UC Berkeley

Working Paper Series

Title
Consumer Ethics Across Cultures

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/08h9j3f4

Authors
Belk, Russell
Devinney, Timothy
Eckhardt, Giana

Publication Date
2005-03-01

Peer reviewed

Consumer Ethics Across Cultures

Russell Belk

Timothy Devinney

Giana Eckhardt*

*Russell Belk is N. Eldon Tanner Professor of Marketing at University of Utah, mktrwb@business.utah.edu. Timothy Devinney is Professor of Management at the Australian Graduate School of Management, t.devinney@agsm.edu.au. Giana Eckhardt is Senior Lecturer of Marketing at the Australian Graduate School of Management, gianae@agsm.edu.au. The authors are listed alphabetically; all three contributed equally. This research was funded by an Australian Research Council grant.

Consumer Ethics Across Cultures

While some attention has been paid in the marketing literature to unethical consumer behaviors like shoplifting, credit card fraud, and vandalism (e.g., Abelson 1989; Fullerton and Punj 1997, 2004; Jolson 1974; Moschis and Cox 1989) and occasional attention has been given to consumer boycotts of companies whom they deem to be acting unethically (e.g., Friedman 1999; Garrett 1987; John and Klein 2001; Klein, Smith, and John 2002), relatively little attention has been given to how ethical considerations in consumption are thought about by consumers. Indeed, what work that has been done has revealed little linkage between underlying theory and actual behavior (Srnka 2004).

Ethical consumer choices can involve purchasing from firms and nations whose behaviors and products are deemed ethical, as well as avoiding patronizing those deemed to engage in unethical practices. Ethical issues can involve worker treatment, fair-trade food, genetically modified food, environmental concerns, human rights, anti-competitive practices, racial or gender discrimination, and other such issues (Michletti 2003).

There is a movement for ethical goods and services in the United Kingdom, but despite as much as a 40% market share for some ethical product choices like range free eggs and energy saving appliances, the overall market share for ethical goods is estimated at under 2 percent (www.neweconomics.org/gen/z_sys_PublicationDetail.aspx?PID=172). A general answer to the question of how much influence ethical considerations have on consumer choice is "not much" (Miller and Studivant 1977; Shaw, Shiu, and Clark 2000; Smith 1990, 2001; Uusitalo and Oksanen 2004). For example, due to pressure from NGOs, Starbucks began offering Fair Trade coffee in its stores in 2001, but has

discovered that consumer demand is low, even in Europe where consumer awareness

about Fair Trade coffee is higher than in the US (Argenti 2004).

A comprehensive reading of the literature reveals little as to the reasoning and

justifications behind why consumers would or would not act in an ethical manner in a

consumption situation. What is particularly apparent is the extent of disconnect between

the issues consumers claim to care about when surveyed and their purchasing behavior

(Auger and Devinney 2005). To investigate this issue more deeply we engaged in an

interpretive research effort concentrating on the foundations of consumer ethics. In

particular, we sought to understand this in the broader international context by

undertaking this study with consumers in eight countries: China, India, Turkey, Australia,

the USA, Germany, Sweden and Spain. This span of countries represents a wide variation

in terms of level of economic development and cultural orientation. The video describes

the varying rationales consumers use as they explain their beliefs on a variety of ethical

issues and their consumption behavior in a variety of product categories. This

accompanying paper lays down the conceptual foundations needed to interpret the results,

outlines the methodology used, and discusses the implications of the rationales used for

consumer ethics theory.

Culture and consumer ethics:

How does culture affect ethical purchasing rationale?

With the collapse of Enron, WorldCom, and Arthur Andersen in the US and numerous examples of ethical and governance transgressions elsewhere, there has been noticeable heightening of the thought given to the actual and supposed role of ethics in business. Commensurate with this concern has been a rise in the part that the ethical stance of business plays in determining consumer product choice and the nature of the way in which consumers make decisions about products of firms with differing ethical positions. Yet despite this interest, there is no definitive understanding of the extent to which consumer choice is affected by ethical positioning or how consumers deal with the ethical conflicts embedded within many of their fundamental purchasing decisions.

Moreover, with globalization taking center stage in the business world, there is also a need to understand how ethical interpretations and behavior may differ in various consumer markets around the world. To address these issues, we conducted and videotaped depth interviews with consumers in eight countries focusing on the rationales they used to justify the ethical conflicts that may arise in their consumption activities. We recorded their elaborated thoughts, elicited through their responses to three different consumption scenarios involving ethical choice dilemmas. We sought to learn how much, if at all, they thought these issues are, or should be, connected to their own purchasing behavior.

