

CSR-consumption paradox: Examination of UK apparel companies

Yu, M., Cao, D. & Tan, J. Y.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Yu, M, Cao, D & Tan, JY 2018, 'CSR-consumption paradox: Examination of UK apparel companies' Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-02-2018-0021>

DOI 10.1108/JFMM-02-2018-0021

ISSN 1361-2026

Publisher: Emerald

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

CSR-consumption paradox: Examination of UK apparel companies

Mei Yu^{1*}, Dongmei Cao ², and Juh Yan Tan³

¹ Dr Mei Yu, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Financial and Corporate Integrity, Coventry University, Coventry CV1 5DL UK. Email: mei.yu@coventry.ac.uk

² Dr Dongmei Cao, Lecturer, School of Strategy and Leadership, Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry CV1 5FB UK. Tel:44(0)2477657929. Email: ab4421@coventry.ac.uk

³ Juh Yan Tan, Birmingham City Business School, Birmingham City University, 4 Cardigan Street, Birmingham B4 7BD UK. Email: joanne_jy128@hotmail.com

*Correspondence to: Dr Mei Yu, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Financial and Corporate Integrity, Coventry University, Coventry CV1 5FB UK. Email: mei.yu@coventry.ac.uk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We acknowledge Professor Marylyn Carrigan, Philip Talbot, and Lisa Siebers for their constructive comments to an early draft of this article. We thank Professor Nigel Berkeley for the support.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Despite extensive study into various aspects of corporate social responsibility (CSR), the effect on consumer behaviour is less explored. A growing amount of research is concerned with the phenomenon that CSR has a minor effect on actual purchases, although CSR practices enhance consumers' purchase intentions. This is documented as the CSR-consumption paradox and is yet to be resolved. This research aims to further understand this paradox.

Design/methodology/approach: Questionnaires were administered face-to-face to consumers in Birmingham. These questionnaires concern consumer behaviour in relation to CSR practices of 21 popular apparel companies in the UK.

Findings: Results suggest that consumers' pro-social priority is significantly related to pro-social consumption; that consumers' awareness of CSR practices is insignificantly associated with their purchase behaviour. The pro-social consumption does not differ significantly among different demographic groups.

Research limitations/implications: To explore the external motivational factors in consumers' decision making will be a potential research direction in future.

Practical implications: The empirical results provide implications for UK apparel marketers and policy makers to engage and motivate socially responsible consumers so as to reap strategic rewards for their CSR efforts.

Originality/value: This paper contributes to the knowledge of socially responsible consumption and how it is affected by CSR.

Keywords: Corporate social responsibility, socially responsible consumption, CSR-consumption paradox, apparel, United Kingdom

CSR-consumption paradox: Examination of UK apparel companies

Introduction

Research Issue

The notion of corporate social responsibility (CSR) has gone through a progressive rationalisation evolving the level of analysis and the theoretical orientation (Lee, 2008). Companies no longer conduct CSR as a response to increasing demand from stakeholders, but as a strategy to integrate into their business processes. CSR initiatives can strengthen the company's competitive advantage through enhancing its relationships with customers, influencing the decisions of the company's key stakeholders, developing a stronger brand image, and sustaining a solid reputation and the legitimacy of company operations (Carroll & Shabana, 2010; Sarkis & Daou, 2013).

Among the studies of CSR effects on consumer behaviour, the issue of the CSR-consumption paradox attracts increasing research interest (e.g. Schlaile *et al.*, 2016; Grimmer & Miles, 2017). On the one hand, extant literature has widely evaluated the positive CSR effects on consumer behaviour, for example, purchase intention for CSR (e.g., Carrington *et al.*, 2010; Romani *et al.*, 2016; Lenne, 2017), consumer willingness to pay more for CSR products (Gupta and Hodges, 2012; Shen *et al.*, 2012; Phau *et al.*, 2015), consumers' choice to buy from green companies or to spend more on green products (Cohn & Wolfe, 2011; Ferreira & Ribeiro, 2017), and consumer boycott behaviour (Snider *et al.*, 2003; Carrington *et al.*, 2010). On the other hand, consumers who expect companies to conduct more socially responsible practices have not behaved accordingly in their purchase decisions (Belk *et al.*, 2005; Bray *et al.*, 2011). Belk *et al.* (2005) and Bray *et al.* (2011) show that CSR is not 'at the top of many consumers' lists'. The gap between consumers'

interest in CSR and the limited role of CSR in their purchase behaviour is revealed by Öberseder *et al.* (2011), and termed as the CSR-consumption paradox (Janssen & Vanhamme, 2015). They argue that the complex process for consumers to evaluate CSR initiatives plays an important role in consumption decisions. Literature views the CSR-consumption paradox as an ‘attitude-behaviour’ or ‘intention-behaviour’ gap (Carrington *et al.*, 2014; Schlaile *et al.*, 2016).

Why has the intention not become actual purchase behaviour? It is argued that consumers’ non-engagement in socially responsible purchasing is due to negative net values perceived about socially responsible purchasing (D’Astous & Legendre, 2009). Previous research indicates that CSR factors are far less important to consumers’ purchase decisions than product attributes such as price, aesthetics and quality (Abraham-Murali *et al.*, 1995; Eckman *et al.*, 1990).

Literature further investigates the paradox between socially responsible intentions and actual behaviour. Results suggest that consumers tend to exaggerate their behavioural intention, but when it comes to actual purchase, more complex factors will be taken into consideration as priority for their purchase decision (e.g. Carrington *et al.*, 2010). The implication here is that the paradox may not really exist, but rather, it is related to the improper survey design, in which behaviour intentions may be somewhat exaggerated (Janssen & Vanhamme, 2015). Encouraged by the concept of priority in Carrington *et al.* (2010) and to address the drawback of behaviour intention in Janssen & Vanhamme (2015), this research adopts ‘pro-social priority’ as a measure of motivational priority towards socially responsible consumption, to replace behaviour intention (Schlaile *et al.*, 2016). Different from normal consumption, pro-social consumption is related to fairness and justice thoughts on the CSR evaluation (White *et al.*, 2012).

