations of all the observed dimensions/factors of socially responsible consumer behavior (SRCB) scale. Descriptive statistics was worked out to know the pattern of score distribution.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

S. No.	Constructs/ dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Perceived Consumer Effectiveness (PCE)	3.530	0.670
2	Ecologically Conscious Consumer Behavior (ECCB)	3.590	0.540
3	Environmental/ Ecological Concern	3.557	0.528
4	Society Responsibility	3.794	0.529
5	Government Responsibility	3.950	0.589
6	Manufacturer Responsibility	4.080	0.767
7	Social Responsible Consumption Behavior	3.697	0.438

Measure Level of Socially Responsible Consumer Behavior

From the above Table 3, one can infer that Indian consumers mainly score between 2.5 and

3.5 on SRCB scale, falling in the category of yellow/middle consumers on the SRCB scale which shows that consumers are cynical and disinterested on the matter of socially responsible consumer behavior. They sometimes show the socially responsible consumer behaviour and also environmentally concerned consumer behaviour in their purchase behaviour. It was also found that only twenty-seven percent were found to be green consumers. There were consumers who can be called as dark green consumers (very high SRCB).

Table 3: Categorization of Indian consumers

SRCB	Frequency	Percent
2	10	5.0
3	136	68.0
4	54	27.0
Total	200	100.0

Also on the basis of environmental concern and ecologically conscious consumer behaviour given by Carrigan and Attalla (2001) we can divide the consumers into the matrix given in Table 4. From this it can be concluded that most people are caring and ethical that is, seventy-eight percent while only eight percent are cynical, eleven percent are uncertain and confused, and three percent are oblivious.

Table 4: Carrigan and Atta classification of Indian consumer

		Ecological concern	
		High	Low
Ecologically conscious consumer behaviour	High	156	22
	Low	16	6

Investigating the Effect of Demographics (Age, Sex, Education, Occupation, Income) on Socially Responsible Consumer Behaviour

One-way ANOVA was performed to assess the effect of various demographic variables on the various dimensions socially responsible consumption behavior. Table 5(a) shows results of one way ANOVA for demographic variables as independent and Social Responsible Consumption Behavior (SRCB) and its dimensions as dependent variable. From results it can be

Table 5(a): One-way ANOVA

S. No.	Statements	Gender		Age		Education	
		F-value	Sig.	F-value	Sig.	F-value	Sig.
1	Perceived Consumer Effectiveness (PCE)	29.629	.000	1.185	.320	1.311	.274
2	Ecologically Conscious Consumer Behavior (ECCB)	82.526	.000	5.225	.002	2.345	.101
3	Environmental/Ecological Concern	52.938	.000	4.332	.007	2.298	.106
4	Society Responsibility	18.733	.000	3.183	.015	.387	.680
5	Government Responsibility	25.497	.000	1.568	.202	.914	.404
6	Manufacturer Responsibility	18.572	.000	2.183	.095	.200	.819
7	Social Responsible Consumption Behavior	55.865	.000	3.321	.023	.299	.742

inferred that there is a significant difference for all the dimensions of SRCB at ninety-five percent level of significance across gender. The study found significant effect of gender on Perceived Consumer Effectiveness (PCE) at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 29.629, $p = 0.00$], Ecologically conscious consumer behavior (ECCB) at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 82.526, $p = 0.00$], Environmental/ecological concern at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 52.938, $p = 0.00$], Manufacturer Responsibility at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 25.497, $p = 0.00$] and Government Responsibility at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 18.572, $p = 0.00$], Society Responsibility at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 55.865, $p = 0.00$] and overall socially responsible consumption behavior (SRCB) at $p \leq .05$ level [F(1, 198) = 52.938, $p = 0.00$]. Descriptive statistics for the various dimensions of SRCB and overall SRCB indicated that male respondents were found to be more concerned than their female counterparts. Results of the study supports past studies which have found a significant relationship between gender and socially responsible consumption behavior. The study revealed that males were found to possess better and higher environment knowledge about green issues than females (Lyons and Breakwell 1994; Grunert and Kristensen 1994; Arcury et al. 1987).

