

PROFILING GREEN CONSUMERS: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

A Thesis  
by  
TARA MCBRIDE MINTZ

Submitted to the Graduate School  
Appalachian State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

May 2011  
Walker College of Business

PROFILING GREEN CONSUMERS: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

A Thesis  
by  
TARA MCBRIDE MINTZ  
May 2011

APPROVED BY:

---

Eva Hyatt  
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

---

Joseph Cazier  
Member, Thesis Committee

---

Pia Albinsson  
Member, Thesis Committee

---

Joseph Cazier  
Director, MBA Program

---

Edelma D. Huntley  
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

Copyright by Tara McBride Mintz 2011  
All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

### PROFILING GREEN CONSUMERS: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Tara M. Mintz, B.S., University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Eva M. Hyatt, Ph.D., University of South Carolina

This paper looks at the subject of green consumers and how the different green consumer segments can be profiled. As environmental issues have become more critical to the sustainability of business there are greater implications for marketers to determine how to adequately advertise to different green consumer segments. This paper attempts to segment and profile different types of green consumers, as well as to predict consumer reactions to environmentally-friendly products, eco-labels, and cause-related campaigns. This research indicates there are clear differentiations in attitudes, behaviors, and psychographics between the separate green consumer segments and outlines what those key differences are.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Literature Review.....	4
The Different Shades of Green Consumers.....	4
Greenwashing and Green Fatigue.....	11
Corporate Social Responsibility .....	14
Cause-Related Marketing.....	15
Green Product Seals.....	18
Good Housekeeping Green Seal .....	19
Research Questions .....	24
Research Question #1 .....	25
Research Question #2 .....	26
Research Question #3 .....	27
Research Question #4 .....	29
Research Question #5 .....	29
Research Question #6 .....	30
Research Methodology.....	31
Survey .....	31
Data Collection Procedures.....	36
Analysis and Results .....	37
Sample Characteristics.....	37
Data Reduction and Results .....	37
Results for Research Question #1.....	38
Results for Research Question #2.....	40
Results for Research Question #3.....	43
Results for Research Question #4.....	48

Results for Research Question #5.....	51
Results for Research Question #6.....	52
Discussion.....	55
Consumer Behavior & Environmental Behavior Implications.....	55
Psychographic Implications .....	57
Psychographic Implications for Marketers.....	59
True Greens .....	59
Marketing Implications for True Greens .....	61
Donor Greens .....	62
Marketing Implications for Donor Greens .....	63
Learning Greens .....	64
Marketing Implications for Learning Greens .....	64
Non-Greens .....	65
Marketing Implications for Non-Greens .....	65
Environmental Implications for Marketers .....	66
Research Question #4: Green Product Implications .....	75
Research Question #5: Eco-Label Implications .....	79
Research Question #6: Cause-Related Marketing Implications .....	81
Conclusion.....	84
Limitations .....	85
Future Direction .....	86
Bibliography .....	87
Tables .....	90
Appendix .....	104

## INTRODUCTION

Marketers once felt that green products were a trend and simply attempted to exploit the potential opportunity of the moment (Banerjee, Gulas, & Iyer, 1995). However, what once was a fad is now social responsibility, and green products and services are here to stay. Although the 1960s wave of earth-friendly awareness brought various movements to the United States, the formal introduction of the idea of green consumers segments did not come to academic literature until the 1990s with the publication of the Roper Organization's Green Gauge Study for 1993 (Stisser, 1994). During that decade, it was clear that consumers had become more educated about the environment and were beginning to make their purchases based on their growing green consciousness (Stisser, 1994). The Roper Organization's polls showed that the "greenest" segment of consumers almost doubled between 1990 and 1992 (Iyer & Banerjee, 1993). This increase in environmental awareness has continued as evidenced in a poll conducted by Yankelovich Clancy Shulman published in *Advertising Age* which found that 70% of the respondents were "sometimes" influenced by environmental advertising and labeling when making purchase decisions (Chase & Smith, 1992).

The Roper polls indicated five different segments of consumers with regard to their environmental activity. The Roper Study determined these segments by measuring 14 different environmental behaviors such as purchase behaviors, post-purchase behaviors, and other behaviors (Miller, 1991). Three of these segments indicated various levels of environmentally active consumers, and two of these segments indicated consumer who are inactive in environmentally driven decisions. The first green segment was coined "true-blue greens," and those consumers appeared to have the highest level of commitment when changing their patterns and behavior with regard to environmental issues. The second

actively green segment was termed “green-back greens.” This segment admitted understanding there are environmental issues and supporting these causes financially; however, those consumers were in the beginning stages of changing their environmental behaviors. The final green segment was referred to as the “sprouts.” The “sprouts” were in the very beginning learning stages of changing environmentally-friendly behaviors. The first segment of less environmentally-friendly consumers was called the “grouzers,” who believed the responsibility lay with the companies who caused the environmental problems. The final segment was termed the “basic browns,” who understood there may be environmental problems but felt overwhelmed with the enormity of the situation and did not feel they could do anything to help (A. P. Minton & Rose, 1997).

Green consumerism has seen ups and downs since the ground breaking movements in the 1960s. What has turned out to be quite surprising more recently is the research that claims green marketing is recession proof. In 2009 alone, studies show that 458 sustainable, environmentally-friendly products were launched. Despite the inflated costs for these products it appears that consumers are still buying. For example, Nielsen Co. claimed a 5.6% increase in sales in the organic food industry. Review of the past several decades indicates that every green movement failed due to recessions; however, the current market indicates that regardless of the failing economy, people are still buying eco-friendly (Neff, 2009). This may indicate that consumers are changing their behaviors for reasons besides financial impact which can change purchasing patterns for the long-term.

In contrast, other research indicates that recession causes consumers to focus less on the future impact of their purchase and more on product prices. Wal-Mart Stores Incorporated, is taking this initiative head-on; they announced in 2009 that they plan to create

an environmental labeling system which will alert consumers to the level of social and ecological impacts of the products on their shelves. This cost will be relayed to their suppliers, which number over 100,000 (Silverman, 2009). This initiative could greatly impact consumers' ability to find environmentally-friendly products at reasonable prices, furthering their purchasing behavior towards eco-friendly products. Logic predicts that consumers would engage in more environmentally-friendly behaviors if the financial impact was reduced. Regardless of economic conditions, consumers are becoming more educated with regard to environmental issues, and hence, requiring responsible companies to produce affordable, environmentally-friendly products.

To better understand which consumers buy green and why, we have to look beyond what consumers say they do, to examine what actions they actually take and how they feel post-purchase. To begin, there are a variety of societal factors that drive all purchase intentions regardless of lifestyle requirements. Consumers want value-added attributes, such as green benefits, with their products; however, just because a product has this value it does not translate into consumer purchase behavior for all green-conscious consumers. The question remains, how do we differentiate between different green consumer segments? Regardless of whether a product is environmental or not, consumers can be segregated based on similar behaviors and patterns. In order to target consumers based on their environmental preferences, researchers must first determine specific profiles for these various consumer groups. Before these questions can be answered, we need to first discuss the differentiating factors which drive green consumers.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### **The Different Shades of Green Consumers**

Choosing to drive a hybrid car, although a green decision, is less involved than walking everywhere. A consumer who chooses to eat organic food could do so primarily for health reasons instead of attempting to impact the environment in a positive way. Regardless of the different levels of motivation, these decisions still encompass various levels of greenness. These choices force consumers to assess the environmental impact of their purchase choices while simultaneously requiring them to alter their behavioral patterns when purchasing, consuming and disposing of products

Although many advertisements today include green claims, very few clearly articulate the true benefit of the product or state the specific environmental action taken by the company to make their product eco-friendly (Banerjee, et al., 1995). As a matter of fact, many advertisements make vague, general claims, and many appear to blatantly mislead consumers. This causes skepticism among green consumer groups and can lead to cynicism if marketers continue this grey path. According to the *Oxford Dictionary* (Oxford University Press, 2011.), a skeptic is a person who is inclined to question the truth of facts, inferences, and so on. Skepticism is more situational and short-term, which indicates the ability to sway individuals who may appear skeptical at times. However, cynicism is characterized by a more enduring, long-term disbelief in the claims of others (Bronn & Vrioni, 2001). Research indicates that skeptics doubt the claims of communications; however, cynics doubt not just the words spoken, but the motives behind the words (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989).

History alludes to consumer skepticism at times; however, falsified green claims can lead to cynicism which is more difficult for marketers to reverse.

As previously discussed, the Roper Organization's Green Gauge Study for 1993 described five categories of green consumers. Three of these categories describe environmentally active consumer segments and the other two describe inactive segments. All of these segments defined differ in terms of behaviors, attitudes and demographics. The "true-blue greens" are the most environmentally aware and show high levels of behavioral change in their purchase, consumption and disposal patterns. The "green-back greens" are also inherently committed to making green decisions, but are not quite as far along as the true-blue greens. The "sprout" segments have acknowledged the need for change and are just beginning to adjust their behaviors. The "grouzers" believe it is the companies' responsibility to make environmentally responsible decisions. And finally, the "basic browns" don't think that they can make a difference or they just do not care (Iyer 1993).

The Roper report examines the stewardship potential of aiming environmental education programs more effectively at sizable and highly influential target segments of U.S. community leaders. The largest of these segments ((20%) of adults) are Roper Environmental Information Seekers. Some 35% of this segment is likely to perform pro-environmental behaviors, compared to 23% of the general public. Another, smaller segment (10%) called the Roper True Blue Greens is a significant segment that "walks" the environmental "talk." As would be expected, this segment shows high levels of pro-environmental behaviors. Importantly, this segment has a nearly one-half overlap with the Influential Americans segment (also 10%). But they may have even more in common when it comes to environmental education and stewardship. This indicates that Influential Americans (i.e.,

those with the financial prowess to make a difference) could possibly be associated with those same segments that are environmentally active (Coyle, 2004).

The more recent 2002 Green Gauge, for example, indicates that while 52% of Americans report that they “have heard of” ozone action days or code orange/code red air quality days, 73% of “Influentials” say they have heard of them and 71% of True Blue Greens say likewise. According to the 2003 Green Gauge report, 26% of Americans purchased an environmentally safe product within the past two months. At 53%, True Blue Greens are twice as likely as the general public to have purchased environmentally-friendly products in the past two months. Accordingly, environmental information seekers (51%) and community Influentials (46%) have recently purchased such products (Coyle, 2004).

The Natural Marketing Institute (NMI), a leading business consultant and marketing research firm, has also been segmenting green consumers since the 1990s. NMI tracks more than 100 different driving forces of consumer behavior and divides them into five categories. The “LOHAS” group (16%) is very progressive on environment and society issues. This group constantly looks for ways to do more and is not affected by premium pricing. The “Naturalites” (25%) use many natural products for personal health and well-being. They are interested in doing more to protect the environment but concentrate on their health first. The “Conventionals” (23%) are interested in supporting environmental issues to the extent that results can be measured. They want a cost effective way to take care of the issues that will sustain. The “Drifters” (23%) are not overly concerned about the environment. The “Drifters” admit there are issues but feel there is plenty of time to handle the problems. Although they do not make many green purchases, they do like to maintain a socially acceptable image. Therefore, if this group happens to be involved in green purchasing it may

be for social acceptance. The “Unconcerned” (14%) are the least involved in environmental issues. They are not interested in knowing about green products and make purchases primarily based on price, value, quality, and convenience (Molyneaux, 2007).

There are also other green consumer segmentations published by the Hartman Group, which is a Seattle-based market research firm who has been tracking green consumer behavior since the 1980s. The Hartman Report on Sustainability categorizes five different green consumer groups. The “Radical Engagement” group (36%) feel that our future will fall apart if we do not band together and radically change our behaviors. The “Sustained Optimism” (27%) believe rationale intelligence can be used to sustain a promising future. The “Divine Faith” (20%) feel God will take care of all of our needs. The “Cynical Pessimism” (9%) think we cannot save ourselves, much less the planet. And the “Pragmatic Acceptance” (8%) feel they have no control over environmental issues therefore, they are not inclined to be concerned about environmental problems (The Hartman Group, 2007).

These various marketing segmentations use different factoring variables; however, they all basically explain the range of different green consumer segments. Putting a name on a consumer segment is less important than determining their level of environmental concern and how to change these attitudes into behaviors. Concern for the environment is established from various positions and can be defined in numerous ways. Researchers explain environmental concern as, “a strong positive attitude toward preserving the environment” (A. P. Minton & Rose, 1997, p. 38). Some research explains this phenomenon as, “A general or global attitude with indirect effects on behaviors through behavioral intentions (A. P. Minton & Rose, 1997, p. 38). Another definition for environmentalism is, “A general concept that can refer to feelings about many different green issues” (A. P. Minton & Rose, 1997, p. 38).

Research shows potential for growth in the green industry. In the early 1990s 93% of adult consumers thought about what impact their purchase had on the environment (Magrath, 1992). During the same time period other research found that 75% of consumers used environmental criteria when determining what to purchase (Peattie, 1992). Although this research indicates environmental concern, this may not predicate environmental behavior. A somewhat unique approach to gaining green consumers is a theory regarding 'ecological cues' which are "experiences of environment-related problems" (Soler, 1995, p. 267) This research indicates that consumers who had personally encountered environmental issues would be a good source for green target marketing (Soler, 1995). It is understandable to believe this consumer segment would be more inclined to not only pay attention to environmental products but also to act accordingly; however, this segment may be too small to make a difference in the green industry.

A general attitude toward wanting to better the environment can be a significant indicator of purchase intentions for environmentally safe products among other things, such as recycling and joining environmental segments (P. S. Ellen, Wiener, & Cobb-Walgren, 1991). Conscious actions to change consumer behaviors cannot begin without a change in consumer attitudes. These attitudes vary greatly depending on specific consumer characteristics and the current economic climate.

Social norms could be a critical influence upon the level of environmental concern. Minton directs us to past research which indicates two different types of social norms. Injunctive norms are motivated by what others think, versus personal norms which are self-motivated by personal beliefs and internal moral obligations. It would appear that personal norms harness greater social responsibility, as complying with personal norms leads to

greater self-esteem, versus non-compliance which intermediates internal feelings of guilt. (A. P. Minton & Rose, 1997). However, as consumer actions become more transparent due to the externalities of social media and societal pressures, injunctive norms may become more indicative of consumer behavior. Each of these factors must be weighed appropriately when determining the underlying motivations for green consumer behavior.

Minton's research supports the implication that the personal norm has the highest effect on environmentally-friendly behavior. This makes sense because when consumers have personal, internal reasons for doing things their intentions follow a natural progression rather than making decisions based on what someone else wants them to do. Minton's research also indicates that consumers' attitude toward the environment had the largest effect on their behavioral intentions; however, their personal norm had the strongest effect on their predication of product choice, information search and recycling (A. P. Minton, & Rose, R. L., 1997). Intentions do not always gravitate towards behaviors. What people say they feel is not always predictive of the choices they make. In order to make long-term changes in consumers' behavioral patterns it would be ideal to change both injunctive and personal norms toward the desired intentions.

This same research indicates that an attempt to establish a sense of personal moral obligation in the "grouzers" and "basic brown" categories would be more difficult in the short-term than changing their attitudes. "This attitude shift might best be accomplished by attempting to change these crucial beliefs underlying their unfavorable or neutral attitudes." (Stisser, 1994, p. 27). Consumers who are uninterested in environmental issues need to be trained over the long-term to change their internal attitudes by instilling a sense of responsibility and guilt for their actions. A direct approach to move the injunctive norms to

personal norms could be to encourage doing the right thing in order to instill a personal sense of environmental importance in those currently inclined to do the right thing only because someone else is watching (A. P. Minton, & Rose, R. L. , 1997).

Environmental awareness is the first step for green purchasing and the slow incline of green market share may suggest that the true green consumer segment is not growing (Meyer, 2001). The modesty of the green market could be explained by the limited amount of green product groups. Many product groups lack green alternatives; therefore, we cannot anticipate large increases in market share while this segment of consumers remains limited (Rex & Baumann, 2006). Some researchers argue that we are wasting our time even discussing green consumers because being green is not a fixed characteristic of a consumer. The same consumer may choose a green product in one situation but not another. This makes targeting these consumers an often frightful task as green buying behavior hinges on more than the characteristics of the consumer (Rex & Baumann, 2006). In order to increase the number of green consumers, companies must display the often hidden environmental qualities of their products in a highly visible, transparent, and non-misleading way. Marketers should be tasked with finding green consumers and educating them about the environmental values and processes the product shares with their beliefs (Rex & Baumann, 2006).

### **Greenwashing and Green Fatigue**

Recent environmental issues have been marketed so heavily that consumers are becoming disillusioned. Due to the enormity of environmental problems and the massive amount of years it would take to fix these issues on a global scale, consumers are tiring of

this environmentally-friendly campaign. Environmentalists have growing concern that people see their actions as irrelevant. Even if consumers have not completely lost hope, cynicism is creeping in to their attitudes. To campaigners this comes as no surprise as businesses have used environmentalism as a marketing strategy. “Green washing” is described in the literature as “Companies that paint a superficial green gloss on conventional business practices” (Wilson, 2007, p. 1). As consumers feel more unclear about the green products and their true impact on the environment, they can become ambivalent.

Ambivalence has many definitions which normally encompass mixed or conflicted feelings associated with an attitude object (Sparks, 2002). Because consumers who experience feelings on both ends of the spectrum, ambivalent attitudes tend to be less extreme than unambivalent attitudes which can cause inactions (Bromer, 1998). Marketers may find that changing a consumer’s mind from one extreme to another may be easier than changing the mind of a consumer who is stuck in the middle. Some researchers claim that strong (unambivalent) attitudes are much more accessible in memory, more extreme in their outward expression, and displayed with more knowledge and confidence. In order for an attitude to be considered “strong,” these researchers state it must remain stable over time, impact behavior, influence information processing, and resist persuasion (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). These considerations are imperative for marketers when introducing new ideas such as environmentally-friendly products, green awareness, and cause-related campaigns. In order to provoke action, companies must be consistent in their efforts, educate consumers in a manner which they can process, and make an impact large enough to dissuade them from changing directions. These associations can assist marketers in changing consumer behaviors to remain stable over the long-term.

Evidence suggests that consumers are not only confused about environmental claims, but also distrustful of them. In a poll published by *Advertising Age* in 1992, respondents indicated they are less likely to pay attention to environmental advertising due to overkill, and the majority of respondents felt these claims are not believable (Chase & Smith, 1992). One article discusses young (age 35 and younger) people's ambivalence as the reasoning for why their obvious concern for the environment does not directly impact behavioral changes. The study done by Connell et al. shows that young people experience a term coined "action paralysis," which is defined as "the feeling that they themselves could not really do very much to help the environment—with the exception of small actions such as recycling" (p. 107). The study found that young respondents did not participate in environmental actions, would not write a letter to help change the environment and/or are very cynical about their effects. Ambivalence seems clear as these young individuals agree they need to make individual changes, but are unsure of what they can personally do. There appears to be a lack of motivation due to pessimism regarding their ability to have a significant impact on the environment. The study showed few of the young people would even acknowledge that their personal actions may be contributing to the environmental problem. They feel unobligated to make changes if they feel there is no collective effort to make a difference (Connell, Fien, Lee, Sykes, & Yencken, 1999).

In comparison, Bentley et al. (2004) cites a similar disconnect between awareness and action; however, this study cautions not to limit this sense of ambivalence only to the young segment. This survey showed that individuals over the age of 35 are more likely to claim their actions do not affect the environment in a negative way. Interestingly enough, this same survey shows that, although young people are unsure of how they can take actions that

truly make a difference, they do obtain a high level of awareness regarding environmental issues. They appear to adopt more environmental behaviors when faced with waste and disposal issues. The study shows this segment was approximately twice as likely to report the waste of paper, report lack of recycling efforts, litter, and report the allowance of harmful materials flushed down the sink (Bentley, Fien, & Neil, 2004).

As consumers are inundated with multitudes of green marketing campaigns, their level of disillusionment continues to climb. Eventually, this will lead to disengagement as environmental issues appear enormously complex and overwhelming, which can cause individuals to become confused and ambivalent. Due to overload, consumers must screen the amount of information they can generally absorb (Wilson, 2007). They sub-consciously become detached from environmental problems and use denial to protect their conscience from the gripping realities of environmental problems. Green campaigns that focus on the destitute situation of our environment will more than likely fail as consumers build a wall to shield their emotions in order to protect their level of anxiety.

Some literature indicates campaigners would benefit more from progressing on small, local scales. History shows individuals rally to save local landmarks, vote in their favorite local politicians, and spend their last penny to keep up with the Joneses. These motivations have a much more instant, and long-term, impact than fears of an uncertain future (Bronn & Vrioni, 2001). Consumers who are initially exposed to green claims from a large scale would be more likely to reject those claims than if they experienced a green uprising through their local communities. Small charity events provide an opportunity for consumers, in the learning process, to familiarize themselves with the full process of how their actions can actually make an impact on an environmental issue. It is important for consumers to

experience the entire process of their environmental efforts, which begins with the creation of an idea, followed by action, which will then lead to results. This will aid in building trust for those consumer segments who feel ambivalent about their ability to make a difference with regard to environmental problems.

### **Corporate Social Responsibility**

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) can be traced back to the 1800s in the form of philanthropy and charitable donations. CSR, as we know it today, began its development in the 1960s when corporations began extending their responsibilities beyond their legal obligations (Bronn & Vrioni, 2001). There are many definitions of CSR, the broadest being, “Corporate social actions whose purpose is to satisfy social needs” (Angelidis & Ibrahim, 1993, p. 7). Another review of literature suggest that CSR is defined by, “The extent to which organizational outcomes are consistent with societal values and expectations” (Lerner & Fryxell, 1988, p. 952). The most recent definition of CSR is described as, “The policy and practice of a corporation’s social involvement over and beyond its legal obligations for the benefit of the society at large” (Enderly & Tavis, 1998, p. 1139).

The Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) movement began growing in the early 2000s from various companies wishing to proactively anticipate the future requirements of their consumers. Many consumers consider CSR to be a type of philanthropy that can be defined as, “The efforts of corporations make above and beyond regulation to balance the needs of stakeholders with the need to make a profit” (Doane, 2005, p. 23). However, CSR emerges more as the positive face of capitalism. Unfortunately, CSR activities are faced with the identical limitations that normal markets require which began this ideology in the

beginning. Companies must now weigh the trade-offs between the financial well being of their firms with the health of ethical outcomes (Doane, 2005).

Many companies use CSR to gain a favorable reputation which sometimes allows them to ask a premium for their products and/or services. Companies who have a good reputation lend themselves to brand awareness, which assists in differentiating a company's product and/or service, which can cause them to either gain or lose a competitive advantage (Kay, 1993). Consumers these days want more for their money and demand that companies make more socially responsible decisions. A company who associates with a non-profit organization can build a positive reputation, generate positive media coverage, guide consumers' preferences, and enhance their integrity and employee productivity (Duncan & Moriarty, 1997).

### **Cause-Related Marketing**

Advocating corporate social responsibility in marketing communication is commonly known as cause-related marketing (CRM). CRM is defined as "The process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by contributing a specific amount to a designated non-profit effort that, in turn, causes customers to engage in revenue-providing exchanges" (Mullen, 1997, p. 45). CRM has become widely known as a communication tool, which entails firms using advertising, packaging, promotions, and social responsibility to attract consumers who wish to make a societal difference through their purchasing decisions. Because of the increasing number of firms engaging in CRM, skepticism is on the rise which leads consumers to reject the claims made by these campaigns. Not only is it important that companies engaging in CRM be genuine in their

efforts, but to be effective, they must gain a thorough understanding of consumers' knowledge regarding CRM (Bronn & Vrioni, 2001). CRM is a dramatic way to build brand equity because it adds the most value to a homogenous product or service which directly enhances a company's financial performance (Mullen, 1997). This type of marketing campaign can generate the long-term value needed for a company to survive and achieve a competitive advantage (Collins, 1993).

Cause-related marketing can be a useful tool for a company to differentiate themselves from their competitors, which improves the chances consumers will purchase their product (Tate, 1995). In some cases, CRM will lead to positive purchase intentions; however, CRM has also been shown to cause negative perceptions regarding a company's reasoning for engaging in a specific social cause (Smith & Stodghill, 1994). However, Smith and Stodghill (1994) cite other research which claims that companies who engage in socially responsible activities have little bearing on consumers' purchase intentions. The consumer market is enormous and consumers determine their purchase intentions based on a multitude of differentiating factors. The marketers' challenge is to determine who they are targeting and how that specific segment determines their purchasing behavior.

When considering the use of CRM, it is important that marketers consider the negative consequences of ineffective integration. Implementing a successful CRM strategy can be done by tying the cause to the company's mission, making the campaign long-term, not simply using CRM as a short-term profit tactic and understanding the effects of the campaign. These outcomes are often ambiguous and difficult to measure (Bronn & Vrioni, 2001). The results of a properly integrated CRM campaign should enhance a company's reputation and have positive, long-term effects for the business (Duncan & Moriarty, 1997).

Companies need to create monitoring systems, however ambiguous, upon implementation, in order to measure the various outcomes that could be due to their CRM campaigns. Although this data may be difficult to assess, without some type of measure, these motives are pointless

In the United States many consumers feel that CRM is an effective and believable way to improve the country's social problems, which effects what and how consumers determine what to purchase (Bronn & Vrioni, 2001). On the other hand, one survey shows that respondents do not find corporate behavior an important factor in their purchasing decisions (Boulstridge & Carrigan, 2000). This could be due to many factors including preconceived notions of the company, existing disillusionment, or consumer ambivalence.

Research suggests that the more a consumer knows and understands what is going on, the less skepticism they have about the claim (Szykman, Bloom, & Levy, 1997). A company who exhibits a long-term commitment to a social cause and who is involved long-term with a non-profit organization can aid in overcoming consumer skepticism towards the company's CRM campaigns. In order to effectively communicate a company's commitment to a social cause they should first emphasize awareness of their corporate social responsibility and how this will benefit the customer (Vrioni, 2001). Consumers who can easily connect the cause with the company will be more likely to trust that their dollars benefit the greater good of the environment. Inevitably the more a consumer trusts a company, for whatever reason, the more likely they are to become brand loyal. This is one of the ultimate goals for any company.

## **Green Product Seals**

Eco-labels are intended as “a means for consumers to make choices that will reduce environmental impact and enable them to influence how products are made. Green products have inherent negative features that must be overcome in order to be viewed as environmentally-friendly. These green labels provide a new step towards enforcing green credentials of a product; however, “a sustainable production and consumption system is still far away” (Rex & Baumann, 2006, p. 574). Although much effort has been put into the creation and dissemination of these green labels, actual sales of products bearing these emblems have remained moderate. The market share of these products may be due to the limited market share of the green consumer (Rex & Baumann, 2006). According to the EcoLabel Index website ([www.ecolabelindex.com](http://www.ecolabelindex.com)), there are approximately 137 eco-labels worthy of discussing in the United States (Big Room Incorporated, 2011). The Good Housekeeping Research Institute’s review the most popular environmental products and issues a guarantee using a Green Good Housekeeping Seal which states, “Applicant’s are certified against the eco-label’s criteria before using the label” (Good Housekeeping Research Institute, 2011). Consumers continue to be ambivalent regarding their beliefs of green claims. For example, anyone can go to The Be Green Certified website ([www.begreencertified.com](http://www.begreencertified.com)) and instantly create a green certificate which is nearly as convincing as others if you don’t do your homework (BeGreenCertified, 2011). Another one that appears to be legitimate but will give out certifications to anyone is the Green Business Association. The proposed product/company inputs their information and submits it for review. Shortly thereafter an email is returned that congratulates the user and gives them access to the green seal to use on their website. The author of this thesis input a fictitious

website called [www.harmfulchemicals.com](http://www.harmfulchemicals.com) with the first name of Harmful and the last name of Chemicals with a street address Toxic Lane. Sure enough a congratulatory email was sent within minutes. Needless to say, being marketed as green is too easy.

The Federal Trade Commission has guidelines for marketing environmental claims. These guidelines state, “Because the guides are not legislative rules under Section 18 of the FTC Act, they are not themselves enforceable regulations, nor do they have the force and effect of law” (Federal Trade Commission, 1998, p. 1). A review of the FTC’s guidelines leaves much grey area unresolved. It is unfortunate that the federal government goes to so much trouble defining guidelines that have no legal enforcement and have not been updated since 1998. However, the website states that the information is current as of February 25, 2011 (Federal Trade Commission, 1998). This shows the lack of progressive measures made by the United States federal government in regulating the use of ambiguous green terms. The FTC’s role is more “retroactive” as it attempts to police products that misuse environmental claims versus preempting the inclusion of green products. Eventually, consumers will demand a market standard for eco-friendly labeling as the market continues to be inundated with false claims.

### **Good Housekeeping Green Seal**

Good housekeeping has had a limited warranty seal since 1909 which guarantees against defectiveness for two years after the purchase of the product. This seal is so ingrained and recognized in the Western culture that many people compare their fame, in a particular area, to needing a “Good Housekeeping Seal” because of it. This is subject to limitations on products and use but does show a strong backing for products endorsed by the

Good Housekeeping Research Institute (GHRI). GHRI has been around longer than the FDA and was once the only recognizable place to look for product safety and guarantees. A timeline of this department shows radical innovation in the way an institute looks at product claims specifically in areas lacking governmental control. In 2009, Good Housekeeping Research Institute worked in collaboration with Brown & Wilmanns Environmental, a green consultant, as well as external experts, to create a green Good Housekeeping Seal in an effort to help consumers muddle through the mass of environmentally-friendly claims.

Good Housekeeping recognized that consumers are confused over the various “earth-friendly” and “environmentally-safe” verbiages awash in the market. They wanted to set an acceptable consumer standard for green products. GHRI reviews various factors to determine whether a product qualifies to bear their seal. These factors included attributes such as “reduction of water use in manufacturing, energy-efficiency in product manufacturing and product use, ingredient and product safety, packaging reduction, and the brand’s corporate responsibility.” GHRI is comprised of an entire institute that employs scientists and engineers who determine if a product is eligible to receive this label and if so, they guarantee the product against defects for two years. However, one has to wonder if the actual costs actually revert back to Good Housekeeping. Most products eligible for this seal would already have manufacturer warranties which would be the first line of defense for the consumer. Should the manufacturer refuse a warranty claim made by a consumer it is a stretch to expect the consumer to then file a second warranty with Good Housekeeping over what is probably a low-price item. Even if the consumer went this far to exonerate their claim, it is normal to assume that GHRI would simply require the manufacturer to refund

them any credits paid under warranty or threaten to pull their seal (Hearst Communications, 2011a).

GHRI admits that no company will ever score perfectly and that it is only attempting to assist consumers in choosing companies that are working towards the greater good of the environment. This environmental seal is a mere extension of GHRI's Good Housekeeping Seal, and a product must first earn the original Good Housekeeping Seal before it can qualify for the green seal. The initial Good Housekeeping Seal simply says that a product fulfills the function intended, is durable, and safe. The environmental Green Seal extension makes additional claims that the product contributes to a greener lifestyle and that the company is working towards being more environmentally responsible (Hearst Communications, 2011a).

Even though they claim to refuse existing clients this seal if their product is not up to par, one has to wonder if GHRI can be completely objective when determining suitability (Hearst Communications, 2011a). Some literature states that a company must spend as much for advertising in Good Housekeeping as they do in other magazines in order to be eligible (Barlow, 2009). This is not necessarily a fair assessment of inclusion and could possibly impact how green consumers view this certification. Obviously GHRI cannot survive for free; however, there should be a standard requirement among companies to make their chances of obtaining this green seal possible.

GHRI claims, "a product that earns the Green Good Housekeeping Seal cannot contain certain harmful ingredients such as any ozone-depleting compounds (ODCs) above 0.001% or product volatile organic compounds (VOCs) above a certain threshold, or have not been tested on animals within the last five years (unless required by government

regulation). There are many different qualities that exempt a product from consideration which can be found on the Good Housekeeping Website (<http://www.goodhousekeeping.com/product-testing/history/green-good-housekeeping-seal-application-summary>) (Hearst Communications, 2011b). GHRI also looks at any renewable energies used by the company, checks to see if energy consumption has reduced since 2006, and reviews the desirable temperature for product use (the higher the temperature required the more energy used). They look at water-use reduction in comparison with 2006 and review various factors for ingredient safety and potential toxicity. The materials going into the product, packaging the product, and disposing of the product are equally important to their determination. Factors such as source of materials (packaging & product), weight, recyclability, bio-degradability, eutrophication potention, and use of reusable products are investigated. They review greenhouse emissions, water reduction, and product distribution (Hearst Communications, 2011a).

Corporate responsibility is reviewed by checking to see if a corporate responsibility report is publicly available and if the report is registered with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) (Hearst Communications, 2011a). GRI is a “Network-based organization that pioneered the world’s most widely used sustainability reporting framework. This framework sets out performance indicators which companies can use to measure their environmental performance (Global Reporting Initiative, 2007).

GHRI then looks to see if there is an environmental system in place at the manufacturing facilities and whether there have been any violations reported. They also look for a LEEDS or Green Globe and a SA8000 certification. Lastly, they look to see what, if any, environmental innovations are being created through the company (Hearst

Communications, 2011a). In summary, the Good Housekeeping Green Seal is a good indication that a product is environmentally-friendly; however, the application process and fees to obtain this seal remain unclear.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the literature review (Coyle, 2004; Iyer & Banerjee, 1993; A. P. Minton, & Rose, R. L. , 1997; Molyneaux, 2007; Raposo & Finisterra do Pacdo, 2008; The Hartman Group, 2007), there are four distinct green consumer segments that emerge from previous findings which are proposed in this research and further examined. The “True Greens” really care and are environmentally active and aware. The “Donor Greens” support environmental issues financially but do not exhibit many environmentally-friendly behaviors. The “Learning Greens” are in the beginning stages of understanding environmental issues and their potential impact. The “Non-Greens” realize there are environmental issues but are not changing their behavior. The following research questions and the study conducted to investigate them, are based on these different green consumer segments.

Also according to the above literature review, there are gaps regarding specific descriptions of different green consumer segments. Green consumers, in general, are defined by Zinkan and Carlson (1995) as, “Consumers who are worried about more than just the purchase and the consumption processes. They are also concerned about the production process, in terms of scarce resources used, and they are concerned with product disposal issues (e.g., recycling)” (p. 2). Green consumers tend to have anti-corporate biases and be more skeptical of marketing in general, which makes them more difficult to target. Green

consumers also tend to engage in activities outside the norms of other consumer segments (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995). As green consumers become a larger market, it becomes more important to understand each of the various segments that exist within this emerging market.

Even consumers who admit they are affecting the environment in a negative way still gravitate toward an easier solution to environmental problems that require less behavioral change. Green products and ideas are less likely to be adopted if they require consumers to dramatically change their behavior. Unfortunately, due to the major extent of environmental problems, only fundamental change to consumer behavior patterns will make a real difference to the planet (Wilson, 2007).

As green markets continue to exist in a somewhat infantile state of development further research is needed to see if there is an existence of clearly defined green consumer segments. Green products and campaigns can be an effective marketing tool when attracting customers; however, different segments of green consumers may react differently to these products and actions. Improving the understanding of green consumer profiles becomes increasingly important in effective targeting.

Previous research has indicated that there are clear segments of green consumers based on level of greenness (P. S. Ellen, et al., 1991). A major question addressed in this research concerns the specificity of clear green consumer profiles regarding consumer attitudes and behaviors, and psychographic characteristics. Some scholars agree that such consumer profiles is the only area of interest with regard to researching green consumers (Iyer & Banerjee, 1993). Therefore the goal of this research is to profile the green consumer segments in a manner that will assist in the development of clear and detailed profiles for use

in marketing strategies. This study is conducted to investigate the possibility that there may be clear profiles for consumers regarding their level of greenness.

**RQ1: Are there distinct consumer behavior profiles of the different green consumer segments? If so, what are they?**

History shows a gap between consumer behaviors and consumer attitudes. Many consumers may say they are green because it is the socially acceptable thing to do, but in reality, make no real attempts to change their behaviors. This gap tends to grow wider when using self-reporting methods to collect data regarding environmentally-friendly behaviors and attitudes. Another issue is the ability of consumers to estimate the frequency with which they engage in particular behaviors. Needless to say, there are considerable social pressures involved in changing any type of behavior, particularly green consumer behavior (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995). Therefore, consumers are more likely to act in ways inconsistent with their claims.

Another goal of this research is to profile the environmental behaviors and attitudes of the different green consumer segments. Marketers are perplexed that their research shows consumers feel the environment is important; however, this does not clearly translate into a change in consumer purchase behavior for all green consumers (Schlossberg, 1991). Research also shows that a consumer's overall attitude regarding his/her ability to improve the environment predicates the intention to consume environmentally-friendly products and make environmentally beneficial behavioral changes (P. S. Ellen, et al., 1991). That would imply that just because consumers are concerned about the environment, this does not predict the same change in behavior for all green consumers. This study is conducted to investigate

the possibility that there may be clear profiles for consumers regarding their environmentally related consumer behaviors.

**RQ2: Are there distinct environmental consumer behavior profiles of the green consumer segments? If so, what are they?**

In profiling different green consumers segments this research attempts to clarify if any of these segments share lifestyle characteristics such as personal interests, leisure activities and opinions. Some research finds little to no connection between demographic characteristics and environmental behaviors and attitudes. Although income, age, education, etc., work well to target consumers in some markets, green consumer targeting seems to be quite different (Shrum, McCarty, & Lowrey, 1995). However, some studies find a greater propensity for psychographic variables to have more differentiating power (Levin, 1990). With increasing demands on consumers to change all sorts of behaviors, it is clear that going green is resonating with many consumers. The intensity level of these reactions is driven by differing variables, in particular, lifestyle (Natural Marketing Research Institute, 2010). This prompts research question number three.

**RQ3: Are there clear psychographic profiles of the green consumer segments? If so, what are they?**

At one time companies weighed the ability to provide environmentally-friendly faces to their corporations against the costs associated with this investment. However, since the 2010 BP oil spill it is clear that consumers are re-evaluating the future of usable resources and demanding that companies provide them with eco-friendly alternatives at marginal costs. Corporations are now faced with the duty to transform goods and services into sustainable products that meet the desires of consumers. Zinkhan and Carlson (1995) mention three circumstances that may cause corporations to provide green products in an efficient manner.

The first may exist when clear green consumer segments are identified. The second could occur when the majority of stakeholders gain more sustainable interests. The third circumstance could occur when sustainability becomes a necessity to continued operations.

As implied previously in this research, green marketing has thus far made little progress, possibly due to the difficulty in targeting and convincing green consumers of product claims. There is a notion that “green marketing” may actually be an oxymoron. Consumers may be reluctant about environmentally-friendly products because of the vague and unregulated use of green claims. Consumers’ past encounters with misuse, and even abuse, of environmental claims by marketers may have jaded their opinions of the effectiveness of green products in positively impacting the environment (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995).

For example, in 2009 Clorox rolled out a line of environmentally-friendly products, called *green works*®, which uses plant-derived chemicals and environmentally-friendly production processes. The Sierra Club endorses this line of Clorox products with their logo. This is the first time Sierra Club has supported a household cleaning product. Clorox borrowed the Sierra Club’s brand equity to transfer goodwill to their new *green works*® line. Clorox claims that 99% of their *green work*® products are natural, and many people agree (McMilker, 2008). However, one could argue there are plenty of “natural” materials that are deadly and harmful to the environment such as lead or mercury. Therefore, being a “natural” product does not necessarily equate to being green.

Clorox *green works*® is a primary example of a large corporation taking advantage of their position to infiltrate the green market. Because they have limitless distribution channels

and economies of scale, they have the ability to provide green products to consumers at comparable prices. Supporters of Clorox *green works*® agree it is not perfect but moving in the right direction. This research attempts to determine how different green consumer segments react to this type of environmental marketing strategy.

**RQ4: Do different segments of green consumers react differently to environmentally-friendly products?**

As consumers become more aware of environmental issues they are taking steps to determine which products are environmentally-friendly. As green products inundate the market there is much confusion over which of these products are derived, processed and disposed of through environmentally-friendly methods. The use of third party eco-labels is one way for consumers to determine the authenticity of environmentally-friendly products. The question is, with thousands of these labels affixed to products in the market and no regulatory agency responsible for their claims, do consumers change their purchasing behavior because a product bears a green seal?

This study used the Green Good Housekeeping Seal due to the long history of product warranty through the Good Housekeeping Research Institute. This emblem is used to investigate the opinions of the respondents regarding products that bear this seal. This study aims to determine if the appearance of this seal on a product affects consumers' opinions of the product's environmental effectiveness and if this varies between different green consumer segments.

**RQ5: Do different segments of green consumers react differently to green product seals?**

Cause-related marketing campaigns are widely used as marketing ploys to create goodwill among consumers. Consumers' reaction to this type of marketing is pivotal to

understanding how to target these different segments. This study uses Coca-Cola's cause-related marketing campaign regarding the preservation of polar bears for various reasons. The primary reason is the popularity of Coca-Cola and their recognizable use of Polar Bears in their advertisements for the past few decades. This survey also aims to measure consumer perceptions regarding companies who support causes but simultaneously produce products which have a negative contribution to those same causes. Although Coca-Cola supports the polar bear cause, they may in fact be contributing to the extinction of polar bears because of their processing techniques.

Past research has found that the strongest influence of CRM cues are found under inter-brand homogeneous situations, where no trade-offs are required in exchange for choosing the brand in terms of CRM activities (Barone, Miyazaki, & Taylor, 2000). This shows how CRM can be a good marketing tool when dealing with commodity products or those with little cost differentiation. Coca-Cola's support of WWF through the polar-bear campaign is a representative sample of inter brand homogeneity. Coca-Cola joined forces with the World Wildlife Federation to create funding for polar bear conservation programs. According to Coca-Cola's website, these programs work with communities, different industries, and the government to implement what they term "Polar Bear Conservation Action Plans." These plans are an attempt to sustain development by protecting polar bear habitats and reducing climate change. Coca-Cola determines how the funds are contributed in several ways. Most of the ways are determined through customer interaction on their website; however, they also match donations to a maximum of \$75,000 (The Coca-Cola Company, 2010). This study aims to show if green consumer segments will react differently to cause-related marketing campaigns.

**RQ6: Do different segments of green consumers react differently to cause-related marketing campaigns.**

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Survey

Developing green consumer profiles can be achieved using many different methods. Each method has various tradeoffs between the achieved results. The purpose of this section is to clarify the reasoning behind the methods used in this research.

This research attempts to profile consumers based on various consumer behavior patterns. One such pattern involves consumers' general consumer behaviors when not faced with environmental factors. Another pattern looks at how different consumer segments respond when faced with a supposed environmentally-friendly product. This research also investigates consumers' overall attitudes about environmental issues and whether they change their behaviors due to level of interest. The presence of a green acceptance seal on a product is used to see if consumers feel this would affect their purchase intentions. This research also delves into cause-related marketing campaigns and the potential impact they have on consumers' purchase intentions and attitudes towards a particular company.

Some questions contained in the survey were extrapolated from academic publications. The first section of the survey includes questions from Raposo (2008), who describes a green consumer as a person who makes decisions which will not endanger his/her health, use damaging production processes, use products that have disposal procedures which damage the environment, use products that cause excessive waste, or use products that require materials which are threatening to the environment. The purpose of Raposo's study was to look at variables relating to different environmental aspects such as perceived

consumer effectiveness, received behavioral control, and environmental knowledge (Raposo, 2008). The survey in the present study includes several questions verbatim from Raposo's survey (See Appendix B), as well as questions with slight variations.

Minton and Rose (1997) conducted an exploratory study to investigate the effects of environmental concern and social norms on consumer behaviors and intentions. The results show that personal norms have the highest level of influence on behaviors while attitudes have the highest influence on behavioral intentions (A. P. Minton & Rose, 1997). The survey in the present study includes several questions verbatim from Minton and Rose's survey (see Appendix A), as well as questions with slight variations.

The information required to conduct the present research includes both qualitative and quantitative data on the attitudes and behaviors of consumers in various segments of green behavior. The sources of secondary data are reports, academic journals, and industry publications.

The survey is composed of eight sections and can be seen in Appendix C. The first part requires consumers to rate their own green behavior and place themselves in one of five segments (True Green, Donor Green, Learning Green, Non-Green, and Anti-Green). The second part examines the normal shopping behavior for participants when not faced with green purchase decisions. The third portion of the survey questions the respondent regarding their feelings about their environmental behaviors and attitudes. The fourth part examines the respondents' use of, or lack of use, of Clorox *green works*® cleaner and how they feel about the product. This section also asks questions regarding the respondents views about this product regardless of their purchase intention. The fifth section presents an

environmentally-friendly seal (Green Good Housekeeping Seal) and then asks respondents questions regarding their attitudes and opinions associated with products bearing this seal. The sixth part presents a webpage from the Coca-Cola website which displays images and verbage related to Coca-Cola's polar bear cause-related marketing campaign and asks respondents various questions regarding their opinion of companies who engage in these types of campaigns and their purchase intentions based on their interaction with cause-related marketing campaigns. The seventh section collects psychographic information by asking respondents to rate their level of participation in various leisure activities and their personal interests. The last section measures demographic characteristics of respondents (political affiliation, gender, age, education, marital status, whether they have children, and income level).

The five segments used in this study are described as follows: True Greens, "I am an environmental activist who cares deeply about reducing my carbon footprint and am adjusting my behavior to be environmental friendly."; Donor Greens, "I am concerned about the environment to the extent I support environmental causes financially; however, I have not really changed my behavior due to environmental concerns and still buy products that are not necessarily friendly."; Learning Greens, "I am learning about environmental concerns and starting to make some changes in my behavior and/or purchasing habits."; Non-Greens, "I have not adjusted my behavior or purchase patterns for environmental reasons, even though I acknowledge that there may be environmental problems."; and Anti-Greens, "I do not really care if there are environmental problems."

Clorox *green works*® glass and surface cleaner was chosen as the target product for this study due to the popularity of the product. The glass and surface cleaner appeared to be

the most used and recognizable product in this category based on personal interviews with limited samples. This research incorporates an advertisement created by the researcher for Clorox *green works*® glass and surface cleaner. The advertisement presented to the respondents displays a visual image of the product affixed with a Green Good Housekeeping Seal. The verbage of the ad was copied from Clorox's website, and ingredients are included to give the respondent a sense of what chemical &/or natural additives in the product. This particular product was used in this research because Clorox *green works*® is coined as an environmentally-friendly product which does not harm the environment nor test on animals while the Clorox company as a whole does not always engage in such environmentally-friendly processes. (For example, its non-*green works*® products are tested on animals and have harmful chemical ingredients). This product was chosen specifically to determine if the "True Green" respondents are so involved in their eco-friendly purchases that they understand the company processes as a whole rather than focusing only on this particular product. Clorox is a classic example of a company who "greenwashes" (Wilson, 2007) its products for green consumers.

Clorox *greens works*® was also chosen because it is the first recognizable green cleaning product launched by a major manufacturer. There is no question that consumers want more natural products to clean their homes, and have a need for a trusted brand to help them make consumer behavioral changes. Consumers have trusted the Clorox name for years so it is a natural progression for many loyal customers as well as new customers to believe its efficacy. The Sierra Club endorsed the roll out of Clorox *green works*® by allowing their label to be affixed to this line of products. According to Clorox, the product is 99% natural (derived from natural ingredients) and is biodegradable, non-toxic, plant-based,

non-animal tested, non-allergenic, has full ingredient transparency and is sold in recyclable packages. Clorox lists all of the ingredients plainly on its line of *green works*® products; however, this is not the case with their other product lines. There are also some concerns regarding Clorox's use of animal testing. Clorox claims not to test its *green works*® line on animals; however, there are still disagreements regarding the use of animal testing on its other products (Dunn, 2008).

It is clear that Clorox is attempting to make its green cleaning products mainstream product. This is an easy task for companies such as Clorox who freely use the word “natural” on its products. The FDA does have guidelines for environmental marketing; however, to say the verbage is grey would be putting it lightly. Currently, the FDA has not established a formal definition for the term “natural” and requests that companies use this term in a way that is useful and not misleading (McMilker, 2008). It is believed that different types of green consumers will consider this type of “green washing” in many different ways.

The Clorox *green works* ® image was copied from the Clorox website and had a Green Good Housekeeping Seal attached. The verbage of the advertisement was partially taken from an existing Clorox *green works*® advertisement. Additional copy was integrated to broaden the scope of interest for respondents. The additions to the advertisement also included the ingredients. This was done in order to determine if respondents would answer differently based on their ability to peruse the actual ingredients in the product

After reviewing the advertisement, respondents were asked to rate their attitudes toward Clorox *green works*® household cleaner (regardless of whether they had purchased

this product or not) based on a five point scale from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” Then respondents were asked to rate their opinions on various attributes of Clorox *green works*® (effectiveness, believability, chemical strength, quality, Attractiveness, level of toxicity/naturalness, and environmental friendliness.) These scales were taken from the *Marketing Scales Handbook* (Bruner & Hensel, 1998).

### **Data Collection Procedures**

The survey was developed using the online survey program administered by surveymonkey.com. The survey link was sent out via social media sites including facebook, LinkedIn, & Twitter. The survey link was also emailed to every student, faculty member, staff member, and retiree of Appalachian State University. In order to safeguard against respondents participating multiple time, ISP addresses were collected and participation attempts denied after an ISP was recorded. All surveys were the same regardless of which segment each respondent self-selected into by completing the initial segmentation question. At the close of the survey time frame, the data was exported from surveymonkey.com into an excel format which was then imported into SPSS.

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data were analyzed to determine the extent to which each green consumer segment varied according to green behaviors and attitudes, as well as their reactions to green products, green seals, and cause-related marketing campaigns. First, we performed factor analysis on univariate variables. This step enabled us to evaluate the nature of interrelationships among the variables and reduce them to a reasonable number of scales. We then computed factor scores from the factor analysis results. Next we performed one-way ANOVA to test mean differences on dependent variables across green segments. The initial five consumer segments were condensed to only four segments because the “Anti-Green” segment did not have enough representation. Crosstabs were conducted on all psychographic and demographic variables by green consumer segment and Pearson Chi-Square tests were done.

### **Sample Characteristics**

The final sample contains 487 respondents of which 398 completed the survey in its entirety. The True Green segment consists of 121 respondents (24.8% of total respondents), the Donor Green segment consists of 53 respondents (10.9% of total respondents), the Learning Green segment consists of 258 respondents (53.0% of total respondents), the Non-green segment consists of 50 respondents (10.3%), and the Anti-Green segment had only 5 respondents (1.0% of total respondents). Due to the small sample size for the Anti-Greens segment it was only included during the factor analysis portion of data computation, and then was excluded from the remaining analysis.

## **Data Reduction and Results**

Factor analysis using a Varimax rotation was employed to reduce the univariate survey items to scales. An item was deemed to be representative of a factor if it had a loading of .50 or higher. This research uses these factors as summated scales as the main dependent variables. Reliability analysis was performed and only scales with coefficient alpha of at least .6 were used in the study. Factor analysis was performed separately on each section of the survey, as each section was designed to measure a different aspect of green consumer behaviors and/or attitudes.

From the general consumer behavior variables a price consciousness scale was created for the general consumer behavior variables (see Table 1). Scales for environmental behaviors were created and include; Environmental Behavior, Environmental Attitude, Consumer Guilt, and Marketer Deception (see Table 2). Scales for Clorox Product Perception were created and include: a Clorox Environmental Scale and Product Perception scale (see Table 3). Scales for Green Seal Perception were created and include: Seal Deception, