

CONSUMER SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE INDEX

Hossein Samavatyan ^a, Fereshteh Akhoondi ^b, Shadi Zareie

^{a,b,c} Psychology Department, University of Isfahan, Iran.

^a Corresponding author: samavatyan@yahoo.com

Available at <http://www.ssrn.com/link/OIDA-Intl-Journal-Sustainable-Dev.html>

ISSN 1923-6654 (print) ISSN 1923-6662 (online).

Ontario International Development Agency, Canada. © Author et al

Abstract: Socially responsible purchasing is the desire to express social and environmental concerns through purchasing choices. Although research in the area of consumers' social responsibility is continually growing, a wide range of studies in this area has been carried out in developed countries while limited theoretical and applied researches have been conducted in developing countries (Chen & Kong, 2009). It should be also noted that the developing countries face different issues and concerns compared with the developed countries. Researchers have developed numerous scales to measure socially responsible purchasing research in this area; however, in spite of a multi-dimensional look at this concept in most scales, none of them covers a wide range of social issues at various stages of before, during, and after the purchase. In addition, differences in economic, social, legal, and cultural development of each country can make different dimensions in the area of social responsibility which requires the identification of factors involved. On the other hand, due to the multi-dimensional and dynamic nature of the concept, it is necessary to implement and monitor social responsibility over time. Therefore, the purpose of the current study was to identify the dimensions and elements involved in the social responsibility of consumers and also to develop a comprehensive measure of social responsibility of consumers.

In order to achieve the goal of the study, which was to identify the involved factors in the buyers'/consumers' social responsibility, a qualitative study conducted through an in-depth interview with a group of consumers and experts. During the interview process, all violations of social responsibility as well as important issues to achieve sustainable development were discussed. The main factors involved in emerging social responsibility were identified through the results of the analysis done on the interview contents which in turn, formed a questionnaire. Content validity of the designed questionnaire was examined by the experts in the area of consuming behaviours and its face validity was reviewed and approved by a number of customers. The questionnaire was then administered in a pilot group and a satisfactory reliability of the questionnaire was obtained via Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.94). The questionnaire was administered among 253 customers in two branches of a giant chain store. Exploratory factor analysis was applied to detect the validity of the designed scale which identified the main dimensions of social responsibility. Exploratory factor analysis was performed using the principal components and Varimax rotation. The results of the factor analysis showed five factors with eigenvalue greater than one, which could explain totally, 43.169% of the variance of social responsibility. Those are the environmental, health, cultural-national, legal, and ethical dimensions. The final version of the designed scale containing 43 items can be considered as a comprehensive scale in the context of social responsibility that entails the entire process of pre-buying, while buying, consuming, and withdrawing products. It might be used as a comprehensive scale to examine the behaviour of socially responsible consumers particularly in developing countries. On the other hand, dimensions detected for consumers' social responsibility determine the areas to enable managers in order to develop strategies in line with identified factors in order to align with social desires of customers and promote their social responsibility practices.

Keywords: Consumer purchase behavior, Consumer social responsibility, Multi-dimensional scale of responsible consumption.

INTRODUCTION

Purchasing is an individual and yet communicative phenomenon (Gonzalez, Korchia, Menuet, & Urbain, 2009). Although the individual dimension of purchasing for the consumers, who are the beneficiaries in the process of marketing, has been always focused and often paid attention to dimensions such as, price, quality, convenience, availability, and so forth, the desire for a sustainable development on the one hand and globalization and the increased concerns about health, environment and, human rights on the other hand has been highlighted a collective dimension for the consumers in the recent decades. Therefore, the idea of buyers'/consumers' social responsibility has been discussed in the area of marketing ethics since decades ago. However, despite considerable research and discussion in the area of corporate social responsibility, buyers'/consumers' social responsibility, which is an important motive for promotion of corporate social responsibility, has not been yet fully explained and is under study and theorization (Caruana & Chatzidakis, 2013).