Table 5(a) also depicts that there is no significant difference on SRCB across age, but there is a significant difference across two dimensions of SRCB - ecological concern and ecologically conscious consumer behaviour across age at ninety-five percent level of significance. Singh (2009) found that younger female urban population was more socially responsible in their consumption behaviour. From results it can be inferred that there is a significant difference for all

the dimensions of SRCB at ninety-five percent level of significance across age. There was found to be a significant effect of age on Ecologically conscious consumer behavior (ECCB) at $p \leq .05$ level [F(3, 196) = 5.225, $p = 0.032$], Environmental/ecological concern at $p \leq .05$ level [F(3, 196) = 4.332, $p = 0.07$], Society Responsibility at $p \leq .05$ level [F(3, 196) = 3.183, $p = 0.015$], and overall socially responsible consumption behavior at $p \leq .05$ level [F(3, 196) = 3.321, $p = 0.023$]. When analyzing consumer's consciousness related to the natural environment by age, the researcher found that children have usually more environmental knowledge and higher levels of involvement with environmental protection compared to their parents. Past studies have also suggested that young consumers are more concerned with sustainability and environmental issues than older consumers (Coddington 1993; D'Souza et al. 2007; Uddin and Khan 1998). Young consumers' involvement in environmental activities can play significant role in promoting sustainable consumption behavior (Chan 1999; Hume 2010; Lee 2010; O'Shaugnessy and O'Shaugnessy 2002). Also, it was found that there was no significant difference for either SRCB nor on its dimensions across education at ninety-five percent level of significance. According to study conducted by Laroche et al. (2001), it was found that the level of education and work status did not have much influence on the consumers' readiness to pay for ecologically produced products. The present study also confirmed that low income families are not able to pay for buying environmentally friendly products because green products are perceived to be more expensive than their "conventional" counterparts. This is similar to the results reported from previous studies (Chan and

Lau 2000; Hiller Connell 2010; Manaktola and Jauhari 2007).

Table 5(b) shows results of one way ANOVA for income as independent variable and SRCB and its dimensions as dependent variables. From the table one can conclude that there was a significant effect of income on Ecologically conscious consumer behavior (ECCB) at the $p \leq .05$ level [$F(3, 196) = 3.923, p = 0.05$], Manufacturer Responsibility at $p \leq .05$ level [$F(3, 196) = 2.618, p = 0.040$] and Government Responsibility at $p \leq .05$ level [$F(3, 196) = 3.289, p = 0.014$]. However, a significant difference was found in overall socially responsible consumption behavior and income at $p \leq .05$ level [$F(3, 196) = 4.477, p = 0.005$]. The results of the study are consistent with the findings reported by earlier researchers (Bisson et al. 2002; Busse and Menzel 2014; Hume 2010; Lee 2010) suggesting that socially responsible consumption behavior have strong influence on consumer purchase decisions, especially affluent consumers. No significant difference could be established across occupation on SRCB and its dimensions at ninety-five percent level

of significance. Moreover, the results of study found that there is no significant difference across family size neither on SRCB nor on any of its dimensions at ninety-five percent level of significance.

Relationship between Collectivism, Idealism, Locus of Control and Socially Responsible Consumer Behavior

It can be seen that socially responsible consumption behavior is associated with customer's personal characteristics. A Chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between socially responsible consumption behavior and collectivism, idealism, locus of control respectively. The results are illustrated in Table 6. The relation between socially responsible consumer behavior and collectivism was significant, $\chi^2 (2, N = 200) = 11.539, p.05$. High individualistic were less likely to show socially responsible consumption behavior as compared to low individualistic. Also, the relation between socially responsible consumer behav-

Table (5b): One-way ANOVA

S. No.	Statements	Occupation		Income		Family size	
		F-value	Sig.	F-value	Sig.	F-value	Sig.
1	Perceived Consumer Effectiveness (PCE)	1.685	.129	1.357	.255	.746	.477
2	Ecologically Conscious Consumer Behavior (ECCB)	1.809	.109	3.923	.005	.211	.810
3	Environmental/Ecological Concern	1.454	.206	1.429	.231	.161	.852
4	Society Responsibility	.901	.499	1.980	.104	.050	.951
5	Government Responsibility	.902	.498	3.923	.005	.909	.406
6	Manufacturer Responsibility	.877	.516	2.618	.040	.068	.934
7	Social Responsible Consumption Behavior	.638	.699	4.477	.005	.708	.495

Table 6: Chi-square analysis

S. No.	Statements	Collectivism		Idealism		Locus of control	
		χ^2 value	Sig.	χ^2 value	Sig.	χ^2 value	Sig.
1	Perceived Consumer Effectiveness (PCE)	7.692	0.050	4.410	0.220	12.739	0.005
2	Ecologically Conscious Consumer Behavior (ECCB)	9.851	0.020	2.912	0.405	11.828	0.008
3	Environmental/Ecological Concern	1.292	0.524	3.784	0.151	6.179	0.046
4	Society Responsibility	2.267	0.519	2.307	0.511	3.593	0.309
5	Government Responsibility	2.048	0.727	7.234	0.124	17.573	0.001
6	Manufacturer Responsibility	5.369	0.252	8.794	0.068	11.519	0.021
7	Social Responsible Consumption Behavior	11.539	0.003	34.894	0.632	10.949	0.004

ior and locus of control was significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 200) = 10.949, p \leq .05$. Consumers who have high locus control internally are more likely to show socially responsible consumption behavior than their counterpart. However, no significant relation was found between socially responsible consumer behavior and idealism.