Researchers have also examined the influence of demographics on socially responsible purchasing behaviour (e.g. Mohr & Schlich, 2016). Panzone *et al.* (2016) reveal that level of education is a key predictor of sustainable consumption. We are also interested in examining the influence of demographic factors on pro-social consumption. Pro-social consumption has a broad connotation, such as conscience, green, and sustainable consumption (Lee *et al.*, 2009). Pro-social consumption in this study refers to positive consumption acts which are related to fairness and justice thoughts on CSR evaluation (White *et al.*, 2012).

Inspired by previous studies and the above debates, we aim to contribute to the further understanding of the paradox phenomenon by examining survey evidence empirically for popular apparel companies in the UK. Our examination focuses on the following three research questions:

RQ1. Is there significant difference in pro-social consumption for different groups in terms of gender, education, occupation, and income?

RQ2. Is consumer awareness of the socially responsible commitments of companies associated with actual purchase behaviour?

RQ3. Does consumers' pro-social priority contribute to pro-social consumption?

Research Context

Since the mid-1990s some UK-based retailers have been criticised for poor working conditions at their suppliers' factories in developing countries, and for not fulfilling their societal obligations (Mujtaba, 2005). There is increasing public interest in how clothes are manufactured, so global retailers are under a lot of pressure to examine how their businesses impact society (Bartley, 2007). Under the global context of increasing demand for companies to take social responsibility, UK apparel companies such as Marks and Spencer (M&S) and Next have developed their CSR policies

and codes of conduct; annual reports of CSR practices have become standard (Goworek, 2011). Gap Inc. implemented their corporate responsibility management programme to strengthen the stakeholder relationship (Arrigo, 2013). In addition to contributing to the debates of CSR effects on consumer behaviour, the results of this research provide key insights for UK apparel companies to enhance socially responsible purchase behaviour from consumers to reap strategic rewards for their CSR efforts.

In the following sections we start conceptual development derived from literature review, discussing concepts of corporate social responsibility, the socially responsible consumer, and pro-social consumption. We formulate the conceptual relationships between consumer awareness of CSR initiatives, pro-social priority, and purchase behaviour. Then we elaborate and discuss the questionnaire, measures, and data. This is followed by presentation of the empirical results, discussion and conclusions.

Conceptual development

Corporate Social Responsibility

The concept of CSR has been widely discussed and developed. Generally, two classes of literature, namely multidimensional theory and stakeholder theory, contribute to development of the concept. A widely accepted multidimensional definition was initially proposed by Carroll (1979; 1991). Carroll (1991) further updates with four responsibilities that companies have to undertake in a CSR pyramid, which indicates the priority in an order from bottom to top: economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic. More recently, the environmental issue is capturing increasing global attention and CSR has evolved mainly into three dimensions: economic, social, and

ecological responsibility (Schuz, 2012). Modern business owes a responsibility to shareholders and other stakeholders (Freeman, 1984). CSR was defined by the Chartered Management Institute in 2015 as corporate responsibility ‘to meet or exceed the expectations of stakeholders beyond such measures as revenue, profit and legal obligations.’ Stakeholder theory provides principles for managers to use to determine which stakeholders and which issues are most important to manage (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Freeman *et al.*, 2004).

Socially Responsible Consumer and Pro-social Consumption

Average consumers seek the optimum self-benefit from a purchase while socially responsible consumers are internally or externally motivated to minimize the harmful impact on society or integrate pro-social responsibility into their purchase decision (Webb *et al.*, 2008; Romani *et al.*, 2016). In the context of CSR, justice, fairness, and adhering to social norms, such as sustainability, are used by socially responsible consumers to make pro-social purchase decisions (Caruana & Chatzidakis, 2014; Schlaile *et al.*, 2016). There has been growing interest in consumer social responsibility (Koszevska, 2013). How do we distinguish the profile of socially responsible consumers? Some studies have examined the influence of demographic factors and the results vary. Mohr and Schlich (2016) show that apart from the wealth factor, German consumers that are female, aged between 46-65, or well educated show a greater tendency to purchase environmentally and socially sustainable products.

In view of the above discussion, this research will examine the first question: Is there a significant difference in pro-social consumption for groups by socio-demographic factors in terms of gender, education, occupation, and income?

Consumer Awareness of CSR and Purchase Behaviour

Most of the previous studies assume that consumer awareness and knowledge of CSR commitments are the key factors for consumers' responses to CSR (Mohr & Webb, 2001; Pomeroy & Donlnicar, 2009) while further studies indicate that consumer awareness of a company's CSR policies and practices have a positive effect on their purchase intention (Sen *et al.*, 2006; Pomeroy & Donlnicar, 2009). Janssen & Vanhamme (2015) suggest that consumer knowledge of CSR initiatives contributes to ethical purchases, however, there is evidence which suggests that stakeholders, such as consumers, are largely unaware of CSR issues; low consumer awareness would have a negative influence for companies to reap the benefits of their CSR efforts (Sen *et al.*, 2006). Connell (2010) shows that lack of knowledge about environmentally preferable apparel is one of the barriers for eco-conscious apparel consumption.

Based on the above discussion, this research will examine the second question: Is consumers' awareness of companies' socially responsible commitments associated with actual purchase behaviour? Evidence consists of both the awareness and unawareness and both luxury and commodity goods.

Pro-social Priority and Pro-social Consumption

It is argued that purchase decision is attributable to values in customers' minds (Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008). Socially responsible consumers are internally motivated to take pro-social belief and value into consideration for making a socially responsible purchase decision (Caruana & Chatzidakis, 2014; Schlaile *et al.*, 2016). Consumers who are increasingly caring for the social-ethical issues become more internally motivated to conduct pro-social consumption. Consumer

behaviours are also motivated by external institutional values, such as organisations and education (Groza *et al.*, 2011; Yeow *et al.*, 2014), and from social values such as friends and family (Salazar & Oerlemans, 2016).