According to the meta-analysis conducted by Filippo and Seidel (2010), 22% of all studies in French and 6% of all in English studies are in the area of ethical marketing of the consumer during the last twenty years (Durif, Boivin, Rajaobelina, & François-Lecompte, 2011). Although research on the socially responsible purchasing continually grows, a wide range of studies in this area has been carried out in developed countries, and limited theoretical and applied researches have been conducted in developing countries (Chen & Kong, 2009) whereas developing countries face different issues and concerns compared with developed countries.

Several measures have been developed to measure socially responsible purchasing in numerous studies on socially responsible consumers (SRC). Although common dimensions, such as attention given to environmental issues and corporate social responsibility (CSR), exist in majority of the measures in this area, specific aspects, such as cultural issues should also be considered. On the other hand, Roberts (1995), and Webb, Mohr, and Harris (2007) pointed out that it is necessary to implement and monitor social responsibility over time due to the multidimensional and dynamic nature of the concept. Due to cultural differences in conceptualization and dimensions of social responsibility and differences in developing and developed countries on the concept, it is theoretically and practically important to identify the dimensions and elements involved in social responsibility specially in developing countries and develop a scale in this regard.

Social responsibility of consumption relates to the people's values, goals, and activities that can reflect environmental, health, legal, cultural, and ethical fundamentals. Increased public awareness of health and environmental issues and resource constraints (energy and materials), along with increased demand, particularly in developing countries has caused that health and environmental issues mention as a concern by the consumers. The cycle of materials return to the nature through recycling and reuse of materials is a solution that depends on the obligation and responsibility of individual consumers in this area. Culture, which is a set of beliefs, values, and visions in every society, affects individual behaviour and is as a basis for the selection, use, and in general dealing with goods and services per person. Individuals are the members of different subcultures; each sub-culture differs according to the variety of emphases on different issues associated with consumption.

Ethical responsibilities have uncertain boundaries compared to legal liabilities because they have more tendencies to the people (with different tendencies and viewpoints) and do not necessarily enjoy the support of government and powerful institutions. However, they can be an introduction to formulate the rules that are proposed under pressure from various groups and then implemented by governments.

In addition to the main above-mentioned items, demographic variables also have certainly a significant role in social responsibility. Age affects the consumer behaviour. Diversity in the individual's needs, ideals, standards, and obligations can be seen in different ages. Individual jobs and economic statuses can show their dependence to a social class that contains a specific view in the area of social responsibility. With the increased incomes and the use of more facilities, the individual's views are more likely to be influenced. On this way, individuals' membership in a social class can affect their attitudes to a different perspective of social responsibility. Furthermore, personality is a key factor of looking at social issues associated with the consumption. Sociability, conscientiousness, and agreeability are those personality dimensions that can interact with the social responsibility of each person.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Hawkins and Mothersbow (2010) defined consumer behaviour as “the study of individuals, groups, organizations and the process they use to select, secure, use, and dispose of products, services, or ideas to satisfy needs and the impacts that these processes have on the consumer and society” (p. 6), where the consumer activities have been judged to measure his behaviour. However, the underlying individual behaviour is the presence of an obvious or non-obvious attitude in every area. Therefore, a willingness to act that is an important element in people’s attitude can be studied to describe and predict the behaviour of individuals. Intention is a function of each individual’s attitudes and criteria. Individual’s intention for a specific behaviour is an evidence of person's readiness for the behaviour. Attitudes derive from the assessment of beliefs about the outcomes of the respective behaviours and relative importance of these outcomes for the individual. Many researches have been done on the effects of attitude on behaviour that arose mainly from two theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour by Azjen (1991).

Both of these theories describe the relationship between attitude and behaviour as a deliberate and conscious process. Russell Fazio (1999) referred to the motivation and opportunity for the behaviour of the attitude in his model (MODE). As in the theory of planned behaviour, the links between attitudes and behaviour have been emphasized in this model. These theories and models rooted in Fishbin and Azjen’s (1975 and 1980) theories.