The findings of the study revealed that seventy-eight percent of the respondents were caring and ethical but only five percent are green consumers and a majority is yellow consumers/middle consumers (68%). There is no significant difference due to the various demographic variables on socially responsible consumer behaviour at ninety-five percent level of significance. However some of its dimensions are affected by it. There is a significant difference due to gender on all the six dimensions of socially responsible consumer behaviour at ninety-five percent level of significance. There is a significant difference due to age on two dimensions of socially responsible consumer behaviour at ninety-five percent level of significance – ecological concern and ecologically conscious consumer behaviour. There is a significant difference due to per capita income on one dimension of socially responsible consumer behaviour at ninety-five percent level of significance – perceived consumer effectiveness. Education, income, and family size didn't show any significant difference neither on SRCB nor on any of its dimensions. Collectivism and locus of control are mildly correlated to socially responsible consumption behaviour and idealism is not correlated to socially responsible consumer behaviour. Yuksel (2009) concluded that high level of collectivism is related to more socially responsive in consumption decisions. A study conducted by Schwepker and Cornwell (1991) reported that an internal locus of control is related to socially responsible consumption behavior. Fundamental value orientations (Collectivism, idealism, locus of control) are abstract variables. The present research do not expect that the variables have direct effect on behavior. Instead, it is expected that value orientations that is, collectivism and locus of control are likely to influence more specific psychological constructs (beliefs), which in turn will influence behavior. The similar findings were reported by earlier authors (Alwitt and Pitts 1996; McCarty and Shrum 2001).

CONCLUSION

Concern towards the environment has led to the emergence of concept of 'sustainable development' in order to promote sustainability and minimizing negative impact on ecosystem and society. Sustainable development is a universal challenge. A number of policy measures have been adopted at global and national level to achieve the objectives of sustainable development. Undoubtedly, the general public have shown concern, but it has not been translated into behavior and actions to a great extent. It appears that cost, time and convenience have strong influence on purchase decision making in the Indian marketplace. There is an urgent need to mobilize the local and personalized responses to achieve sustainable societies. Strong self-regulation is required on the part of individuals rather than imposition of regulations by the government. It should be remembered that sustainable development is not only about production and consumption. It is also basically about the way routine life is organized. The individuals are trying to make few adjustments which are mainly focused on routine /habitual activities such as water and energy conservation, use of pressure cookers, recycling etc. The concerns are inclined towards low-impact ecological practices of cleanliness rather than conservation of resources. New environmental activism demands varied set of behavioral responses, ranging from a strong assurance to environmental actions/behaviors. The findings also revealed that consumer behavior is more or less inconsistent for the concern. This is because of the fact that traditional campaigns emphasizing on consumers "the right thing" are effective in short run. There is need to adopt methods that could trigger internal motivation, internalized social norms and positive cueing among consumers for long time span. The Government should think strategically to encourage responsible consumption among citizens. They can also provide support in the form of different kinds of subsidy to push sales of environmentally sustainable products. Companies should also contribute for this global concern by investing and adopting in environment-friendly technologies and green sustainable products in order to minimize the extent of environmental degeneration. Companies should make efforts to manufacture products in conformity with social and environmen-

tal standards. It is also suggested that companies should focus on products with manufacturing processes that make use of recyclable or reused materials as a substitute of original materials. Companies can reduce the overall cost of green products by selling directly to clients via agents instead of using cost ineffective retailers. Practical responses can only be defined at corporate level and tactical level. Sustainable marketing should be pursued with greater enthusiasm and dynamism. Greening should be considered as a potential source of opportunity instead of burden in order to improve efficiency and competitive advantage.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This present study has tried to study demographic and psychological variables influencing socially responsible consumption behavior (SRCB). Future studies need to explore effect of life style distinctiveness and different media habits to the levels of socially responsible consumption behavior. Empirical studies enabling cross cultural comparisons can also be conducted regarding socially responsible consumption behavior (SRCB).