When consumers are motivated to conduct socially responsible consumption, their attitudes are reflected in various levels of pro-social priorities for the choice of ethical products from a company which supports a social or environmental cause (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). Together with various levels of pro-social belief and value, other criteria such as price and quality of a product or service also affect a purchasing decision.

Pro-social consumption is used in this study measuring socially responsible purchase behaviour (White *et al.*, 2012). Unlike purchase behaviour without definition of social responsibility in its nature, this design is arguably to address the attitude-behaviour gap (Moraes *et al.*, 2012) or the intention-behaviour gap (Schlaile *et al.*, 2016). In addition to choice of ethical products, pro-social consumption behaviour is also reflected in boycotting products from a garment company because of social or environmental concerns (Shaw & Clarke, 1999), or paying more or buying more when perceiving more positive CSR values (Wesley *et al.*, 2012). Based on the above discussion, this research will examine the third question: Does consumers' pro-social priority contribute to pro-social consumption?

Research Methods

Instrument and Scales

To empirically examine roles of consumer demographics, awareness of CSR, and pro-social priority played in the pro-social consumption behaviour, we designed a four-part questionnaire to

collect the required data. Part one of the questionnaire is concerned with participants' demographic information including gender, age, occupation, education and annual income. Part two asks participants about their shopping experiences with 21 popular apparel brands in the UK and their awareness of the companies' CSR commitments and scandals. The selection of the 21 companies is based on the existence of market presence in the UK. The '2012 Global RepTrak 100' listed the 'World's Most Reputable Companies' including a range of other industries. All six clothing industry companies in the list are selected: Adidas Group, Nike Inc., LVMH Fashion Group (Louis Vuitton Moët Hennessey), H&M Hennes & Mauritz AB, Marks & Spencer Group Plc. (M&S) and Inditex Group (Zara). The remaining 15 companies are selected at random from Look Fashion Magazine (Look, 2013)¹. This selection helps to reveal the general state of CSR-consumption paradox related to UK apparel companies, and the results are more generalisable. The 15 companies include well-known luxury fashion brands, such as Burberry and Gucci, and high street fast-fashion brands, such as Next and New Look.

Part three is concerned with the role that pro-social priority played in participants' purchase decisions. Reflecting discussion by Campbell and Cowton (2015), the concept of pro-social priority is not operationalised in the way that most researchers have adopted, for example, quantifying the concept with rating questions that directly ask participants' subjective views about pro-social priority on shopping behaviour. Instead, in order to get good quality data with this sensitive issue, respondents were asked to rank their preference to a list of factors for their choice of brand from the highest priority to the lowest priority; traditional factors like price, quality, brand, trend, design, comfort, together with CSR initiatives were on the list. This measurement is consistent with other literature (e.g., Caruana & Chatzidakis, 2014).

In the last part, three measurement scales for pro-social consumption are adapted from Webb *et al.* (2008). Respondents were required to choose their answers to three questions regarding their socially responsible purchase behaviour, namely, to pay more, boycott, and try a new product for CSR reasons.

Sample and Data

Questionnaires were distributed face-to-face to randomly selected people walking or shopping on Birmingham high streets. Birmingham is the second largest city in the UK and has some well known shopping centres and department stores, as well as independent shops and well-known branded apparel chains. Birmingham's residents are from a wide range of ethnic and religious groups. Therefore, this location was chosen as a representative of UK consumption.

Of the 142 questionnaires received, five were filtered due to incompleteness and the remaining 137 valid questionnaires were employed for analysis. The sample size is sufficient to support our study attempt and for the test and algorithm computation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). The demographic data is presented in Table 2. The sample is gender balanced with males accounting for 52 per cent and females 48 per cent. The majority (57%) were professionals, such as clerks and officers, sales personnel, engineers, and businessmen; the rest were students, retired, unemployed and part-time workers.

Results and Analysis

Differences in pro-social consumption by socio-demographics

RQ1 compares pro-social consumption for different groups of people by demographics in terms of gender, education, occupation, and income. The data analysis software is SPSS 24 and principal

component analysis is used to extract the component of pro-social consumption, which can explain as much of the variance in the original data set as possible (Pallant, 2010). The results are displayed in Table 1. KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy) value (0.61) and significance of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value ($p=0.000$) suggest that it is an appropriate factor analysis (Table 1 Panel A). The eigenvalue (1.77) for the first and only component explains 59 per cent of the variance (Table 1 Panel B), which is substantially sufficient as a representative measure of pro-social consumption. Item loadings (ranging from 0.65 to 0.83), means, and standard deviation (S.D.) display in Table 1 Panel C.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Next, an independent-samples T-Test was conducted to compare the mean pro-social consumption score for groups by gender (males vs. females), education (degree vs. non-degree), occupation (student vs. professional), and average annual income (£10,000 and below vs. £30,001 and above). Dependent variable uses the extracted component of pro-social consumption. For the indicator of average annual income, the middle-income group is not selected and only low and high income groups are selected, hereby a bigger variation of the income enables association of income to reflect better with pro-social consumption. For the indicator of occupation, those unemployed and retired, only accounting for 9 per cent of the sample, are not selected.

[Insert Table 2 here]

Levene's T-test results for equality of means indicate that there is no significant difference in scores of pro-social consumption for any of the groups by gender, education, occupation, or income. For example, test for variance of pro-social consumption scores among gender groups

suggests that there is statistically insignificant relationship between males and females: males ($M = -.12$, $SD = .98$) and females ($M = .12$, $SD = 1.02$), $t(df = 135) = -1.40$, and $p = .16$ (two-tailed).