Abric (1994a,p.13) defines social responsibility as “functions of a system for interpreting reality that governs the relationships of individuals with their physical and social environment, and determines their behaviours and their practices. [...] it orientates actions and social relations” (Gonzalez et al., 2009). In the area of social responsibility of purchasing, Webster (1975) defined the socially conscious consumer as “a consumer who takes into account the public consequences of his or her private consumption or who attempts to use his or her purchasing power to bring about social change” (p.188). Based on the definition, he discussed that socially responsible consumers must be aware of social problems and believes that they can make changes and must be active in society (Webster, 1975). Roberts (1993) defines the socially responsible consumer “one who purchases products and services perceived to have a positive (or less negative) influence on the environment or who patronizes businesses that attempt to effect related positive social change”(p.140). The definition assumes both environmental concerns and social concerns in responsible purchasing.

Based on their definition of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and also based on the concept of Kotler’s (1991) social marketing, Mohr, Webb, and Harris (2001) define the behaviour of a socially responsible consumer (SRC) as follows: "A person basing his or her acquisition, usage, and dispositions of products on a desire to minimize or eliminate any harmful effects and maximize the long-run beneficial impact on society"(p.47).

Consistent with the conceptualization of consumers’ social responsibility, several measurement scales have been designed and developed to assess or estimate the individuals’ willingness to SRC. Although these scales have shortcomings and are not comprehensive, they measure responsible purchasing behaviour or attitudes toward these behaviours.

Robert (1993) conducted one of the earliest and most complete works in this area who developed a 40-items scale to measure the socially responsible consumers’ behaviour with two dimensions of environmental and social. After that, a shortened 18-item scale was developed. These scales were an excellent starting point for other things because they measured behaviour and included a range of social issues. (Webb, Mohr, & Harris, 2007).

Francois-Lecompto (2005) distinguishes five dimensions of SRC in his scale: 1- the firm's behavior ("refusing to buy from firms whose behavior is deemed to be irresponsible"), 2- buying cause-related products (products "for which part of the price will go to a good cause"), 3- the desire to help small businesses ("not buying everything in supermarket and enabling small storekeepers to survive"), 4- taking account of the geographical origin of products ("the desire to favor products from one's community") and 5- reducing the volume of consumption ("the consumer avoids consuming too much and tries as much as possible to make things him/herself") (Gonzalez et al., 2009). Webb Mohr, and Harris (2007), have designed a multi-dimensional Socially Responsible Purchase and Disposal (SRPD) scale based on their conceptualization of socially responsible purchasing behavior. They introduced dimensions of the scale as follows: purchasing based on firms' corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance, recycling, and avoidance and use reduction of products based on their environmental impact as the dimensions of the scale (Webb et al., 2007).

Durif, Boivin, Rajaobelina, and François-Lecompte (2011) identified the socially responsible purchasing factor in their scale: 1- citizenship behavior (behavior in support of organizations with social convictions), 2- behavior focused on the environment protection, 3- recycling behavior, 4- composting behavior, 5- local consumption behavior, 6- behavior with respect to animal protection 7- de-consumption behavior, 8- sustainable transport behavior (Durif et al., 2011).

Berné-Manero, Pedraja-Iglesias and Ramo-Sáez (2013) have designed a measurement model of socially responsible purchasing based on the definition of Mohr et al (2001) and Mohr and Webb (2005). The model introduced three agent as determinants of the buyers' social responsibility; CSR as a criterion of purchase, predisposition to civic behaviors and activities indicative of CSR that actually determines the level of one's knowledge to CSR. Moreover, Balderjahn, Buerke, Kirchgeorg, Peyer, Seegebarth, and Wiedmann (2013) developed a scale called customers' consciousness for sustainable purchase (CSC) based on the triple concept of planet, people, and profit. This scale includes environmental, social and, economic dimensions (Balderjahn et al., 2013). To date, research in this field, Pecoraro and Uusitalo (2014) have introduced the purchase of organic food, simplification, and reduction of the level of purchasing as the principles of ethical purchasing.