The video details the rationales consumers in a wide variety of cultures use to explain and justify both their ethical stances and their consumption behavior. Our concern is with whether and how perceptions of consumption ethics differ between varying populations, and whether any universal factors that exist across cultures can be

identified. Understanding the nature of consumer ethical rationales may lead us to better understanding how to bridge the disconnect between beliefs and behavior. The themes raised in the video suggest that, consistent with other recent studies, ethical beliefs are not based on one's socioeconomic position in society, and that culture has less effect on perceptions of consumption ethics than we expected. The middle class respondents from India and Germany, for example, have very different responses and understandings of the scenarios presented to them, yet their overall evaluations as to whether their consumption behavior is ethical or not is remarkably similar. Specifically, the video outlines the connection between producer ethics and consumer ethics as perceived by our respondents, and more generally outlines the lack of concern among most of our informants to some of the most visible consumer ethics issues discussed in the global media today.

Although the video illustrates our results, this paper details the conceptual foundations needed for understanding the complexities of the interaction between culture and consumer ethics and behavior. We also describe the methodology used in the study and outline how the results contribute to consumer ethics theory.

Conceptual Foundations

Consumer ethics – what do we know so far? Studies of the ethical dimension of consumer decision-making are nothing new. The non-academic literature has almost exclusively been concerned with creating justification for a position that ethics matter (e.g., Christian Aid Abroad 2002). The academic literature has focused on many issues related to ethical consumerism such as the willingness of consumers to benefit from questionable actions (Al-Khatib, Vitell and Rawwas 1997; Vitell 2003; Vitell and

Paolillo 2003), consumer reaction to ethical transgressions by sellers (Whalen, Pitts and

Wong 1991; Pitts, Wong and Whalen 1991), the perception of company ethics and

product purchasing (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001), the willingness of consumers to pay for

socially acceptable products (Auger, Burke, Devinney, and Louvier 2003, 2004a,b;

Elliott and Freeman 2001), and the emergence of and reasons for consumer boycotts of

business organizations (John and Klein 2003; Klein, Smith and John 2002), to name only

a limited set. In addition, the literature is replete with studies measuring responsible

consumer behavior (Roberts 1996) or attitudes and intentions to purchase specific ethical

products, such as environmentally safe products (Belk, Painter, and Semenik 1981;

Manrai, Manrai, Lascu, and Ryans 1997).

One can summarize this literature in a host of ways and there is a great deal of

inconsistency in the findings (see Srnka 2004 for a comprehensive review). However, a

few generalities do arise.

First, there is little doubt that ethically orientated consumers do exist. Where the

literature differs is in estimating the size and composition of this group and whether or

not it is mainly situational; i.e., specific to the product or purchase environment, for

instance. For example, Roberts (1996), using a simple 18-item scale, came to the

conclusion that: (1) non-ethical consumers exist (only 39 per cent of respondents

indicated no ethical concerns); (2) very little of the variance on his scale is related to

demographic variables; and (3) the relationship between expressed environmental and

social concern and active consumer action is weak. In a more comprehensive set of

studies examining consumer choice of products with socially embedded attributes (e.g.,

environmental issues relating to biodegradability and work related issues such as child

labor) in multiple countries, Auger et al. (2003, 2004a,b) showed that clusters of "responsible" consumers do exist but that predicting who is in these clusters is difficult ex ante based on observable characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, education, and so on. The most important predictor of future ethical behavior is past behavior relating to social causes, such as being involved with a social cause group like Amnesty International. Auger and Devinney (2005) show that general ethical attitude surveys or even surveys intent on measuring consumption ethics are almost completely unrelated to actual behaviour.

Second, ethical behavior can be affected by the nature of the product and the price that is paid. Auger et al. (2003, 2004a) show that for two sets of products categories, consumer heterogeneity exists in terms of price sensitivity with respect to a host of environmental and labor rights issues embedded in products. For low-price, low-involvement products (bath soaps) more price sensitive consumers were less ethically orientated. For high-price, high-involvement products (athletic shoes) there was no relationship between price sensitivity and ethical attribute sensitivity. Elliott and Freeman (2001) found relatively high price elasticity of demand for products made under bad labor conditions but low price elasticity for products made under good conditions, implying that companies can potentially lose from having their products identified as being made under bad conditions but have little to gain from marketing their products as being made under good conditions. These results are supported by Folkes and Kamins (1999) who found that the attitudes of consumers toward an organization were more affected by unethical behavior than by pro-social behavior. That is, pro-social behavior did not compensate for an inferior product, but unethical behavior had a significant

impact on attitudes even if the product had superior features. Bhattacharya and Sen (2004) report similar results that they characterize as doing bad hurting more than doing good helping in terms of consumer evaluation of corporate CSR behavior.