Consumer awareness of CSR and purchase behaviour

RQ2 examines whether consumers' awareness of companies' socially responsible commitments is associated with actual purchase behaviour. Firstly, we check whether customers are aware of CSR commitments associated with 21 popular garment brands in the UK. Table 3 shows that the public awareness is still relatively weak. Instances of consumers' awareness of the sample companies' CSR commitments range from 0.7 (A&F) to 17.5 per cent (M&S) with mean 4.5 per cent. M&S has the highest number of respondents who are aware of its CSR commitments (24 respondents), followed by Primark (18), Gap (11) and Adidas (10). The low levels of the general consumers' awareness might be an impediment for the association with the purchase of CSR related products. Mohr *et al.* (2001) indicate that customers would like more systematic information on companies' CSR activities as their awareness is low due to the difficulty in obtaining this kind of information. Instances of consumers' awareness of perceived CSR scandals (186) are slightly higher than those of the commitments (128). Primark has the highest numbers of respondents who are aware of its CSR scandals (55), followed by Nike (20) and Adidas (17).

[Insert Table 3 here]

From Table 3, M&S and Primark have the highest number of shoppers (110 and 109 respondents respectively), followed by Next (107) and H&M (93). This indicates that the sample respondents are representative of the population in the UK as these four brands are UK's largest clothing retailers by market value (Bloomberg, 2012). Although Primark ranks lowest in terms of

poor CSR reputation, it still holds the second highest market share. This indicates that consumers may be aware of the scandals, but the awareness did not prevent them from purchasing from the apparel company. As such, consumers may be affected by factors other than CSR when making purchase decisions. The following section provides further and deeper analysis of the factors that affect consumers' purchasing decisions, such as the importance of social-responsibility aspects relative to other considerations.

With the above descriptive analysis, we proceed to examine whether consumers' awareness (Yes or No) of CSR practices is associated with actual purchase behaviour (Yes or No). A non-parametric Chi-square test for independence is conducted. This generates 21 tests of 2×2 relationships, for example awareness of Primark's commitment (Yes or No) \times actual purchase experience (Yes or No). We first check the Chi-square assumption concerning minimum expected cell frequency, which should be 5 or greater. Results suggest that only one independent variable, Gap commitments, has all cells with expected count of more than 5. The remainder have violated the assumption, which is due to weak public awareness. Bearing this in mind, we still conduct 2×2 non-parametric Chi-square tests for all 21 companies. The 21 Chi-square tests show significant results for Burberry and Zara commitments only. The results indicate that there is no significant association between consumers' awareness of CSR practices and actual purchase behaviour, for either luxury or fast fashion brands².

CSR-consumption paradox

Building on the above test results, RQ3 sheds further light on the CSR-consumption paradox. Firstly, we check consumers' pro-social priority in responding to companies' CSR initiatives versus other traditional factors while making the purchase decision (Table 4 Panel A). Quality was

chosen as first priority (36%) or second priority (35%) by consumers. Price was chosen as first priority (31%) or second priority (30%). Approximately 66 per cent and 11 per cent of consumers chose CSR as seventh or sixth priority respectively, which reflects their pro-social priority value. This suggests that most consumers have a higher consideration for price and quality aspects than CSR-related products and thus are unwilling to sacrifice financially for pro-social products or brands. It seems that it is the value-for-money and price of a product that influence customers' purchasing decisions. Dickson (2005) shows that only a small segment of the consumer population considers social responsibility to be more important than other product attributes when making apparel purchase decisions. Even though consumers report concern about social responsibility issues, factors other than these concerns — such as quality, price and fashion — may have a greater influence on purchase decisions (Auger *et al.*, 2003; Joergens, 2006). Though customers tend to develop a positive attitude towards socially responsible companies, economic criteria are given a priority over the social criteria (Kolkailah *et al.*, 2012).

[Insert Table 4 here]

Next, we examine whether this pro-social priority value is related to socially responsible consumers' actual purchase behaviour, or pro-social consumption. The dependent variable is pro-social consumption using the generated principal component (Table 1); the independent variable is pro-social priority. CSR priority ranks in Table 4 (Panel A) from first to seventh are coded into corresponding pro-social priority values, i.e., from 7 to 1. Test results are displayed in Table 4 panel B. The model explains 13 per cent of the variance of pro-social consumption behaviour ($R^2 = .13$, $p < 0.005$). This result is understandable since traditional criteria, such as price and quality,

still dominate most consumers' purchase decisions. Pro-social priority is significantly related to pro-social consumption ($\beta=.36, \rho < 0.005$). This is considered as a medium-size effect, as indicated in Tabachnick & Fidell (2014). Kozar & Connell (2013) show that consumers exhibit low involvement in ethical consumption behaviour, yet, knowledge and attitudes of social and environmental issues affect ethical consumption behaviour positively. This suggests that companies may need to educate consumers, and engage in consistent CSR initiatives that reflect the companies' values and ethics (Pomeroy & Dolnicar, 2009).

Discussion

Test 1 result suggests that differences of pro-social consumption among demographic factors such as gender, education, income and occupation are not significantly supported. Mohr & Schlich (2016) suggest that socio-demographic factors, such as gender, age, wealth, and education, have significant correlations with socially responsible consumption. The different results might be related to various research contexts and research issues. Mohr & Schlich (2016) examine German sustainable consumerism in foods and grocery, and this study tests UK consumers' pro-social consumption toward fashion clothes related to fairness and justice thoughts on their CSR evaluation. Demographic variables may not be consistent predictors of pro-social consumption across these different contexts and various issues related to socially responsible consumption. Therefore, care must be taken when applying this result to a different context such as different culture or nationality.

Test 2 result suggests that consumers are largely unaware of the 21 companies' CSR commitments and that consumers' awareness of CSR commitments is insignificantly associated

with actual purchase of either luxury or fast fashion brands. This seems in line with the previous literature suggesting that lack of awareness of companies' CSR commitments among consumers is the barrier for companies to reap the benefits of their CSR efforts (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2002).