As it was shown, the researchers have developed several scales to measure socially responsible purchasing; however, despite a multi-dimensional look at this concept in most scales, none of them does cover a whole range of the social issues at various stages of before, during, and after the purchase. In addition, differences in economic, social, legal, and cultural development of different countries can create different aspects in the area of social responsibility that involves identifying the factors of consumers' social responsibility and developing a related scale.

METHODOLOGY

In order to achieve the objective of the study, which was, developing a comprehensive scale of the buyers' social responsibility, and identifying the factors of buyers' social responsibility, in the current qualitative study, an in-depth interview with a group of consumers and experts was conducted. Then, factor analysis was performed to approve the identified factors and a quantitative study was conducted to determine the dimensions of the scale.

During the qualitative study, an in-depth interview was conducted with ten customers and five experts who were professors of psychology, management, and sociology. During the interview process, all violations of social responsibility as well as important issues to achieve sustainable development were discussed. In fact, the interview was led considering two axes of avoidance factors (i.e., social responsibility which depends on the avoidance of such factors) and tendency factors (i.e., social responsibility which depends to the tendency to such factors). The main factors of social responsibility were detected from the results of the analysis of interviews content and then were designed in a form of a questionnaire.

The experts in the field examined content validity of the designed questionnaire at the early stages of the study and a number of customers examined and approved its face validity. During the quantitative study, the questionnaire was first administered in the pilot group and reliability of the questionnaire was calculated via Cronbach alpha that was found to be 0.94. Then, the questionnaires were administered among 253 customers in two branches of a giant chain store in order to confirm the detected factors. Data was analysed applying SPSS-20 and finally, the intended scale was approved as a 43-items questionnaire after identifying and investigating different dimensions and the kind of real and ideal behavior of the consumers in relation to social responsibilities.

FINDINGS

Exploratory factor analysis was used to detect the validity of the designed scale and identify the main dimensions of consumers' social responsibility. Exploratory factor analysis was performed by the use of the principal components and Varimax rotation. In the process of investigating the sampling adequacy, the results of KMO (KMO=0.812) in the study of factor analysis confirm the sufficiency of the sample size and materials capabilities for factor classification. Moreover, the values of Bartlett's test of sphericity and the level of significance (chi-square=3011.772, sig=0.001) which emphasises principal component analysis relevancy for the data set and as correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, therefore, it could be factorized. Results of the factor analysis showed five factors with eigenvalue greater than one, which explained totally 43.169% of the variance of social responsibility. All items of the detected factors had a factor loading greater than 0.3. Thus, no item of the questionnaire was eliminated. The factors were named at the last stage. Table 1 presents the extracted factors and

factor loadings of the items. Table 2 shows the degree of variance explained by each factor, eigenvalue, and Cronbach alpha coefficient for each factor.

Table 1. Factor structure (factor dimensions and loads) of the buyers'/consumers' Social Responsibility Index (CSRI)

Items	Environmental	Health	Cultural-national	Legal	ethical
4. Not to buy the products that damage natural resources.	0.68				
5. Not to purchase the goods that increases the environmental contaminations.	0.68				
2. To purchase the goods that can be recycled.	0.59				
10. To purchase the more durable goods.	0.55				
9. Not to purchase the goods with unrecyclable packaging.	0.54				
3. Not to purchase the only disposable and unrecyclable goods.	0.54				
11. To purchase the organic goods.	0.49				
1. To get information of the environmental harms as a result of purchasing and consuming some goods.	0.47				
8. To purchase at the slow traffic hours compared to the hours of heavy traffic.	0.36				
6. To use the cloth bags instead of plastic bags when buying things.	0.35				
18. To focus on the standard signs of the goods.		0.72			
33. To express the strengths and weaknesses of the purchased goods to other people.		0.58			
34. To submit recommendations and complaints to the authorities about the performance of companies.		0.57			
16. To give information about the goods harmful for the health of others.		0.53			
17. To avoid the purchase of the goods that the health issues are not observed in their production.		0.50			
14. To focus on the constructive combinations of each good before the purchase.		0.46			
13. To reduce the purchase of goods with the additives and artificial colors.		0.46			
32. To maintain the relationship with the stores and give information of the desirability and undesirability of goods.		0.45			
15. To avoid the purchase of goods that endangers others' health, such as smoking.		0.37			
20. To avoid the purchase of counterfeit goods.		0.34			
12. Not to purchase the goods whose harm to the health has been approved.		0.33			