Third, individuals react to personal costs and rewards. Osterhus (1997) studied the influence of seven key constructs (personal cost, personal benefit, personal norms, social norms, attribution of responsibility, awareness of consequences, and trust), and developed a model that blended normative, structural and economic factors to predict pro-social consumer behavior. His two main finding of importance here were that normative influences do not automatically translate into behavior (consistent with Roberts 1996) and people are strongly influenced by personal costs and rewards. These findings are reinforced by Tan (2002) who investigated the purchase of pirated software and found nearly identical results.

Consumer ethics – how may culture be important? Because ethics are a part of culture, to study ethical choices without explicitly considering the cultural context is not realistic. Differing cultural reactions to consumption practices would be expected to occur, not only because moral values are socially and culturally constructed, but also because there are cultural differences in social roles, gender roles, institutional structures, welfare expectations, laws, and traditional rights, privileges, and obligations. In other words, culture filters our perceptions of what constitutes good or responsible consumption and what are perceived to be the consequences of violating these moral norms. Due to varying conceptions of what is good for the individual and what is good for society, the judgment of what constitutes an ethical breach in the first place would be expected to vary greatly depending on cultural orientation.

Although a host of studies have examined the impact of culture on ethical positioning, most of these studies have focused on attitudinal or intention to purchase differences (e.g., Singhapakdi, Vitell, and Leelakulthanit 1994; Al-Khatib, Vitell and Rawwas 1997). As noted by Auger et al. (2004b), there is a fundamental flaw in these studies as they exacerbate small differences and suffer from scale inequivalence problems. These issues arise mainly from the fact that these studies invariably seek out differences between predetermined groups. Using a series of what are known as best-worst experiments, Auger et al. (2004b) show that there is more variance between individuals within a single country than between different countries when it comes the ordering of their preferences about 16 different social issues ranging from human, gender, labor, and sexual rights to recycling, biodegradability and animal testing.

In interpretive work, Ger and Belk (1999) studied perceptions of and behaviors regarding materialism in the U.S., Turkey, Romania, and Western Europe. They found that while those in each area condemned materialism as a shallow, asocial, and ultimately unrewarding consumption orientation, most also wanted higher salaries, better housing, a nice car, and other materialistic goods and services. What differed by culture was the manner in which these behaviors were justified in light of their condemnation of materialism. They used various accounts, consisting of justifications or excuses to explain their behavior. Americans felt they deserved more because of their hard work and cleverness. Romanians also felt they deserved more, but based more on their relative deprivation under years of Communism. Although some older Turks felt they couldn't realistically desire anything materially, most felt they needed more and justified it as being for their children and family. And Western Europeans condemned gadget-loving

Americans as being the real materialists, while they themselves had the good taste to spend their money well on good food, good wine, fine music, and enriching travel; this, they said, isn't materialistic at all. Thus each culture found a way to make their own materialistic behavior seem sensible and reasonable, in spite of their condemnation of materialism.

This implies that while there may not be much cultural variance with regards to preferences of social issues, there may be cultural variation in the rationales consumers use with regards to the ethical dimension of their consumption patterns. Thus, we need to tease out the intricacies of whether and how much culture may have an influence on ethical consumerism. To that end, we employ interpretive methods as a means of decomposing the meaning and influence of ethics in consumption choices. Interpretive methods are capable of uncovering paradoxes in thoughts and behavior, and revealing the nature and structure of consumer rationales and justifications (e.g., Ger and Belk 1999), making them especially appropriate for examining this situation wherein people's stated attitudes and behaviors differ. Moreover, this approach allows us to examine the holistic influence of culture, rather than utilizing particular reductionist dimensions of culture.

Methodology

We conducted approximately hour-long depth interviews with twenty consumers each in eight countries. During these interviews, informants were presented with three scenarios each, addressing qualitatively different consumer ethics situations. One scenario involves the ethicality of purchasing counterfeit products, one involves purchase of a popular athletic shoe manufactured under conditions of worker exploitation, and the final scenario involves the ethicality and purchase behavior for a product that is

potentially harmful to the environment or that uses animal by-products and animal testing. See Appendix 1 for the text of the scenarios used.

Using scenarios to elicit open-ended responses is recommended as a way of getting at hidden cultural meanings (Triandis 1995). This methodology has also been noted for revealing the process of the development of cultural meanings, not just the meanings themselves (Greenfield 1997). Giving respondents specific situations to respond to avoids the problem of asking consumers their views a-contextually, which in many cultures does not lead to meaningful responses (Eckhardt 2004). Additionally, it allows respondents to link up their abstract thoughts on various ethical issues to their consumption behavior in each context.