Statistical inference in Test 3 suggests that consumers' pro-social priority, is significantly related to pro-social consumption. In other words, the CSR-consumption paradox disappeared when it is specified as the relationship between pro-social priority and pro-social consumption. This conforms to some extant previous studies (e.g. Du *et al.*, 2011; Park *et al.*, 2014; Romani *et al.*, 2016) as pro-social consumption has become the mainstream consumer culture (Lewis & Potter, 2011). Further, consumers often trade-off values and needs by giving priority to pro-social consumption (Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008; Yeow *et al.*, 2014; Carrington *et al.*, 2014).

Conclusion

This study aims to further understand the CSR-consumption paradox by depositing it into three research issues: namely, whether the paradox is related to the socio-demographic differences in pro-social consumption; whether consumers' awareness of CSR commitments is associated with the actual purchase; and whether pro-social values and beliefs, termed as pro-social priority, is related to pro-social consumption. The results suggest a non-significant influence of demographic factors and consumers' awareness, and a positive impact of pro-social priority.

This study suggests that the pro-social consumption does not differ significantly among different socio-demographic groups, which shows that environmental protection and green consumption cannot depend only on some groups of people as traditional marketing segmentation suggests; instead, pro-social consumption is determined by the general public and their pro-social priority values (Lewis & Potter, 2011). This provides insight into how CSR affects socially

responsible consumption and has implications for UK apparel marketers and policy makers to engage and motivate socially responsible consumers so as to reap strategic reward for their CSR efforts.

This study reveals that consumers' awareness of CSR practices is insignificantly associated with purchase behaviour. However, consumers' pro-social priority is significantly related to pro-social consumption. This empirical result provides implications to support and encourage socially responsible companies for their CSR commitments. In order to gain benefits from the CSR strategy, companies are advised to make efforts to enhance general consumers' pro-social values and beliefs.

This research has contributed to further understanding of the CSR-consumption paradox by examining empirical evidence of a representative sample of apparel companies in the UK. We are aware that a bigger sample size could have been better to test the influence of demographic factors on consumers' purchase decision. Another limitation is that we did not consider various motivations from the external aspect as discussed by Caruana & Chatzidakis (2014) and Schlaile *et al.* (2016) that various levels of motives from external agents, such as family, media, community, and government, play a critical role in driving consumers' social responsibility. Clothing sustainability is complex and sustainable consumption involves diverse considerations (Harris *et al.*, 2016; Song & Ko, 2017). A promising avenue for future research is, therefore, to explore the external motivational factors in consumers' decision making process. Moreover, a qualitative method such as interviews could have been conducted to discover how consumers' pro-social priority results in pro-social consumption and why consumers' awareness of CSR commitments could not proceed to actual purchase acts. Due to resource constraint we leave this for future studies to explore the more in-depth aspects of the CSR-consumption paradox.

Table 1: Extract principal component of pro-social consumption

| Panel A: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | | .61 | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | | 61.98 | | | |
| | df | | 3 | | | |
| | Sig. | | .000 | | | |
| Panel B: Loading, Mean and S.D. | | | | | | |
| Items for the Principal Component | Loadings | Mean/S.D. | | | | |
| Pay more | 0.83 | 2.16/0.99 | | | | |
| Boycott | 0.81 | 2.17/1.14 | | | | |
| Try new | 0.65 | 2.39/0.69 | | | | |
| Panel C: Total Variance Explained | | | | | | |
| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 1.77 | 59.01 | 59.01 | 1.77 | 59.01 | 59.01 |
| 2 | .76 | 25.46 | 84.47 | | | |
| 3 | .47 | 15.53 | 100.00 | | | |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis | | | | | | |

Table 2: Test variance of pro-social consumption scores among groups by demographics

| Demographic variable | Group statistics | | | | Levene's t-test for equality of means | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|----|------|-------|---------------------------------------|-----|------------------|-----------------|--|
| | Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | t | df | Sig (two-tailed) | Mean difference | 95% confidence interval of the difference Low/upper |
| Gender | Male | 71 | -.12 | .98 | -1.40 | 135 | .16 | .24 | -.58/.10 |
| | Female | 66 | .12 | .1.02 | | | | | |
| Education | Non-degree | 40 | .03 | 1.00 | .26 | 135 | .80 | .49 | -.32/.42 |
| | Degree | 97 | -.01 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Occupation | Student | 47 | -.20 | 1.02 | -1.56 | 123 | .12 | -.30 | -.67/.08 |
| | Professional | 78 | .10 | 1.03 | | | | | |
| Income | ≤ £10,000 | 59 | -.08 | 1.06 | .20 | 86 | .84 | .05 | -.42/.52 |
| | ≥ £30,001 | 29 | -.13 | 1.00 | | | | | |

Table 3: Frequency of awareness on CSR commitments and scandals of 21 sample companies