36. Not to purchase the goods for the mere reason that others have bought them.			0.61		
35. Not to purchase the products, in which the limbs and members of overthrowing animals have been used.			0.55		
7. To purchase from the stores closer to the work place or residence place.			0.55		
42. To make the companies produce high quality goods by not purchasing poor quality goods.			0.55		
41. To focus on the fact that what effect our purchasing has on other countries.			0.49		
37. Not to purchase the goods exceeded the required amount.			0.48		
40. To purchase from the small and local stores.			0.45		
39. To purchase the national goods.			0.40		
43. To purchase the goods from companies, which provide more information.			0.39		
38. Not to insist on purchasing the goods that others do not have.			0.35		
23. Not to purchase the products that we do not need them in spite their very low price.			0.34		
21. To list necessary goods or products before purchasing.			0.33		
21. Not to purchase the smuggled goods.				0.80	
22. Pay attention to the damages incurred to the society as a result of the purchase of smuggled or counterfeit goods.				0.77	
19. Not to purchase the goods that has legal prohibition.				0.55	
28. To purchase from companies that affiliate to the charity institutes.					0.72
27. To purchase from companies that employ individuals with special inabilities.					0.68
29. Not to purchase the products from companies that differentiates between the minority groups.					0.48
31. To purchase and support for some goods in order to prevent the destruction of some industries, including handicrafts.					0.43
25. To purchase from companies that pay attention to the working conditions of their personnel.					0.43
26. To purchase from the companies that stress on social and environmental effects of their performance.					0.40
30. Not to purchase the goods produced by the labor children.					0.34

Table 2. Level of the explained variance, eigenvalue, and Cronbach alpha coefficient of the dimensions of consumers' social responsibility

	Environmental	Health	Cultural-national	Legal	Ethical
Number of items	10	11	12	3	7
Variation explained (%)	10.099	9.940	8.338	8.212	6.579
Eigenvalue	4.343	4.274	3.586	3.531	2.829
Cronbach alpha	0.788	0.827	0.756	0.779	0.715

Based on the results of factor analysis, the consumers' social responsibility index is composed of five dimensions that include:

1. Environmental dimension: it contains 10 items of different environmental factors. The consumers pay attention to this dimension while making decisions to purchase. Not to purchase the items that hurt the natural sources and also purchase the goods that can be recycle are two instances of such items in the environmental dimension. In general, the dimension explained 10.099% of the buyers'/consumers' social responsibility variance and has an eigenvalue of 4.343.
2. Health dimension: as it was expected, the socially responsible consumers are responsible for their and others' health and are sensitive to the issues that can directly or indirectly contribute to overall health of the society. Purchasing the organic food products, reducing the purchase of goods with artificial colours and additives, and considering the barcodes and standard signs when purchasing items are classified into this dimension. In general, the dimension includes 11 items and explained 9.940% of the consumers' social responsibility variance.
3. Cultural-national dimension: this includes factors that relate to the economic, social, and cultural development in terms of consumers' social responsibility. Purchasing the goods for the mere reason that others buy them and or insist on purchasing the goods that no one else owns it, are classified into the cultural factors of social responsibility. Moreover, purchasing poor quality products are those items that relate to the economic and social development. This dimension includes 12 items and it explains 8.338% of the consumer social responsibility variance.
4. Legal dimension: the socially responsible consumers are low-abiding and are sensitive to observe the legal issues while decision making on their purchase. Not to purchase the goods with the legal prohibition and also contraband goods are classified into this dimension. It consists of three items and explains 8.212% of the social responsibility variance.
5. Ethical dimension: although there is no definition for legal items in some issues, the socially responsible consumers are socially sensitive to ethical issues. The tendency to purchase the goods that affiliate to the charity institutes, employment of the people with special inabilities, and not to purchase the goods that are produced by the labor children are some of the cases related to the ethical issues of purchasing. The dimension includes seven items and explains 6.579% of the socially responsibility variance of purchase.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The development of the scale related to consumers' social responsibility or segmentation of the consumers in terms of social responsibility are the initial efforts to measure and enhance the consumers' social responsibility. As mentioned by several researchers, increased awareness of the customers to the issue and adoption of a positive attitude to the social responsibility can contribute to increase their social responsibility. In this way, according to the review of the literature as well as the results of interview with the customers and experts, different factors of responsibility particularly in developing countries could be identified and measured.

American Managers Association sets the year 2015 as the time when CSR will be established as a priority in the management of any organizations (Berné-Manero, Pedraja-Iglesias, & Ramo-Sáez, 2013). It also predicts that the consumers' social responsibility will be focused more than ever. In recent years, the studies of the consumers' social responsibility have been expanded. A majority of the related studies has been either on the designing and

developing a scale related to measure the consumers' social responsibility behavior or to identify the profiles with different social responsibilities. However, despite the increased studies in this area, limited theoretical and applied researches have been conducted especially in developing countries (Chen & Kong, 2009). Based on the review of the literature, some issues must be taken into account to develop a comprehensive scale of social responsibility including the substantial and significant factors. First, the consumers' social responsibility is a multi-dimensional construct that entails different dimensions (Webb et al., 2007). Therefore, a one-dimensional look at the concept or extreme focus on the environmental dimension would limit it. Second, cultural context can contribute positively or negatively to increase the social responsibility and thus it must not be regarded as a concept independent from cultural context. Third, social responsibility relates to all circumstances of the purchasing, such as before and during the purchase, consumption, withdrawal, and situations other than the purchase and thus it must not be considered only for the purchase. On the other hand, this variable is a dynamic concept whose dimensions and components can be changed with time and requires revising and reviewing the concept (Webb et al., 2007). Therefore, the scale was designed with awareness and attention to all of such issues. The scale has five major factors of social responsibility; environmental, health, cultural-natural, legal, and ethical dimensions, each of them entails different components. In other words, the designed scale has discussed new aspects that were not observed in other studies. For instance, the support for and purchase of the goods from the industries that are destructing (e.g., handicrafts), attention to the role of purchase in other countries and nations, support for the companies that increase the level of consumers' awareness, and attention to some cultural contexts that can be in line or contrary to the consumers' social responsibility are the instances of components that exist in the current designed scale. Therefore, the scale can be used as a comprehensive scale to examine the behavior of socially responsible consumers in the domain of researches of social responsibility particularly in developing countries.

As mentioned by Roberts (1996), although the consumers tend to focus the social and environmental dimensions, the main purchase criteria of the customers are the price, quality, convenience, availability, and so forth; so if the criteria of social responsibility are against the individual criteria of purchasing, on the time of decision making about the purchase and consumption, the customers would have less tendency to observe the responsible purchase criteria. Another effective factor might be the fact that people believe their purchases can contribute to high levels of social, environmental, cultural, and national criteria. Although, advertisement and information has been spread increasingly in terms of the role of purchase and consumption on environment, the customers' belief on the effects of purchase is not well identified in terms of the legal, national, cultural, and health dimensions. Thus, it is necessary to advertise and develop strategies in order to raise the awareness of this issue. In this regard, the consumers must believe that their individual efforts and purchases can contribute to the reduction of potential social and environmental problems. Moreover, other factors, such as unawareness and a lack of information, a lack of transparency, a lack of trust, the presence of legal voids, a lack of proper observance of the rules, a lack of other alternatives for selection, the problems of availability, unequal prices, and non-competitive quality can also contribute to the lack of consumers' social responsibility mostly in developing countries. Hence, it is not enough to have a peripheral look at the issue of consumers' social responsibility and examine the individual predictors of this variable. Indeed, the issue must be considered at micro and macro levels, both. The results of the study indicated that consumers pay attention to different environmental, health, cultural-national, legal, and ethical dimensions, which each of them entails several components. Therefore, the managers at macro and micro levels must develop strategies in line with the identified factors in order to align their activities with social desires of customers and promote the social responsibility, regionally, nationally, and globally.