LIMITATIONS

There are some limitations of the present research which needs to be discussed. The study attempts to measure consumers propensity (or intention) for socially responsible consumption behavior (SRCB). It should be noted that the research did not measure actual socially responsible consumption behavior (SRCB) performance. The study has been conducted on small sample of population, therefore, tentative conclusions should be made from the study. A larger sample of the respondents would seem to be prudent in order to generalize the results of the current study.

REFERENCES

- Alwitt LF, Pitts RE 1996. Predicting purchase intentions for an environmentally sensitive product. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 5(1): 49-64.
- Antil JH 1984. Socially responsible consumers: Profile and implications for public policy. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 4(2): 18-39.
- Arcury TA, Scollay SJ, Johnson TP 1987. Sex differences in environmental concern and knowledge: The case of acid rain. *Sex Roles*, 16(9/10): 463-472.
- Bisson LF, Waterhouse AL, Ebeler SE, Walker MA, Lapsley JT 2002. The present and future of the international wine industry. *Nature*, 8: 696-699.
- Busse M, Menzel S 2014. The role of perceived socio-spatial distance in adolescents' willingness to engage in pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 40: 412-420.
- Carrigan M, Attalla A 2001. The myth of the ethical consumer – do ethics matter in purchase behaviour? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(7): 560-577.
- Chan RYK 1999. Environmental attitudes and behavior of consumers in China: Survey findings and implications. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 11(4): 25-52.
- Chan RYK, Lau LBY 2000. Antecedents of green purchases: A survey in China. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(4): 338-357.
- Chaklader B, Gulati PA 2015. A study of corporate environmental disclosure practices of companies doing business in India. *Global Business Review*, 16(2): 321-335.
- Coddington W 1993. *Environmental Marketing: Positive Strategies for Reaching the Green Consumer*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Cornwell B, Drennan J 2004. Cross-cultural consumer consumption research: Dealing with issues emerging from globalization and fragmentation. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 24(2): 108-121.
- Cojuharenco I, Cornelissen G, Karelaiia N 2016. Yes, I can: Feeling connected to others increases perceived effectiveness and socially responsible behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 48: 75-86.
- Crilly D, Schneider SC, Zollo M 2008. Psychological antecedents to socially responsible behavior. *European Management Review*, 5: 175-190.
- Cronbach LJ 1951. Coefficient alphas and the internal structure of tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52: 281-302.
- D'Souza C, Taghian M, Khosla R 2007. Examination of environmental beliefs and its impact on the influence of price, quality and demographic characteristics with respect to green purchase intention. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 15(2): 69-78.
- Grunert SC, Juhl HJ 1995. Values, environmental attitudes, and buying of organic foods. *Journal of Economy Psychology*, 16(1): 39-62.
- Hasford J, Farmer A 2016. Responsible you, despicable me: Contrasting competitor inferences from socially responsible behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 69: 1234-1241
- Hertwich E 2005. Life cycle approaches to sustainable consumption: A critical review. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 39(13): 4673.
- Hiller Connell KY 2010. Internal and external barriers to eco-conscious apparel acquisition. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(3): 279-286.
- Humes M 2010. Compassion without action: Examining the young consumers' consumption and attitude to sustainable consumption. *Journal of World Business*, 45(4): 385-394.
- Jain SK, Kaur G 2004. Green marketing: An attitudinal and behavioural analysis of Indian consumers. *Global Business Review*, 5(2): 187-205.