| No. | Apparel Company in the UK | Respondents who have shopped for a brand | Respondents' awareness of a brand's CSR commitments | Respondents' awareness of a brand's CSR scandals |
|-------|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Associated British Foods Plc (Primark) | 109 (79.6%) | 18 (13.1%) | 55 (40.1%) |
| 2 | Adidas Group | 69 (50.4%) | 10 (7.3%) | 17 (12.4%) |
| 3 | Abercrombie & Fitch Co. | 20 (14.6%) | 1 (0.7%) | 9 (6.6%) |
| 4 | Arcadia Group(TopShop) | 79 (57.7%) | 6 (4.4%) | 9 (6.6%) |
| 5 | Asos Plc. | 25 (18.2%) | 2 (1.5%) | 2 (1.5%) |
| 6 | Burberry Group Plc. | 16 (11.7%) | 3 (2.2%) | 4 (2.9%) |
| 7 | GAP Incorporated | 68 (49.6%) | 11 (8.0%) | 9 (6.6%) |
| 8 | H&M Hennes & Mauritz AB | 93 (67.9%) | 9 (6.6%) | 7 (5.1%) |
| 9 | The John David Group Plc. (JD) | 71 (51.8%) | 2 (1.5%) | 5 (3.6%) |
| 10 | Levi Strauss & Co | 32 (23.4%) | 2 (1.5%) | 3 (2.2%) |
| 11 | LVMH Fashion Group (Louis Vuitton Moet Hennessy) | 21 (15.3%) | 4 (2.9%) | 4 (2.9%) |
| 12 | Mango MNG Holding | 25 (18.2%) | 2 (1.5%) | 4 (2.9%) |
| 13 | Marks & Spencer Group Plc | 110 (80.3%) | 24 (17.5%) | 12 (8.8%) |
| 14 | New Look Retail Group Limited | 76 (55.5%) | 2 (1.5%) | 6 (4.4%) |
| 15 | Next Group Plc | 107 (78.1%) | 9 (6.6%) | 5 (3.6%) |
| 16 | Nike Inc. | 78 (56.9%) | 6 (4.4%) | 20 (14.6%) |
| 17 | Phillips-Van Heusen Corporation (CK) | 40 (29.2%) | 3 (2.2%) | 3 (2.2%) |
| 18 | Inditex Group (Gucci) | 31 (22.6%) | 4 (2.9%) | 2 (1.5%) |
| 19 | The TJX Companies Incorporated (Timeberland) | 31 (22.6%) | 2 (1.5%) | 4 (2.9%) |
| 20 | VF (Vanity Fair) Corporation (TKMaxx) | 84 (61.3%) | 3 (2.2%) | 3 (2.2%) |
| 21 | Pinault-Printemps-Redoute (PPR) Group (Zara) | 55 (40.1%) | 5 (3.6%) | 3(2.2%) |
| Total | | | 128 | 186 |

Table 4: CSR awareness-purchase behaviour of 21 apparel brands

| Brand CSR practices | Cells with expected count less than 5; minimum expected count | Chi-square value (df, sig) (Yates' Correction for Continuity) | Effect size (<i>Phi</i> Coefficient) |
|---------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Primark: | | | |
| Commitment | 1 cells (25%), 3.68; | .55 (1, 0.46) | .90 |
| 2. Adidas: | | | |
| Commitment | 1 cells (25%), 4.96; | 2.62 (1, 0.052) | .17 |
| 3. A&F: | | | |
| Commitment | 2cells (50%), .15; | 1.01 (1, 0.31) | .21 |
| 4. Topshop: | | | |
| Commitment | 2cells (50%), 2.54; | .00 (1, 0.97) | .04 |
| 5. Asos: | | | |
| Commitment | 2cells (50%), .36; | .06 (1, 0.80) | .10 |
| 6. Burberry: | | | |
| Commitment | 2cells (50%), .35; | 4.37 (1, 0.04*) | .26 |
| 7. GAP: | | | |
| Commitment | 0 cells, 5.46; | .00 (1, 0.98) | .03 |
| 8. H&M: | | | |
| Commitment | 1 cells (25%), 2.89; | .08 (1, 0.77) | .06 |
| 9. JDSport: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .96; | .00 (1, 1.0) | -.00 |
| 10. LeviStraus: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .47; | .00 (1, 0.96) | .08 |
| 11. LV: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .61; | .00 (1, 1.0) | .05 |
| 12. Mango: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .36; | .00 (1, 1.0) | -.06 |
| 13. M&S: | | | |
| Commitment | 1 cells (25%), 4.73; | 3.33 (1, 0.07) | .18 |
| 14. NewLook: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .89; | .48 (1, 0.49) | -.01 |
| 15. Next: | | | |
| Commitment | 1 cells (25%), 1.97; | 1.50 (1, 0.22) | .14 |
| 16. Nike: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), 2.58; | .84 (1, 0.36) | .1 |
| 17. CK: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .88; | .64 (1, 0.42) | .12 |
| 18. Gucci: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .91; | .00 (1, 1.0) | .01 |
| 19. Timberland: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), .45; | .01 (1, 0.94) | .08 |
| 20. TKMaxx: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), 1.16; | .63 (1, 0.43) | .12 |
| 21. Zara: | | | |
| Commitment | 2 cells (50%), 2.01; | 5.37 (1, 0.02*) | .24 |

Note: * significant at 0.95 confidence level (two-tailed).

Table 5: Pro-social priority on pro-social consumption

| Panel A: Priorities of main factors determining the purchase behaviour (frequency by percentage) | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------------|
| Priority rank | Price | Quality | Brand | Trend | Style | Comfort | CSR |
| 1st priority | 30.7 | 35.8 | 5.1 | 1.5 | 18.2 | 8.8 | 0 |
| 2 nd priority | 30 | 35.0 | 10.9 | 5.1 | 10.2 | 16.8 | 0 |
| 3 rd priority | 31 | 16.8 | 12.4 | 9.5 | 17.5 | 19.7 | 1.5 |
| 4 th priority | 17 | 5.8 | 19.0 | 9.5 | 21.2 | 24.1 | 8.0 |
| 5 th priority | 6 | 4.4 | 19.7 | 20.4 | 17.5 | 19.7 | 13.9 |
| 6 th priority | 9 | 2.2 | 25.5 | 34.3 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.9 |
| 7 th priority | 2 | 0 | 7.3 | 19.7 | 5.1 | 0.7 | 65.7 |

| Panel B: Effect of pro-social priority on pro-social consumption | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Linear regression | R square | Regression sig. | Coefficients (Beta) | Coefficient sig. | 95% intervals | confident |
| Pro-social priority → Pro-social consumption | .13 | .000 | .36 | .000 | .48, .19 | |

Note: For the test in Panel B, the dependent variable is pro-social consumption using the generated principal component from Table 1; the independent variable is pro-social priority: CSR priority ranks in Panel A from 1st to 7th are recoded into corresponding pro-social priority values, i.e., from 7 to 1.