REFERENCES

- [1] Fishbein M. 1980. *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- [2] Ajzen I. 1991. The theory of planned behaviour. *Organization Behaviour and Human Decision Process*. 50:179–211
- [3] Balderjahn, I., Buerke, A., Kirchgeorg, M., Peyer, M., Seegebarth, B., & Wiedmann, K. P. (2013). Consciousness for sustainable consumption: scale development and new insights in the economic dimension of consumers' sustainability. *AMS review*, 3(4), 181-192.
- [4] Berné-Manero, C., Pedraja-Iglesias, M., & Ramo-Sáez, P. (2014). A measurement model for the socially responsible consumer. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 11(1), 31-46.

- [5] Carrigan, M., & Attalla, A. (2001). The myth of the ethical consumer - do ethics matter in purchase behaviour? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(7), 560 - 578.
- [6] Caruana, R., & Chatzidakis, A. (2013). Consumer Social Responsibility (CnSR): Toward a Multi-Level, Multi-Agent Conceptualization of the "Other CSR". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-16.
- [7] Chen, H., & Kong, Y. (2009). Chinese consumer perceptions of socially responsible consumption. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 5(2), 144-151.
- [8] Devinney, T. M., Auger, P., Eckhardt, G., & Birtchnell, T. (2006). The other CSR: Consumer social responsibility.
- [9] Durif, F., Boivin, C., Rajaobelina, L., & François-Lecompte, A. (2011). Socially Responsible Consumers: Profile and Implications for Marketing Strategy. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 7(6), 215-224.
- [10] Fazio,
Russell H., and Tamara Towles-Schwen. (1999). The MODE Model of Attitude-Behaviour Processes. In Chaiken, Shelly, and Trope, Yaacov, *Dual Process Theories in Social Psychology*, New York: Guilford Press.
- [11] Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [12] Follows, S. B., & Jobber, D. (2000). environmentally responsible purchase behavior : a test of a consumer model. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(5/6), 723-746.
- [13] Gonzalez, C., Korchia, M., Menuet, L., & Urbain, C. (2009). How do socially responsible consumers consider consumption?an approach with the free associations method. *recherche et applications en marketing*, 24(3), 25-42.
- [14] Goodwin, H., & Francis, J. (2003). Ethical and responsible tourism: Consumer trends in the UK. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(3), 271-284.
- [15] Hawkins, D. I., & Mothersbaugh, D. L. (2010). *Consumer behavior: Building marketing strategy*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- [16] Mohr, L. A., Webb, D. J., & Harris, K. E. (2001). Do consumers expect companies to be socially responsible? The impact of corporate social responsibility on buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 45-72.
- [17] Pecoraro, M. G., & Uusitalo, O. (2014). Conflicting values of ethical consumption in diverse worlds - A cultural approach. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14(1), 45-65.
- [18] Roberts, J. A. (1993). SEX DIFFERENCES IN SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE CONSUMERS' BEHAVIOR. *Psychological Reports*, 73, 139-148.
- [19] Roberts, J. A. (1995). Profiling Levels of Socially Responsible Consumer Behavior: A Cluster Analytic Approach and Its Implications for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 3(4), 97-117.
- [20] Roberts, J. A. (1996). Will the Real Socially Responsible Consumer Please Step Forward? *Business Horizons*, 79-84.
- [21] Vitell, S. J. A Case for Consumer Social Responsibility (CnSR): Including a Selected Review of Consumer Ethics/Social Responsibility Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-8.
- [22] Wagner, T., Bicen, P., & Hall, Z. R. (2008). The dark side of retailing: towards a scale of corporate social irresponsibility. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 36(2), 124-142.
- [23] Webb, D. J., Mohr, L. A., & Harris, K. E. (2008). A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(2), 91-98.
- [24] Webster, F. E. (1975). Determining the Characteristics of the Socially Conscious Consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2(3), 188-196.