The questions asked of the participants after they read each scenario began in a projective manner and then later narrowed down to more specific queries. The projective questions asked the respondents to tell the interviewer how they thought people from their country would respond to the issue involved in a scenario. See Appendix 2 for the semi-structured interview guide. The use of projective techniques is regarded as especially desirable when dealing with sensitive subject matter and topics that might lead to socially desirable but inaccurate answers in more direct questioning (Belk, Ger, and Askegaard 2003; Rook 1988, 2001).

Two versions of each scenario were created. Manipulations in the scenarios involve: (1) the type of ethical breach—environmental or animal related, (2) male or female worker-related, and (3) trademark infringement on either a big ticket or small ticket item. The combination of the 2nd and 3rd scenarios contrasted the country of origin of the corporations involved—First or Third World. One version of each scenario was

shown to an informant, with the version systematically rotated over informants. That is, manipulations were partly within subjects and partly across subjects. This enabled us to see how these various types of ethical evaluations are interpreted both by the same respondent as well as by informants in various different cultures.

Important characteristics that differ over the scenarios include how likely important others were to know about the purchase and the ethical issues surrounding it. This is especially important, in that in some cultures both the nature of the people presented in the scenarios (e.g., whether they are of higher, lower, equal, or peripheral status to the focal person) as well as the social (face) implications, are of potential importance in developing rationales for perceived ethicality of products.

All responses were audio and video recorded in digital video format in the native language and dialect of each locale, and later translated into English, when needed. In some cases, an audio version of the English translation was recorded onto the second audio track of the mini-DV tapes. In other cases, the translation was produced in written transcript form only. Thus, some of the interviews in the video are dubbed, while others are translated into text. This depended on the technological capabilities available in each locale.

We hired market researchers or research assistants in each locale to assist in the data collection, with one of three authors supervising the process in each location, and with some overlap between the three authors for triangulation purposes. At least one of the authors conducted an extensive, day long training session with the local qualitative researcher, who would conduct the interviews in each non-English speaking country. This was to ensure identical procedures were followed in all locations, with the same

instructions given to all participants. In Australia and the US, interviews were conducted

by one of the authors. In order to build rapport with informants as well as provide

additional material for a contextualized understanding, interviews began with "grand

tour" questions about the informant's background before turning to the scenarios

(McCracken 1988).

To maximize cultural variance, we chose informants from developed and

emerging markets in a variety of cultures from both the East and West. These markets

also have substantial overlap with the locales used by Auger et al. (2003a, 2004b),

allowing for comparisons between their results and ours. Those selected in each country

were high school graduates ranging in age from 20 to 60, with an equal proportion of

men and women. These ranges comprise the target market for the goods in the three

scenarios. Respondents were from major urban areas in each country, with the sample

reflecting the ethnicity and religions of the nation as well as varying socioeconomic

levels. See Table 1 for a summary of the purposive sampling criteria.

After discussing the 'grand tour' questions with the researcher, respondents were

presented with each of the three scenarios, one at a time. Which version of each scenario

was given to the respondents was determined randomly. The order of the scenarios

presented was rotated within each group of 20 to ensure there were no order effects.

The analysis of the transcripts and videos was qualitative and hermeneutic

(Arnold and Fischer 1994; Thompson 1997; Thompson, Pollio, and Locander 1994). All

of the authors participated in the interpretive process, first individually and then in unison

in order to leverage our own differing cultural and individual differences (Belk et al.

2003). Each author first analyzed the responses from the interviews at which s/he either

conducted or supervised. Then all of the authors compared and contrasted the analyses across countries in an iterative process to reach the themes presented in the video.

Discussion

As is evident from the excerpts of interviews seen in the video, consumers are not generally very concerned with the ethical issues raised in the scenarios and are ill informed to a great extent. This is surprising in that in previous studies consumers would typically give lip service to being concerned about the issues, even if they were not willing to expend any effort to purchase in line with their beliefs, such as by paying more for ethical products for example. Evidently the ease of marking a socially desirable answer on a questionnaire is greater than adopting a false posture in an hour-long depth interview. Some consumers do bring ethical concerns into their product choices, but most would rather have a good product at a good price, regardless of who makes it, the conditions of workers, the uses made of animals, or issues of copyright versus counterfeit. Many consumers from the more affluent countries offered a justification involving ethical abuses by multinational corporations that make these goods. Corporations were said to be out only for profits, and they were described as not caring for the workers, consumers, or natural resources harmed in this pursuit. In citing prominent cases of corporate abuse, like Enron, consumers invoked the argument that since sellers don't care about what is right, why should they? Some consumers, from both more affluent and less affluent countries, also claimed that the prices charged by companies like Nike and Louis Vuitton are immoral. While some of these arguments may be excuses for pursuing their own perceived interests as consumers, a link between producer ethics and consumer ethics does exist in our data.