References

- Abraham-Murali, L. and Mary, A. L. (1995), "Consumers' Conceptualization of Apparel Attributes", *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 65-74.
- Arrigo, E. (2013), "Corporate responsibility management in fast fashion companies: The Gap Inc. case", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 17 No 2, pp. 175-189.
- Auger, P., Burke, P., Devinney, T. and Louviere, J. (2003), "What will consumers pay for social product features"? *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 281-304.
- Bartley, T. (2007), "Institutional emergence in an era of globalization: The rise of transnational private regulation of labor and environmental conditions", *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 113 No. 2, pp.297-351.
- Belk, R. W., Devinney, T. and Eckhardt, G. (2005), "Consumer ethics across cultures". *Consumption Markets & Culture*, Vol.8 No. 3, pp.275-289.
- Bhattacharya, C. B. and Sen, S. (2002), "Consumer-company identification: A framework for understanding consumers' relationships with companies", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 66 No. 4, pp. 76-88.
- Bloomberg, (2012), "*M&S loses Britain's largest clothing retailer title to Next*", available at <<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-29/m-s-loses-britain-s-largest-clothing-retailer-title-to-next-1-.html>> (Accessed 21 March 2013).
- Bray, J., Johns, N. and Kilburn, D. (2011), "An exploratory study into the factors impeding ethical consumption", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 98 No. 4, pp. 597-608.
- Campbell, D. and Cowton, C. J. (2015), "Method issues in business ethics research: Finding credible answers to questions that matter". *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp.3-10.
- Carrington, M., Neville, B. and Whitwell, G. (2010), "Why ethical consumers don't walk their talk: Towards a framework for understanding the gap between the ethical purchase intentions and actual buying behaviour of ethically minded consumers", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 97 No. 1, pp.139-158.

- Carrington, M., Neville, B. and Whitwell, G. (2014), "Lost in translation: Exploring the ethical consumer intention-behavior gap", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 1, pp. 2759-2767.
- Carroll, A.B. (1979), "A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp.497-505.
- Carroll, A.B. (1991), "The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders", *Business Horizons*, Vol.34 No.4, pp.39-48.
- Carroll, A. and Shabana, K. (2010), "The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research and practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*", Vol.12 No. 1, pp. 85-105.
- Caruana, R. and Chatzidakis, A. (2014), 'Consumer social responsibility (CnSR): Toward a multi-level, multi-agent conceptualization of the "other CSR"', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.121 No. 4, pp.577-592.
- Cohn and Wolfe. (2011), "*The 2011 green brand survey*", available at <<http://www.cohnwolfe.com/en/ideas-insights/white-papers/green-brandssurvey-2011>> (Accessed 5 March 2013).
- Connell, K. Y. H. (2010), "Internal and external barriers to eco-conscious apparel acquisition", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp.279-286.
- D'Astous, A. and Legendre, A. (2009), "Understanding consumers' ethical justifications: A scale for appraising consumers' reasons for not behaving ethically", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 87 No. 2, pp.255-268.
- Dickson, M.A. (2005), "Identifying and profiling apparel label users". In R. Harrison, T. Newholm, and D. Shaw (Eds.), *The Ethical Consumer*, Thousand Oaks, London, pp.155-171.
- Divirgilio, A. (2013), "10 most luxurious billion dollar brands of 2013", available at <<http://www.therichest.com/expensive-lifestyle/fashion/10-most-luxurious-billion-dollar-brands-of-2013>> (Accessed 5 May 2014).
- Donaldson, T. and Preston, L.E. (1995), "The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 20 No. 1, pp. 65-91.
- Du, S.,Bhattacharya, C.B. and Sen, S. (2011), "Corporate social responsibility and competitive advantage: Overcoming the trust barrier", *Management Science*, Vol.57 No. 9,pp.1528-1545.

- Eckman, M., Damhorst, M.L. and Kadolph, S J. (1990), "Towards a model of the in-store purchase decision process: Consumer use of criteria for evaluating women's apparel". *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp.13-22.
- Ferreira, A.I and Ribeiro, I. (2017), "Are you willing to pay the price? The impact of corporate social (ir) responsibility on consumer behavior towards national and foreign brands". *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp.63–71.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984), "*A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation*". Mc-Graw Hill, Singapore.
- Freeman, R., Wicks, A. and Parmar, B. (2004), 'Stakeholder theory and "the corporate objective revisited"', *Organization Science*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp.364-369.
- Freestone, O. and Mcgoldrick, P. (2008), "Motivations of the ethical consumer", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 79 No. 4, pp.445-467.
- Goworek, H. (2011), "Social and environmental sustainability in the clothing industry: A case study of a fair trade retailer", *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp.74 – 86.
- Grimmer, M. and Miles, M.P. (2017), "With the best of intentions: a large sample test of the intention-behaviour gap in pro-environmental consumer behaviour", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp.2-10.
- Groza, M., Pronschinske, M. and Walker, M. (2011), "Perceived organizational motives and consumer responses to proactive and reactive CSR", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 102 No. 4, pp.639-652.
- Gupta, M. and Hodges, N. (2012), "Corporate Social Responsibility in the apparel industry", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol 16 No 2, pp.216-233.
- Harris, F., Roby, H. and Dibb, S. (2016), "Sustainable clothing: challenges, barriers and interventions for encouraging more sustainable consumer behaviour", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 40 No 3, pp.309-318.
- Janssen, C. and Vanhamme, J. (2015), "Theoretical lenses for understanding the CSR- consumer paradox", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 130 No 4, pp.775-787.
- Joergens, C. (2006), "Ethical fashion: Myth or future trend"? *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol 10 No. 3, pp.360-371.

- Kolkailah, S.K., Aish,E.A. and El-Bassiouny,N.E. (2012), “The impact of corporate social responsibility initiatives on consumers’ behavioural intentions in the Egyptian market”, *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp.369-384.
- Koszevska, M. (2013), “A typology of Polish consumers and their behaviours in the market for sustainable textiles and clothing”, *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol.37 No. 5, pp.507-521.
- Kozar, J. M. & Connell, Y. H. (2011), “Socially and environmentally responsible apparel consumption: knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors”, *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp.316-325.
- Lee, M.P. (2008), “A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol.10 No. 1, pp.53-73.
- Lee, M.S.W., Fernandez, K.V. and Hyman, M.R. (2009), “Anti-consumption: An overview and research agenda”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp.145-147.
- Lenne, O. D. and Vandenbosch, L. (2017), “Media and sustainable apparel buying intention”, *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No 4, pp. 483-498.
- Lewis, T. and Potter, E. (2011) *Ethical consumption: a critical introduction*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Look (2013), “*Look, Britain's Best Selling Fashion Magazine*”, available at <http://www.look.co.uk/fashion-brands> (Accessed 02 January 2013).
- Mohr, L., Webb, D. and Harris, K. (2001), “Do consumers expect companies to be socially responsible? The impact of corporate social responsibility on buying behaviour”, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol.35 No.1, pp.45-72.
- Mohr, L.A. and Webb, D.J. (2005), “The effects of corporate social responsibility and price on consumer responses”, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp.121-147.
- Mohr, M. and Schlich, M. (2016), “Socio-demographic basic factors of German customers as predictors for sustainable consumerism regarding foodstuffs and meat products”, *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 40 No.2, pp.158–167.

- Moraes, C., Carrigan, M. and Szmigin, I. (2012), "The coherence of inconsistencies: Attitude-behaviour gaps and new consumption communities", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol.28 No.1-2, pp.103-128.
- Mujtaba, B., Cavico, F. and Jones, C. (2005), "Global labor practices and corporate social responsibility", *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, Vol. 4 No.9, p p.1-10.
- Öberseder, M., Schlegelmilch, B. and Gruber, V. (2011), "'Why don't consumers care about CSR?": A qualitative study exploring the role of CSR in consumption decisions', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 104 No. 4, pp.449-460.
- Pallant, J. (2010), "*SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*" (4th Ed.) Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Panzone, L., Hilton, D., Sale, L. and Cohen, D. (2016), "Socio-demographics, implicit attitudes, explicit attitudes, and sustainable consumption in supermarket shopping", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol.55, pp.77-95.
- Park, J., Lee, H. and Kim, C. (2014), "Corporate social responsibilities, consumer trust and corporate reputation: South Korean consumers' perspectives", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.67 No. 3, pp.295-302.
- Phau, I., Teah, M. and Chuah, J. (2012), "Consumer attitudes towards luxury fashion apparel made in sweatshops", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol 19 No. 2, pp.169-187.
- Pomeroy, A. and Dolnicar, S. (2009), "Assessing the prerequisite of successful CSR implementation: Are consumers aware of CSR initiatives"? *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.85 No. 2, pp.285-301.
- Reputation Institute, (2012), "*2012-Global RepTrak™ 100 The World's Most Reputable Companies*", available at:http://www.rankingthebrands.com/PDF/2012%20RepTrak%20100-Global_Report,%20Reputation%20Institute.pdf (accessed 13 January 2013).
- Romani, S., Grappi, S. and Bagozzi, R. P. (2016), "Corporate socially responsible initiatives and their effects on consumption of green products", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp.253.

- Salazar, HA. and Oerlemans, L. (2016), "Do we follow the leader or the masses? Antecedents of the willingness to pay extra for eco- products", *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol.50 No. 2, pp.286-314.
- Sarkis, N. and Daou, L. (2013), "Giving back to the community, an obligation or an option today?"—Case of the educational sector in Lebanon', *International Strategic Management Review*, Vol.1 No. 1-2, pp.59-64.
- Schlaile, M.P., Klein, K. and Bock, W. (2016), "From bounded morality to consumer social responsibility: A transdisciplinary approach to socially responsibility consumption and its obstacles", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.11 No.1, pp.119-142.
- Schuz, M. (2012), "Sustainable corporate responsibility - The foundation of successful business in the new millenium", *Central European Business Review*, Vol.1 No. 2, pp.7-15.
- Schwartz, S. H. and Bilsky, W. (1987), "Toward a universal psychological structure of human values", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.53, No. 3, pp.550-562.
- Sen, S., Bhattacharya, C. and Korschun, D. (2006), "The role of corporate social responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: A field experiment", *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, Vol.34 No.2, pp.158-166.
- Shaw, D. and Clarke, I. (1999), "Belief formation in ethical consumer groups: An exploratory study", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol.17 No.2, pp.109-120.
- Shen, B., Wang, Y., Lo, C.K.Y. and Shum, M. (2012), "The impact of ethical fashion on consumer purchase behaviour", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp.234-245
- Snider, J., Hill, R. and Martin, D. (2003), "Corporate social responsibility in the 21st century: A view from the world's most successful firms", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.48 No.2, pp.175-187.
- Song, S. and Ko, E. (2017), "Perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors towards sustainable fashion: Application of Q and Q-R methodologies", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol.41 No.3, pp.264-273.
- Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2014), "*Using multivariate statistics*", (6th Ed., Pearson new International edition). Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.

- Webb, D.J., Mohr, L.A. and Harris, K.E. (2008), “A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.61 No.2, pp.91-98.
- Wesley, S.C., Lee, M. and Kim, E.Y. (2012), “The role of perceived consumer effectiveness and motivational attitude on socially responsible purchasing behavior in South Korea”, *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol.25 No.1, pp.29-44.
- White, K., MacDonnell, R. and Ellard, J.H. (2012), “Belief in a just world: Consumer intentions and behaviors toward ethical products”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.76 No. 1, pp.103-118.
- Yeow, P., Dean, A. and Tucker, D. (2014). “Bags for life: The embedding of ethical consumerism”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.125 No.1, pp.87-99.
-

¹ Burberry, Louis Vuitton, and Gucci were selected from 21 companies as luxury fashion brands. This was based on the list “10 Most Luxurious Billion Dollar Brands of 2013” (Divirgilio, 2013). H&M, Mango, New Look, Next, and Zara were selected as fast fashion brands based on our expertise in fashion research.

² To save space, we do not present these test results. They are available upon request.