- Keegan WJ, Green MC 2000. *Global Marketing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Krathwohl DR 1998. *Methods of Educational and Social Science Research*. 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers.
- Kumar V, Rahman Z, Kazmi AA 2013. Sustainability marketing strategy: An analysis of recent literature. *Global Business Review*, 14(4): 601-625.
- Kunchambo V, Lee CKC, Brace-Govan J 2017. Nature as extended-self: Sacred nature relationship and implications for responsible consumption behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 74: 126-132
- Kaufmann-Hoyoz R, Brohmann B, Defila R, Weiss J (Eds.) 2012. Societal steering of consumption towards sustainability. In: R Defila, A Di Giulio, R Kaufmann-Hoyoz (Eds.): *The Nature of Sustainable Consumption and How to Achieve It. Results from the Focal Topic "From Knowledge to Action – New Paths Towards Sustainable Consumption."* München: Oekom, pp. 113–142.
- 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.
- Lee K 2010. The green purchase behavior of Hong Kong young consumers: The role of peer influence, local environmental involvement, and concrete environmental knowledge. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(1): 21–44.
- Lin YC, Chang CCA 2017. Exploring wasteful consumption. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 49: 106-111.
- Longhurst M 2006. Mediating for sustainable consumption. *Consumer Policy Review*, 16(4): 131–137.
- Lyons E, Breakwell GM 1994. Factors predicting environmental concern and indifference in 13- to 16-year-olds. *Environ Behav*, 26(2): 223-238.
- Manaktola K, Jauhari V 2007. Exploring consumer attitude and behavior towards green practices in the lodging industry in India. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19(5): 364-377.
- Mandese J 1991. New study finds green confusion. *Advertising Age*, 62(45): 1-56.
- McCarty JA, Shrum LJ 2001. The influence of individualism, idealism, and locus of control on environmental beliefs and behavior. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 20(1): 93-104.
- Mohr LA, Webb DJ, Harris KE 2001. Do consumers expect companies to be socially responsible? The impact of corporate social responsibility on buying behavior. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1): 45-72.
- OECD 2016. *Promoting Sustainable Consumption: Good Practices in OECD Countries*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD 2008. *Promoting Sustainable Consumption: Good Practices in OECD Countries*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Official Page of Nielsen 2011. From <<http://www.nielsen.com/in/en/press-room/2011/indian-consumers-conscious-of-environmental-benefits.html>> (Retrieved on 27 April 2017).
- Official Page of Economic Times 2014. From <<http://brandequity.economicstimes.indiatimes.com/news/marketing/world-environment-day-are-indian-consumers-and-brands-eco-conscious/47525109>> (Retrieved on 27 April 2017).
- Official Page of United Nations 2010. From <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2010_United_Nations_Climate_Change_Conference> (Retrieved on 10 April 2017).
- Official Page of United Nations 2011. From <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011_United_Nations_Climate_Change_Conference> (Retrieved on 10 April 2017).
- O'Shaugnessy J, O'Shaugnessy NJ 2002. Marketing, the consumer society and hedonism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(5/6): 524–547.
- Peattie K 1995. *Environmental Marketing Management: Meeting the Green Challenge*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Pieters RG, Bijmolt T, Van Raaij F 1998. Consumers' attributions of pro-environmental behavior, motivation, and ability to self and others. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 17(2): 215-225.
- Punyatoya P 2014. Linking environmental awareness and perceived brand eco-friendliness to brand trust and purchase intention. *Global Business Review*, 15(2): 279–289.
- Reisch L, Thøgersen J 2014. Unsustainable consumption: basic causes and implications for policy. *Europe Psychology*, 19: 84–95
- Robins N 1999. Making sustainability bite: Transforming global consumption patterns. *The Journal of Sustainable Product Design*, 4: 14-18
- Roberts JA 1995. Profiling levels of socially responsible consumer behaviour: A cluster analytic approach and its implications for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 4: 97-117.
- Schäfer M, Jaeger-Erben M, Bamberg S 2011. Life events as windows of opportunity for changing towards sustainable consumption patterns? Results from an intervention study. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 35: 65–84.
- Schwepker CH, Cornwell BT 1991. An examination of ecologically concerned consumers and their intention to purchase ecologically packaged products. *Journal of Public Policy Marketing*, 10(2): 77- 101.
- Sharma R, Jha M 2017. Values influencing sustainable consumption behaviour: Exploring the contextual relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 76: 77-88.
- Singh DP 2011. Indian ecological consumer market profile. *Global Business Review*, 12(3): 447–457.
- Singh N 2009. Exploring socially responsible behavior of Indian consumers: An empirical investigation. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 5(2): 200-211.
- Su L, Swanson SR 2017. The effect of destination social responsibility on tourist environmentally responsible behavior: Compared analysis of first time and repeat tourists. *Tourism Management*, 60: 308-321.
- Tukker A et al. 2006. Environmental Impact of Products (EIPRO): Analysis of the Life Cycle Environmental Impacts Related to the Final Consumption of the EU-25. *Final Report*.

- Uddin SF, Khan MN 2016. Exploring green purchasing behavior of young urban consumers: Empirical evidences from India. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(1): 85–103.
- Ulusoy E 2016. Experiential responsible consumption. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(1): 284-297.
- Webb DJ, Mohr LA, Harris KE 2008. A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61: 91-98.
- Webster FE 1975. Determining the characteristics of the socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2: 188-196.
- Yuksel CA 2009. Relationship among socially responsible consumption behavior, anxiety, values and moral philosophies. *International Journal of Global Business*, 2(1): 1-54.
-
- Paper received for publication on May 2016**
Paper accepted for publication on December 2016