Culture influences these justifications and ethical stances less than we anticipated, although the lack of cultural influence is in line with the results found by Auger et al. (2004b, 2005). At least among the middle class informants studied, even those in less affluent countries where worker abuse is more likely are not very upset by the ethical issues raised in the scenarios. Although some informants in these countries said that they had seen such ethical abuses and were angered by them, others said it was simply the way of the world. Informants from the more affluent world often offered an additional justification for their attitudes and behavior by saying that the problems that exist in the less affluent world are far away from them and their lives. When they did care it was often because of recently aired investigative reporting by the media that brought these dilemmas to their attention in a vivid and concrete manner.

This suggests that at least some consumers can be made to bring ethical factors into their choices, but that they are not likely to do so without help. This does not imply, however, that if everyone could be made aware of the issues that they would then bring ethical factors into their product choices. As Auger et al. (2003, 2004a,b) have shown, the best predictor of future ethical behavior is past association with ethical groups such as Amnesty International. If consumers who have had these affiliations in the past can be identified and targeted for education, these would be the consumers we could envision changing their choice structure in the future.

Our findings also suggest that better ethical behavior on the part of business can influence ethical behavior on the part of consumers. This suggests that rather than consumers pulling businesses forward in terms of ethical behavior, it may be the other way around. It is interesting to contrast this finding – that consumers are waiting to

follow the ethical example of businesses before they alter their own behavior – with the findings discussed earlier whereby companies have little to gain by promoting themselves as acting in an ethical or prosocial manner (Elliott and Freeman 2001; Folkes and Kamins 1999). Consumer ethical attitudes and willingness to pay may be affected by unethical behavior on the part of businesses, but ethical behavior on the part of business has minimal impact on consumers. Moreover, given consumer citations of prominent corporate ethical scandals like Enron, even when an entire industry behaves in an ethical manner, this may not be enough to spur consumers to make ethical choices themselves, because they can always find an exemplar of bad business ethics elsewhere.

In sum, our results have highlighted the importance of consumer rationales as realized in an emic fashion for understanding the reasons behind the disconnect between people's ethical thought processes and their consumption behavior. Hopefully this understanding can lead toward a more comprehensive theory on the nature and structure of consumer ethics.

Table 1. Respondent details

Country	Cities used within country
Australia	Sydney
China	Beijing and Shanghai
Germany	Hamburg
India	Mumbai and Hyderabad
Spain	Madrid
Sweden	Gøteborg
Turkey	Istanbul and Ankara
USA	Salt Lake City

Note: In countries with two cities, each city had 10 respondents each. In countries with one city, all twenty respondents came from that city.

References

Abelson, Elaine. 1989. *When Ladies Go A-Thieving: Middle Class Shoplifters in the Victorian Department Store.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Al-Khatib, Jamal A., Scoff J. Vitell, and Mohammed Y. A. Rawwas. 1997. Consumer Ethics: A Cross–cultural Investigation. *European Journal of Marketing* 31(11/12): 750–67.

Argenti, Paul A. 2004. Collaborating with activists: How Starbucks works with NGOs. *California Management Review* 47(1): 91-116.

Arnold, Stephan .J. and Eileen Fisher. 1994. Hermeneutics and Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research* 21: 55–70.

Auger, Pat, Paul Burke, Timothy M. Devinney, and Jordan J. Louviere. 2003. What Will Consumers Pay for Social Product Features? *Journal of Business Ethics* 42(3): 281–304.

Auger, Pat, Paul Burke, Timothy M. Devinney, and Jordan J. Louviere. 2004a. Consumer Assessment of Social Product Features: An Empirical Investigation Using Choice Experiments. Unpublished working paper.

Auger, Pat, Timothy M. Devinney and Jordan J. Louviere. 2004b. Consumer Social Beliefs: An International Investigation Using Best-Worst Scaling Methodology. Unpublished working paper.

Auger, Pat, and Timothy M. Devinney. 2005. Do What Consumers Say Matter? Unpublished working paper.

Belk, Russell W., Guliz Ger and Soren Askegaard. 2003. The Fire of Desire: A

Multisited Inquiry into Consumer Passion. *Journal of Consumer Research* 30 (3): 326-351.

Belk, Russell W., John Painter, and Richard Semenik. 1981. Preferred Solutions to the Energy Crisis as a Function of Causal Attributions. *Journal of Consumer Research* 8 (December): 306-312.

Bhate, Seema and Kevin Lawler. 1997. Environmentally Friendly Products: Factors That Influence Their Adoption. *Technovation* 17(8): 457–65.

