DON'T GIVE ME ATTITUDE: HOW CAN MARKETERS BRIDGE THE ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOR GAP IN ETHICAL CONSUMER BEHAVIOR?

Alexei Gloukhovtsev, Aalto University School of Business, Finland[1]

Antti Vassinen, Aalto University School of Business, Finland

Pekka Mattila, Aalto University School of Business, Finland

ABSTRACT

The study tests a theoretical framework for examining the consumer decision-making process with regards to ethically questionable behavior. The results indicate that subjective norms, perceived behavioral control and self-efficacy are significant predictors of consumer intentions to engage in ethically questionable behavior. Attitude was not found to be a significant predictor.

INTRODUCTION

The last couple of decades have seen a marked increase in consumer interest in the ethicality of products and services offered on the marketplace (Menon & Menon, 1997). However, such interest has yet to manifest itself in a significant increase in sales and market share for companies dealing in environmentally and socially responsible products and services (Ehrich & Irwin, 2005). The relatively low demand for ethical products and services is cause for concern, not least because the supply of

[1] Corresponding author. Email: alexei.gloukhovtsev@aalto.fi

socially and environmentally responsible goods and services is likely to at least partially mirror the willingness of consumers to purchase such products. White and Simpson (2013) go as far as to suggest that encouraging consumers to engage in environmentally sustainable behaviors is one of the biggest challenges facing the world today. However, precious little empirical work in consumer behavior literature has thus far focused on the factors that influence consumers' pro-social and pro-environmental behaviors (Goldstein, Cialdini, & Griskevicius, 2008).

Drawing on Ajzen's theory of planned behavior (1985), this study addresses the above gap in research by examining how various factors influence consumer decision-making in ethically questionable situations. Special attention is paid to how perceptions of self-efficacy and moral intensity influence behavioral intentions, as these constructs have received scant attention from scholars in the contexts of consumer ethics and the theory of planned behavior, respectively. The paper contributes to academic discourse in consumer ethics by presenting a new framework for examining the consumer decision-making process, and offers implications for marketing practitioners seeking to encourage the consumption of ethical products and services.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Although recent years have seen a noticeable growth in the amount of research addressing consumer behavior in relation to ethical issues, such literature continues to be dwarfed in volume by research in business ethics (Valentine & Hollingworth,

2012), and most frameworks used in the consumer context have been directly adopted from the that discipline. However, business ethics frameworks tend to emphasize the importance of moral judgment and attitude in explaining behavioral intentions and ethical behavior, and a considerable number of recent studies in the consumer context have shown the relationship between judgment (attitudes) and ethical consumer behavior to be rather weak (Carrington et al., 2010; Ehrich & Irwin, 2005).

In light of this attitude-behavior gap, many consumer ethics researchers have called for a more holistic approach to the study of ethical consumer decision-making. Ajzen's (1985) theory of planned behavior (TPB), a more holistic model that looks beyond moral judgment as the primary determinant of ethical behavior, has been widely applied in such research. Many scholars (e.g. Fukukawa and Ennew, 2010) suggest that the theory of planned behavior makes for an appropriate conceptual framework on which to build a consumer decision-making model for ethically questionable behavior, as it permits a broader spectrum of factors to affect behavioral intentions (attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control).

The TPB has received widespread empirical support in a wide range of contexts, including consumer ethics. Nevertheless, Ajzen (1991) himself has suggested that the theoretical model may be expanded to include additional predictor variables, provided that they can be empirically shown to capture a significant proportion of variance in intention after the theory's existing components have been taken into account. A number of measures have since been proposed, with Ajzen suggesting that a component measuring personal moral norms may add predictive power to the model

in situations where an ethical dilemma is present (1991), and that the perceived behavioral control construct could be separated into two measures – perceived controllability and perceived self-efficacy (2002).

Empirical research has provided some degree of support for separation of self-efficacy and controllability into separate constructs (Manstead and van Eekelen, 1998), and Ajzen (2002) has responded by proposing a hierarchical model that incorporates both constructs, which he contends together comprise the higher-order concept of perceived behavioral control. Such a hierarchical model allows for the distinction of the two different constructs, each assessed by a different indicator, while at the same time maintaining a single overarching measure of perceived behavioral control for the two sub-constructs to feed into. Interestingly, this hierarchical model has yet to be examined in the context of ethical consumer behavior, which is somewhat surprising given the potential wealth of insight that could be gained into the nature of the barriers that contribute to the formation of the attitude-behavior gap. In light of this, the first two hypotheses of the study are as follows:

H1: Inclusion of the perceived self-efficacy *construct will increase the predictive validity of the theory of planned behavior model*

H2: Greater perceived self-efficacy *is associated with a decrease in consumer intentions to act unethically*

The proposal to include a measure of personal moral norms in the theory of planned behavior has received significant attention from scholars of consumer ethics. A number of potential measures have been suggested, including moral obligation (Flannery & May, 2000), perceived unfairness (Fukukawa, 2002), moral sensitivity (Buchan, 2005), and justice (Yoon, 2011). However, none of these measures has received widespread empirical support and a universally agreed upon measure has proved elusive.

One concept that has surprisingly been overlooked by researchers is moral intensity, first proposed by Jones (1991) as a measure of the moral imperative present in a given situation. Jones (1991) conceptualizes moral intensity as comprising six dimensions that are inherent in all ethical issues: magnitude of consequences, social consensus, probability of effect, temporary immediacy, proximity of effect and concentration of effect. Jones argues that if the moral intensity of a situation is viewed as weak in terms of these six components, the situation will not be viewed by the decision-maker as having an ethical element.

Although moral intensity has featured prominently in academic research and a number of studies have found a strong link between perceptions of moral intensity and intentions to engage in ethical behavior (Valentine & Bateman, 2011), perceptions of moral intensity have thus far not been adequately tested in conjunction with the theory of planned behavior.

H3: Inclusion of the perceived moral intensity *construct will increase the predictive validity of the theory of planned behavior model*

H4: Greater perceived moral intensity *is associated with a decrease in consumer intentions to act unethically*

Based on the hypothesized relationships, the full model examined in this study is specified as follows: *Behavioral intention* = β_0 + β_1 *attitude* + β_2 *subjective norm* + β_2 *perceived controllability* + β_4 *perceived self-efficacy* + β_5 *perceived moral intensity* + *u.*

METHODOLOGY

The target population for the study consisted of graduate and undergraduate university students. Data for the study were collected using an Internet-based questionnaire as part of a larger study on consumer decision-making in ethically questionable situations. In order to attain a higher response rate and avoid non-response bias, data were collected using convenience sampling. Altogether, a total of 83 undergraduate college students (75.9 percent female) participated in the study for partial course credit. Participants ranged in age from 20 to 46, with a median age of 24.

A scenario-based approach was chosen for the study. Multiple scenarios were used in order to cover a broad spectrum of ethical dilemmas and situations. Scenarios were pretested to verify that they embody the ethical issues as intended, measure the constructs proposed in the research question, and above all, depict realistic ethical

dilemmas that are familiar and relevant to research participants. Four ethically-questionable behaviors were chosen as the foundation for the scenarios: purchasing a product manufactured in poor working conditions, purchasing a product manufactured at a factory that causes environmental harm, purchasing a product made of animal fur, and not reporting a salesperson's miscalculation in the consumer's favor.

The four different scenarios were presented to participants in an online survey. Each of the scenarios was followed by a seven-point semantic differential scale, consisting of fifteen questionnaire items used to measure the components of the theory of planned behavior, self-efficacy, and the six dimensions of moral intensity. All of the items had been tested and validated in previous research. Participants were asked to provide all responses on a 7-point likert scale. Construct reliability was assessed by calculating Cronbach's α coefficients. The results revealed that Cronbach's α of each construct was in line with the recommended criterion of 0.70 (see Table 1).

RESULTS

To test the ability of the proposed framework to explain consumer intentions to engage in morally questionable behavior, data were submitted to a three-step hierarchical regression analysis, with behavioral intentions serving as the dependent variable. The components of the theory of planned behavior were entered in the first step, perceived self-efficacy was added in Step 2, and Step 3 included the full model. To decrease the possibility of potentially overestimating the effects of additional

variables in the TPB model, the explanatory power of all proposed models was assessed using adjusted R^2. The results of the regression analyses are presented in Tables 2-5.

Step 1: Theory of Planned Behavior

The theory of planned behavior performed reasonable well, explaining between 42 and 72 percent of the variance in intensions (adjusted R^2). F tests showed the TPB model had a high level of statistical significance in all four scenarios ($F = 17.384$, $p < 0.01$; $F = 21.609$, $p < 0.01$; $F = 64.465$, $p < 0.01$; $F = 29.259$, $p < 0.01$). A large portion of the regression models' predictive accuracy is due to subjective norm, the only component to have a statistically significant effect on intentions across all four scenarios ($p < 0.05$ in Scenario 1 and $p < 0.01$ in Scenarios 2, 3 and 4), and the strongest predictor of behavioral intentions in half of the scenarios. Participants' attitude had a statistically significant effect on behavioral intentions in three scenarios ($p < 0.01$) and was the strongest predictor of intentions in one scenario. Similarly, perceived controllability had a statistically significant effect on intentions in three of four scenarios ($p < 0.01$) and was the strongest predictor of intentions in one scenario. As expected, the direction of effect for all coefficients is negative.

Step 2: Theory of Planned Behavior + Perceived Self-efficacy

Including the perceived self-efficacy construct resulted in a noticeably and statistically significant improvement in the model's predictive power. The

explanatory power (adjusted R^2) of the new model ranged from 46 to 76 percent of total variance in intentions (adjusted R^2), representing increases of 4 (Scenario 2) to 6 percent (Scenario 4) from Step 1. The coefficient on perceived self-efficacy was statistically significant in all four scenarios ($p < 0.05$ in Scenarios 1 and 2, $p < 0.01$ in Scenarios 3 and 4), supporting hypothesis 1. F-tests for each scenario confirmed that the expanded model gives a statistically significant better fit to the data in three of four scenarios ($F = 5.970$, $p < 0.01$; $F = 8.889$, $p < 0.01$; $F = 4.367$, $p < 0.05$; $F = 1.571$, $p < 0.215$), thus partially confirming hypothesis 2. Adding perceived self-efficacy to the model caused the effects of attitude and perceived controllability to drop in significance from 99 to 95 percent in Scenario 1 and the effect of attitude to drop from 99 to 95 percent in Scenario 4.

Step 3: Theory of Planned Behavior + Perceived Self-efficacy + Perceived Moral Intensity

In the final step, behavioral intentions were regressed on the full model proposed in the study, including both perceived self-efficacy and moral intensity in addition to the components of the original TPB. This resulted in further improvements in both predictive power (the dependent variables explained from 51 to 78 percent of total variance in intentions) and a statistically significant better fit to data across all four scenarios ($F = 4.410$, $p = < 0.01$; $F = 6.065$, $p = 0.01$; $F = 6.877$, $p = 0.01$; $F = 5.802$, $p = 0.01$), supporting hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 3 was also supported, as the coefficient on perceived moral intensity was at least partially statistically significant in all four scenarios ($p < 0.01$ in Scenario 2, $p < 0.05$ in Scenarios 1 and 3, and $p <$

0.1 in Scenario 4). Perceived self-efficacy was again strongly significant in all four scenarios ($p < 0.01$). The coefficients on the original components of the TPB decreased in both size and significance in Scenario 1, with perceived self-efficacy now the best predictor of intentions. In Scenario 2, subjective norm decreased in both significance and effect, and perceived controllability and moral intensity were jointly best predictors of intentions. The coefficient on attitude decreased in significance in Scenarios 3 and 4; subjective norm remained the best predictor.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study provide substantial evidence as to the importance of consumer perceptions of subjective norm, controllability, self-efficacy and moral intensity in determining intentions to engage in ethically questionable behavior, thus highlighting the usefulness of Ajzen's theory of planned behavior for understanding ethical decision-making among consumers. The successful performance of the TPB in all four scenarios is particularly notable, given the range of moral issues and behaviors included therein. The proposed model was able to explain between 51 and 78 percent of total variance in intention to engage in ethically questionable behaviors, which is in line with the theoretical limit of what can be expected of the TPB (Ajzen, 2011).

Interestingly, the study found attitude to be a poor predictor of behavioral intentions. While it is possible that the effect of attitude was taken over by other constructs, it is unlikely given the low degree of multicollinearity between the constructs. A more

plausible explanation is that negative attitudes towards unethical products tend to be overruled by other considerations such as price, quality and convenience (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001). This casts doubt over the ability of judgment-based models such as Hunt and Vitell's 1986) to fully explain the consumer decision-making process. A more holistic perspective appears to be necessary.

To a large extent, the predictive power of the full model was derived from subjective norms. Consumers' intentions to refrain from engaging in unethical behavior appear to be greatly influenced by perceptions of how their "important others" view such behavior. Unlike consumers' own attitudes, the perceived attitudes and beliefs of "close others" appear to be a key driver of (un)ethical behavior. Peer pressure is likely to play an important role in consumer decisions to act unethically, causing consumers to abstain from products and behaviors deemed unacceptable by others in their surroundings. Consumers may also consider ethically questionable behavior exhibited by referent groups as an indicator that such behavior is acceptable.

The findings also provide substantial evidence for Ajzen's (2002) proposed hierarchical conceptualization of the perceived behavioral control (PBC) construct. Perceived controllability achieved statistical significance in all but one scenario, while the inclusion of perceived self-efficacy improved the predictive power of the model in three out of four scenarios. *H1* is thus supported. The direction of effect is uniformly negative, which lends supports to *H2*.

A significant relationship between perceived controllability and behavioral intentions indicates that consumers perceive external barriers to behavior (Randall & Gibson, 1991). These barriers negatively impact their intentions to abstain from purchasing unethical products, and may include a perceived lack of availability of ethical products or a general inconvenience associated with the effort required to seek out such products (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001).

Perceived self-efficacy reflects consumers' perceptions of their capability and capacity to exercise control over their purchasing practices, and its significance shows that factors affecting consumer intentions to engage in ethical behavior are not limited to the external environmental setting. Consumers may feel that they are not qualified to successfully determine the ethicality of a product due to insufficient information. On the other hand, ubiquitous marketing communication about product ethicality may cause difficulties for consumers to distinguish reliable information from "greenwashing".

Perceived moral intensity (PMI) was able to explain an additional 2 to 5 percent of total variance in behavioral intentions and improved the data fit of the model in all four scenarios, lending support for *H3*. The findings also support *H4,* as higher PMI was associated with decreased intention to engage in ethically questionable behavior. The present study thus offers compelling evidence for the inclusion of the PMI construct in Ajzen's TPB framework, demonstrating its predictive power in a wide range of contexts involving ethically questionable issues and behaviors. No moderating relationship was found between PMI and any of the other independent

variables in the theory of planned behavior, thus supporting *H5*. The latter result is at variance with the findings of Chen et al. (2009), who found moral intensity to have a moderating effect on other explanatory variables, but supports the findings of Valentine and Bateman (2011).

The effect sizes and statistical significances of certain independent variables varied from scenario to scenario. For example, attitude did not reach statistical significance in determining intentions to purchase products with environmentally harmful byproducts. The relatively high predictive power of perceived controllability and self-efficacy in the same scenario suggests that consumers may perceive significant barriers to purchasing environmentally friendly products, and as a result may be forced to opt for goods that are not in agreement with their personal attitudes and values. Similarly, perceived behavioral control did not reach statistical significance in the scenario where the behavior in question is informing the cashier or shopkeeper of a mistake in favor of the customer. The behavior is likely to be perceived as completely under volitional control of the consumer, rendering the construct irrelevant.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

In addition to contributing to academic discourse on ethical consumer behavior, the study also offers valuable insight for marketing practitioners seeking to influence the occurrence of ethical behavior in the retail environment. Recommendations for

managers are synthesized into a marketing tool kit (Table 6), which details the actions that marketers can undertake to increase the incidence of ethical consumer behavior.

The finding that attitude is a relatively weak predictor of intentions should be a concern to many managers and marketers, given the emphasis commonly placed on influencing consumer attitudes towards products and services. In fact, the results suggest that marketers are better served by focusing on consumers' perceptions of subjective norms, controllability, self-efficacy and moral intensity.

Consumers' subjective norms can be influenced by using descriptive and injunctive appeals in marketing communications (White & Simpson 2013), as well as by showing reference group members consuming ethical products or expressing negative attitudes towards unethical products and behavior. Point-of-purchase marketing may also be used to increase the salience of beliefs that underlie subjective norms during the decision-making process. Control beliefs may be addressed by emphasizing the availability of ethical products, and the general ease with which they can be purchased, while perceptions of self-efficacy can be enhanced both by educating consumers about ethical issues on a general level and by facilitating the distinction of specific ethical products from unethical ones. Marketing campaigns that drive home the seriousness of ethical issues and their consequences are likely to influence consumers' perception of moral intensity.

Finally, it must be noted that the degree of influence that each component of the theory of planned behavior exerts on behavioral intentions varies depending on the ethical issue or behavior in question. Thus, Rather than adopting a one-size-fits-all

approach to marketing ethical products, marketers are encouraged to carefully evaluate what are the most critical ethical issues related to their specific products or services, and tailor their marketing communications accordingly

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As with any study, there are limitations pertaining both to the methodology and the research context. Care should be taken when extrapolating the findings of the study to real-life retail contexts. For one, the findings of the study are largely contingent on maintaining ceteris paribus conditions. Also, because the behaviors studied are of a morally sensitive nature, the data gathered from participants are potentially susceptible to social desirability bias. Finally, although scenarios and vignettes are a popular in studies involving consumer decision-making, it must be acknowledged that responses to scenarios are only reflections of actual reasoning, decisions and behavior.

The sample size, while satisfying the commonly cited minimum requirements of ten observations per independent variable, could be larger. A larger sample size would substantially increase the external validity of the findings and allow for in-depth tests of construct convergent and discriminant validity using factor analyses. Although research has shown the decision-making process to not be influenced by demographic factors, one should nevertheless exercise caution when generalizing the findings to other cultural contexts.

Due to the difficulty in attaining accurate information about the behavior of participants, the outcome variable in the study is behavioral intentions, not actual behavior. Future studies could test the hypotheses and relationships established in this study using behavior as the dependent variable. Another fruitful direction for further research lies in examining the potential interrelationships between the independent variables of the framework proposed in this paper. Structural equation modeling could also be used to examine the underlying beliefs that underpin the key cognitive constructs of the TPB.

One of the key findings of this study is the importance of perceived control and self-efficacy in determining consumer intentions to abstain from purchasing unethical products and services. This suggests that consumers are aware of certain factors, both internal and external, that inhibit them from purchasing ethically. A detailed exploration of consumer limiting beliefs regarding personal capability to purchase ethical products would shed much needed light on the issue, and likely provide compelling insights for academic researchers and marketers of ethical products alike.

References

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

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

Ajzen, I. (2002). Residual effects of past on later behavior: Habituation and reasoned action perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 107-122.

Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behavior: Reaction and reflections. *Psychology and Health, 26*(9), 1113-1127.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*, 248-287.

Buchan, H. F. (2005). Ethical decision making in the public accounting profession: An extension of Ajzen's theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 61*, 165-181.

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.

Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (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*, *97*(1), 139-158.

Chen, M. F., Pan, C. T., & Pan, M. C. (2009). The joint moderating impact of moral intensity and moral judgment on consumer's use intention of pirated software. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90*, 361-373.

Ehrich, K. R., & Irwin, J R. (2005). Willful ignorance in the request for product attribute information. *Journal of Marketing Research, 42*(3), 266-277.

Flannery B. L. and D. R. May: 2000, Environmental Ethical Decision Making in the U.S. Metal Finishing Industry, *Academy of Management 43*, 642-66.

Fukukawa, K. (2002). Developing a framework for ethically questionable behavior in consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics, 41*, 99-119.

Fukukawa, K., & Ennew, K. (2010). What we believe is not always what we do: An empirical investigation into ethically questionable behavior in consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics, 91*, 49-60.

Goldstein, N. J., Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). A room with a viewpoint: Using social norms to motivate environmental conservation in hotels. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35(3)*, 472-482.

Hunt, S. D., & Vitell, S. M. (1986). A general theory of making ethics. *Journal of Macromarketing, 6*, 5-16.

Jones, T. M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(2), 366–395.

Manstead, A. S. R., & van Eekelen, S. A. M. (1998). Distinguishing between perceived behavioral control and self-efficacy in the domain of academic intentions and behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 1375-1392.

Menon, A., & Menon. A. (1997). Enviropreneurial marketing strategy: The emergence of corporate environmentalism as market strategy. *Journal of Marketing, 61*(1), 51-67.

Randall, D. M., & Gibson, A. M. (1991). Ethical decision making in the medical profession: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 10*, 111-122.

Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Valentine, S. R., & Bateman, C. R. (2011). The impact of ethical ideologies, moral intensity, and social context on sales-based ethical reasoning. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*, 155-168.

Valentine, S. R., & Hollingworth, D. (2012). Moral intensity, issue importance, and ethical reasoning in operations situations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 108*, 509-523.

White, C., & Simpson, B. (2013). When do (and don't) normative appeals influence sustainable consumer behaviors? *Journal of Marketing, 77*(2), 78-95.

Yoon, C. (2011). Theory of planned behavior and ethics theory in digital piracy: an integrated model. *Journal of Business Ethics, 100*, 405-417.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Summary of Construct Measures

TABLE 1
Summary of construct measures

Construct	Source	Sample items	Cronbach's alpha			
			Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Intention	Chang (1998)	In the future, I intend to purchase products such as the one mentioned above.	0.736	0.802	0.982	0.961
	Bagozzi and Warshaw (1990)	All things considered, it is likely that in the future I will purchase a product such as the one mentioned above.				
Attitude	Ajzen (2013)	On balance, the action described tends to be good.	0.695	0.727	0.902	0.830
	Reidenbach, Robin and Dawson (1991)	The action described above is ethical.				
Subjective norm	Reidenbach and Robin (1990)	The action is acceptable to the people I most admire.	0.680	0.711	0.806	0.790
	Reidenbach and Robin (1990)	The action is acceptable to my family.				
	Ajzen (2013)	The probability that my peers would undertake the same action is high.				
Perceived controllability	Ajzen (2002)	Not acting in such a way is beyond my control.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Perceived self-efficacy	Ajzen (2002)	I am capable of not acting in such a way.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Perceived moral intensity	Singhapakdi, Vitell and Kraft (1996)	The overall harm (if any) done as a result of acting in such a way would be very small.	0.727	0.805	0.879	0.877
	Singhapakdi, Vitell and Kraft (1996)	Most people would agree that purchasing the product is wrong.				
	Singhapakdi, Vitell and Kraft (1996)	There is a very small likelihood that purchasing the product will actually cause any harm.				
	Singhapakdi, Vitell and Kraft (1996)	Purchasing the product will not cause any harm in the immediate future.				
	McMahon and Harvey (2006)	I am unlikely to be close to anyone who might be negatively affected by my purchasing such a product.				
	Singhapakdi, Vitell and Kraft (1996)	Purchasing the product will harm very few people, if any.				

Tables 2: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, Scenario 1

TABLE 2
Multiple linear regression analysis, Scenario 1

	b	Standard error	Standardized coefficient	t	Sig.	F	Sig.	Adj Rsq	Δ adj Rsq	Tolerance	VIF
Step 1											
Attitude	-0.535	0.169	-0.385	-3.158	0.002					0.570	1.756
Subjective norm	-0.277	0.126	-0.268	-2.191	0.032					0.566	1.765
Perceived behavioral control	-0.249	0.082	-0.283	-3.052	0.003	17.384	0.000	0.416	0.416	0.985	1.015
Step 2											
Attitude	-0.412	0.169	-0.297	-2.439	0.017					0.526	1.902
Subjective norm	-0.279	0.121	-0.270	-2.301	0.025					0.566	1.766
Perceived behavioral control	-0.186	0.082	-0.211	-2.274	0.026					0.900	1.111
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.264	0.100	-0.257	-2.624	0.011	5.970	0.017	0.464	0.048	0.811	1.233
Step 3											
Attitude	-0.323	0.165	-0.232	-1.954	0.055					0.504	1.985
Subjective norm	-0.207	0.119	-0.200	-1.74	0.087					0.537	1.862
Perceived behavioral control	-0.147	0.080	-0.167	-1.847	0.069					0.869	1.151
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.277	0.096	-0.270	-2.882	0.005					0.809	1.236
Perceived moral intensity	-0.338	0.128	-0.256	-2.643	0.010	4.410	0.016	0.509	0.045	0.758	1.320

a: F-test for the signifiance of all variables in the model
b: F-test for the (joint) signifiance of variables added to the TPB

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, Scenario 2

TABLE 3
Multiple linear regression analysis, Scenario 2

	b	Standard error	Standardized coefficient	t	Sig.	F	Sig.	Adj Rsq	Δ adj Rsq	Tolerance	VIF
Step 1											
Attitude	0.044	0.171	0.030	0.258	0.797					0.542	1.845
Subjective norm	-0.487	0.129	-0.431	-3.770	0.000					0.566	1.766
Perceived behavioral control	-0.472	0.102	-0.437	-4.614	0.000	21.609	0.000	0.459	0.459	0.829	1.207
Step 2											
Attitude	0.029	0.164	0.020	0.176	0.861					0.541	1.848
Subjective norm	-0.481	0.124	-0.426	-3.872	0.000					0.566	1.766
Perceived behavioral control	-0.381	0.105	-0.352	-3.635	0.001					0.732	1.365
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.205	0.080	-0.228	-2.565	0.012	8.889	0.004	0.499	0.040	0.869	1.151
Step 3											
Attitude	0.054	0.157	0.037	0.345	0.731					0.539	1.854
Subjective norm	-0.316	0.133	-0.280	-2.376	0.020					0.452	2.214
Perceived behavioral control	-0.315	0.103	-0.291	-3.060	0.003					0.693	1.443
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.204	0.076	-0.227	-2.670	0.009					0.869	1.151
Perceived moral intensity	-0.398	0.143	-0.290	-2.773	0.007	6.065	0.004	0.543	0.044	0.572	1.749

a: F-test for the signifiance of all variables in the model
b: F-test for the (joint) signifiance of variables added to the TPB

Table 4: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, Scenario 3

TABLE 4
Multiple linear regression analysis, Scenario 3

	b	Standard error	Standardized coefficient	t	Sig.	F	Sig.	Adj Rsq	Δ adj Rsq	Tolerance	VIF
Step 1											
Attitude	-0.435	0.112	-0.365	-3.893	0.000					0.393	2.542
Subjective norm	-0.498	0.119	-0.403	-4.183	0.000					0.371	2.693
Perceived behavioral control	-0.279	0.069	-0.264	-4.051	0.000	64.465	0.000	0.717	0.717	0.815	1.228
Step 2											
Attitude	-0.416	0.104	-0.348	-4.011	0.000					0.392	2.549
Subjective norm	-0.474	0.110	-0.384	-4.295	0.000					0.370	2.702
Perceived behavioral control	-0.229	0.065	-0.216	-3.497	0.001					0.776	1.288
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.245	0.068	-0.207	-3.586	0.001	4.367	0.040	0.761	0.044	0.888	1.126
Step 3											
Attitude	-0.279	0.123	-0.234	-2.272	0.026					0.368	2.729
Subjective norm	-0.430	0.110	-0.348	-3.896	0.000					0.355	2.816
Perceived behavioral control	-0.223	0.064	-0.211	-3.479	0.001					0.775	1.290
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.207	0.070	-0.175	-2.973	0.004					0.821	1.218
Perceived moral intensity	-0.260	0.132	-0.189	-1.977	0.050	6.877	0.002	0.779	0.018	0.419	2.233

a: F-test for the signifiance of all variables in the model
b: F-test for the (joint) signifiance of variables added to the TPB

Table 5: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, Scenario 4

TABLE 4
Multiple linear regression analysis, Scenario 4

	b	Standard error	Standardized coefficient	t	Sig.	F	Sig.	Adj Rsq	Δ adj Rsq	Tolerance	VIF
Step 1											
Attitude	-0.444	0.163	-0.317	-2.719	0.008					0.482	2.076
Subjective norm	-0.562	0.134	-0.492	-4.185	0.000					0.474	2.112
Perceived behavioral control	0.047	0.074	0.051	0.626	0.534	29.259	0.000	0.555	0.555	0.966	1.035
Step 2											
Attitude	-0.317	0.156	-0.226	-2.037	0.046					0.455	2.200
Subjective norm	-0.486	0.126	-0.425	-3.844	0.000					0.459	2.179
Perceived behavioral control	0.044	0.069	0.049	0.642	0.523					0.966	1.035
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.317	0.092	-0.296	-3.439	0.001	1.571	0.215	0.618	0.063	0.756	1.323
Step 3											
Attitude	-0.260	0.155	-0.186	-1.681	0.098					0.439	2.277
Subjective norm	-0.426	0.127	-0.373	-3.356	0.001					0.434	2.305
Perceived behavioral control	0.047	0.067	0.052	0.699	0.487					0.966	1.035
Perceived self-efficacy	-0.268	0.093	-0.250	-2.867	0.006					0.703	1.422
Perceived moral intensity	-0.234	0.117	-0.186	-1.996	0.050	5.802	0.005	0.635	0.017	0.616	1.623

a: F-test for the signifiance of all variables in the model
b: F-test for the (joint) signifiance of variables added to the TPB

Table 6: Tool Kit for Marketers of Ethical Products

TABLE 6
Tool kit for marketers of ethical products

Factor	Marketing action
Subjective norm	Use descriptive and injunctive appeals in marketing communications
	Capitalize on reference group influence through social media and word-of-mouth campaigns
	Use point-of-purchase marketing to increase salience of social norm beliefs
Perceived controllability	Emphasize lack of physical barriers; ethical purchasing should not be perceived as an inconvenience
	Highlight availability and accessibility of ethical products
Perceived self-efficacy	Make information about ethicality easy to find, clear and easy to interpret and understand
	Information should not increase confusion or uncertainty about ethicality of product or underlying moral issue
Perceived moral intensity	Focus on magnitude, concentration, proximity, temporal immediacy, and probability of negative consequences
	Highlight characteristics of moral issue, not customer segment