Appendix Questionnaire

Dear Responder:

Hello,

The current questionnaire includes those aspects that are considered in the purchases. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent of your agreement with each item. The accuracy of your responses is important to obtain accurate results, so please answer all the questions carefully. Also, none of the questions contain correct or incorrect answers, so just indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement according to your criteria. It should be also mentioned that all stages of the study has been approved by the ethics committee and be assured that your responses will remain completely confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation in advance.

No.	Questions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Looking for information about the environmental losses due to purchase and consume certain goods is important.					
2	In choosing between two similar products, I would like to buy goods that can be recycled.					
3	Compared with non-recycled disposable products, I would like to buy goods that are reusable.					
4	It is important to not to buy the products that damage natural resources.					
5	The products that cause environmental contamination should not be bought.					
6	I do shopping using cloth bags instead of plastic ones.					
7	I would purchase needed items from a store closer to my work or home.					
8	I try to buy during the times other than rush hours.					
9	I try not to buy items that have inappropriate recyclable packaging.					
10	In the choice between goods that do not have the possibility to recycle, I try to buy more durable goods.					
11	I try to buy organic instead of non-organic products (products that are used chemicals in producing).					
12	I try not to buy and used those goods which are proven to be harmful.					
13	It is important to purchase the goods in which none or fewer preservatives, additives or artificial coloring are used.					
14	Before buying any product, I read the label to know what materials are used in its production.					
15	I would avoid buying goods that endanger the health of others (such as tobacco or fireworks).					
16	If the product or products are harmful to health, I bring this to others' (e.g. friends and family) attention.					
17	If it is determined that health is not in compliance with production of a certain item, I would avoid buying it.					

18	When buying a product, standard signs and approvals should be checked and considered.					
19	If the information regarding legal prohibition on production of an item is available, I would not buy it.					
20	Purchasing counterfeit goods (the ones with fake labels of famous companies) should be avoided.					
21	If I have the information regarding illegally tract commodity (contraband) to the country, I do not buy it.					
22	I care about the damages of bought counterfeit goods which are contraband into the country.					
23	If the goods or products are not in need, I do not buy it, even if it costs almost nothing.					
24	Before going to buy, I have compiled a list of goods or products I need.					
25	I would like to buy from stores or companies that consider the working conditions of their employees.					
26	I would like to buy from stores or companies that social and environmental impacts of production are also important to them (e.g., not polluting the environment).					
27	I try to buy from companies that individuals with certain disabilities (such as the disabled, elderly, etc.) are employed.					
28	I try to buy from companies that are affiliated to charities.					
29	I do not buy products from companies in which discriminate against minority groups.					
30	I don't buy products or goods produced by child labor, (employing children less than 15 years old who are forced into slave labor).					
31	I try to avoid the destruction of certain industries (such as handicrafts) by purchasing them.					
32	I try to express the desirability or undesirability of the goods to related companies and chainstocks.					
33	Positive and/or negative points of the purchased items should be shared with others.					
34	The recommendations and complaints should be submitted to the authorities about the performance of a business regarding social responsibility.					
35	I never buy and use products (such as some cosmetics) that use organs of endangered animals.					
36	Buying goods just because other people have bought it, is not right.					
37	Buying goods more than they are needed is not right.					
38	Buy the goods just because no one else or few people own it, is not right.					
39	If national and foreign goods have the same price and quality, I would buy the national one.					
40	To support small local stores, I buy some needed items from them.					
41	When shopping, considering the effects of purchase and use of the goods on other countries, is important.					

42	By not purchasing low-quality goods, the manufacturers lead to produce higher quality products.					
43	I try to buy needed goods from companies that share related information and increase customer awareness.					