Bhattacharya, C.B. and Sankar Sen. 2004. Doing better at doing good: When, why and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review* 47(1): 9-24.

Christian Aid Abroad. 2002. *Behind the Mask: The Real Face of Corporate Social Responsibility*. London.

Eckhardt, Giana M. 2004. The role of culture in conducting trustworthy and credible qualitative business research in China. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for International Business,* Catherine Welch and Rebecca Piekkari (eds.). Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar: 402-420.

Elliott, Kimberly Anne and Richard B. Freeman. 2001. *White Hats or Don Quixotes? Human Rights Vigilantes in the Global Economy.* Cambridge MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Folkes, Valerie S. and Michael A. Kamins. 1999. Effects of Information About Firms' Ethical and Unethical Actions on Consumers' Attitudes. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 8(3): 243–259.

Friedman, Monroe. 1999. *Consumer Boycotts.* New York: Routledge.

Fullerton, Ronald and G. Punj. 1997. The Unintended Consequences of the Culture of

    Consumption: An Historical-Theoretical Analysis of Consumer Misbehavior.

    Consumption, Markets and Culture 1(3): 1-31.

Fullerton, Ronald and G. Punj. 2004. Repurcussions of Promoting an Ideology of

    Consumption: Consumer Misbehavior. *Journal of Business Research* 57 (November):

    1239-1249.

Garrett, Dennis E. 1987. The Effectiveness of Marketing Policy Boycotts: Environmental

    Opposition to Marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 51 (April): 46-57.

Ger, Guliz and Russell Belk. 1999. Accounting for Materialism in Four Cultures. *Journal*

    of Material Culture 4 (July): 183–204.

Greenfield, Patricia A. 1997. Culture as process: Empirical methods for cultural

    psychology. In *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2nd Edition: Volume 1 -*

    Theory and Method, eds. J.W. Berry, Y.H. Poortinga and J. Pandey. Boston: Allyn

    and Bacon: 301–346.

Jolson, Marvin A. 1974. Consumers as Offenders. *Journal of Business Research*

    2(January): 89-98.

John, Andrew and Jill G. Klein. 2003. The Boycott Puzzle: Consumer Motivations for

    Purchase Sacrifice. *Management Science* 49(9): 1196–209.

Klein, Jill G., N. Craig Smith, and Andrew John. 2002. Exploring Motivations for

    Participation in a Consumer Boycott. *Advances in Consumer Research* 29(1): 363–69.

Manrai, Lalita A., Ajay K. Manrai, Dana-Nicoleta Lascu, and John R. Ryans Jr. 1997. How Green-Claim Strength and Country Disposition Affect Product Evaluation and Company Image. *Psychology and Marketing* 14 (5): 511–37.

McCracken, Grant. 1988. *The Long Interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Micheletti, Michelle. 2003. Voting By Shopping: Shopping as Political Activity. *Axess*, 9 (http://www.axess.se/english/archive/2003/nr9/current issue/theme_shopping.php).

Miller, Kenneth and Frederick Sturdivant. 1977. Consumer Responses to Socially Questionable Corporate Behavior: An Empirical Test. *Journal of Consumer Research* 4(June): 1-7.

Moschis, George and Dena Cox. 1989. Deviant Consumer Behavior. *Advances in Consumer Research* Vol. 16: 732-737.

Osterhus, Thomas L. 1997. Pro-Social Consumer Influence Strategies: When and How Do They Work? *Journal of Marketing* 61(4): 16–29.

Pitts, Robert E., John K. Wong, and D. Joel Whalen. 1991. Consumers' Evaluative Structures in Two Ethical Situations: A Means-End Approach. *Journal of Business Research* 22(2): 119–30.

Roberts, James A. 1996. Will the Real Socially Responsible Consumer Please Step Forward? *Business Horizons* 39(1): 79–83.

Rook, Dennis. 2001. Typology of Projective Techniques. In *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol 28, M.C. Gilly & J. Myers-Levy, eds. Valdosta: Association for Consumer Research: 253.

Rook, Dennis. 1988. Researching Consumer Fantasy. In *Research in Consumer Behavior*, Vol. 3, J. Sheth & E. Hirschman, eds. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press: 247–270.

Sen, Sankar and C. B. Bhattacharya. 2001. Does Doing Good Always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research* 38(May): 225–43.

Shaw, Deirdre, Edward Shiu, and Ian Clarke. 2000. The Contribution of Ethical Obligations and Self-Identity to the Theory of Planned Behaviour: An Exploration of Ethical Consumers. *Journal of Marketing Management* 16: 879-894.

Singhapakdi, Anusorn, Scott J. Vitell, and Orose Leelakulthanit. 1994. A Cross-Cultural Study of Moral Philosophies, Ethical Perceptions and Judgments. *International Marketing Review* 11(6): 65–78.

Srnka, Katharina J. 2004. Culture's Role in Marketers' Ethical Decision Making: An Integrated Theoretical Framework. *Academy of Marketing Science Review* 1: 1–32.

Smith, N. Craig. 1990. Morality and the Market: Consumer Pressure for Corporate Responsibility. In *Handbook of Marketing and Society*, Paul N. Bloom and Gregory T. Gundlach, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tan, Benjamin. 2002. Understanding Consumer Ethical Decision Making With Respect to Purchase of Pirated Software. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 19 (2): 96–111.

Thompson, Craig J. 1997. Interpreting Consumers: A Hermeneutical Framework for Deriving Marketing Insights From The Texts Of Consumers' Consumption Stories. *Journal of Marketing Research* 34: 438–456.

Thompson, Craig J., H.R. Pollio, and W.B. Locander. 1994. The Spoken and Unspoken: A Hermeneutic Approach To Understanding The Cultural Viewpoints That Underlie Consumers' Expressed Meanings. *Journal of Consumer Research* 21(3): 432–452.

Triandis, H.C. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism.* Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Uusitalo, Outi and Reetta M. Oksanen. 2004. Ethical Consumerism: A View from

    Finland. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 28 (3): 214-221.

Vitell, Scott J. 2003. Consumer Ethics Research: Review, Synthesis and Suggestions for

    the Future. *Journal of Business Ethics* 43(1/2): 33–47.

Vitell, Scott J. and Joseph G. Paolillo. 2003. Consumer Ethics: The Role of Religiosity.

    Journal of Business Ethics 46(2): 151–62.

Whalen, D. Joel, Robert E. Pitts, and John K. Wong. 1991. Exploring the Structure of

    Ethical Attributions as a Component of the Consumer Decision Model: The Vicarious

    Versus Personal Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics* 10(4): 285–93.

Appendix 1. Consumer ethics scenarios. Second version changes in bold for each.

Nike Athletic shoe scenario – labor practices

The product choice available to today's athlete—professional, amateur, or casual—is truly amazing. Also what was once a product for use only by the athletically inclined has become an everyday fashion item. The humble sneaker has come of age.

Today's sophisticated athletic shoes are made for many different people and purposes. They differ based not only on comfort and cushioning but have many additional specialized characteristics. Shoes vary based on their ability to ventilate your feet, whether they support your ankles, their weight, and the durability of the soles. Shoes are available in a variety of synthetic and natural materials, and in a variety of colors and styles. And of course, shoes vary by brand, with the Nike brand name being the most well known worldwide brand.

Most Nike athletic shoes are made in developing nations in South East Asia where a contracted manufacturing company can pay the female **[male]** workers substandard wages. The labor standards in these countries can also be quite lax. It is not uncommon to find that the shoes coming from countries in South East Asia have been manufactured in factories with unsafe working conditions, by women who are required to work long hours.

It was once the case that when you purchased a sneaker your choice was limited to a few standard options. Now only product design and marketing are done in the West with production being done in South East Asian factories that are quickly able to change to new designs and materials. As a result, the variety of athletic shoes available to today's consumer is a blistering array that is meant to satisfy almost any consumer's athletic or fashion requirements around the world.

Bath Soap scenario - animal testing/biodegradability

Soap is one of the oldest and most basic commodities known to humankind. It exists in a variety of forms and is used by billions of people everyday. The ordinary bath soap, that bar sitting in your bathroom, can be anything from the very simple formulation used, and perhaps made, by your grandmother to a quite complex mixture of ingredients.

Today's sophisticated soaps are made for many different people and purposes. They vary based not only fragrance and moisturizing capacity but have many additional medicinal characteristics. Some soaps are designed to keep the pores open and unclogged while other soaps are specially formulated so as not to aggravate acne conditions. 'All natural' soaps avoid the use of non-natural ingredients and artificial coloring and 'anti-bacterial' soaps aim to stop the spread of germs.

Traditional soaps are made from animal by-products (e.g., from tallow, a rendering of beef fat). A concern for animal rights has had an effect on the lowly soap. Companies today market products guaranteed not to be tested on animals or use any animal by-products. This way the concerned consumer can be sure the soap manufacturer did not

contribute to the harm of animals in any way. **[Concern for the environment has led to the development of soaps with biodegradable ingredients. This means the soap will dissolve safely into the local water supply after being used, and any chemicals that might be in the soap will not adversely affect local animal or human populations.}**

It was once the case that when you purchased a bar of soap your only choice was the rectangular bar or the round bar. However, the variety available to today's consumer is a huge array that is meant to satisfy almost any consumer's skin type and cleaning requirements.

Louis Vuitton scenario – counterfeit luggage/wallet

Luxury goods by famous designers are often available in counterfeit versions at much lower prices than genuine versions. One of the more common categories of goods where this is the case is luggage **[wallets]**. For example, a genuine Louis Vuitton roll-on airline suitcase **[wallet]** would cost about US$1100 **[US$300]**. But fake bags **[wallets]** of the same size and appearance can cost as little as 1/20 of this amount. The suitcase **[wallet]** has the same characteristic brown color with gold monogram "LVs" on it and the same color gold clasps. It is the same size and has similar appearing lining, handles, and wheels.

Some of these suitcases **[wallets]** are thought to be made in the same Chinese factories where the genuine suitcases are made under contract to Louis Vuitton. Others of the less expensive suitcases **[wallets]** are clever unauthorized copies. Those making the fake luggage **[wallets]** are local Chinese individuals who either use the manufacturing facilities of companies under contract to Louis Vuitton (during off hours like evenings and Sundays) or else set up separate manufacturing facilities in other plants. They sell the suitcases **[wallets]** through networks of small scale dealers and distributors who often set up temporary shops or work in bazaars, markets, and on the streets of large cities in Asia, Europe, Africa, and North and South America. Recently, some such bags **[wallets]** have also become available on the Internet.

Even though companies like Louis Vuitton have international copyrights on their designs and logotypes, it is difficult for them to stop this counterfeiting because the makers move plants and are hard to locate. While they occasionally succeed in shutting down dealers, there are so many sellers and the scale of their individual operations is so small and mobile that this is also difficult.

Appendix 2. Semi structured interview guide, used in all countries.

Questions after the Nike scenario:

What do you think **[insert country name]** people think about Nike sport shoes?

Are they likely to buy Nike sport shoes?

Which factors will be most important when they are evaluating which brand of sport shoes to choose?

Who is typically with someone when they are deciding which brand of sport shoes to purchase?

Who pays attention to which brand of sport shoes someone is wearing?

What do your family and friends think about Nike sport shoes?

Tell me about what the Nike brand symbolizes compared to other brands.

What would they think about you if you were wearing Nike sport shoes?

If you were wearing some other brand?

Tell me about a recent experience you have had purchasing sport shoes. Where did you purchase them? Who was with you? How did you make the decision? Which were the most important attributes?

Are the ethical concerns brought up in the scenario of much concern to **[country name]** people?

Do you think **[country name]** people are aware of the conditions the shoes are made under?

Do you think about these labor issues when you are making your purchasing decision? Do others?

Who if anyone is hurt by Nike paying substandard wages to male or female factory workers who are working in factories without high labor standards?

Who if anyone benefits from Nike paying substandard wages to male or female factory workers who are working in factories without high labor standards?

Have you read any articles or seen any shows on TV talking about the types of ethical concerns brought up in this scenario? What did you think when you read or saw them?

Questions after the soap scenario

How do most **[country name]** people decide on which type of soap to use?

Which factors are the most important when **[country name]** people are deciding on which type of soap to use?

Do people ask each other what kind of soap they purchase?

Tell me about a recent soap purchase you made. Where did you buy the soap? Which attributes were important to you? How did you make the decision?

Tell me about your soap usage. Where do you use soap? How often?

Are the ethical concerns brought up in the scenario of much concern to **[country name]** people?

Do **[country name]** people discuss these concerns with each other?

Who if anyone is hurt by soap being tested on animals? By soap not being biodegradable?

Who if anyone benefits from soap being tested on animals? By soap not being biodegradable?

Have you read or seen any programs or information about the type of ethical concerns brought up in this scenario? What did you think about the programs or articles?

Questions after the counterfeit goods scenario

What do you think **[country name]** people would think about counterfeit goods like fake Louis Vuitton luggage or wallets?

What factors do you think would be most important to them in deciding whether or not to buy such fake bags or wallets when they encounter them?

If they have such a bag or wallet, are they likely to tell other people that it is a fake?

Could other people tell it is a fake?

How would they know it is a fake?

How would you feel if someone gave you such a bag or wallet as a gift?

Would you consider purchasing a counterfeited piece of luggage or a wallet? How would you make the decision whether to purchase it or not?

Do you know anyone who has counterfeit luggage or wallets?

Are the ethical concerns brought up in this scenario of much concern to **[country name]** people?

Do people discuss these concerns with each other?

Who, if anyone, is hurt by counterfeit Louis Vuitton luggage or wallets?

Who, if anyone, benefits from these counterfeits?

Have you read articles or seen TV shows about counterfeit goods such as this? What did you think of those articles or programs?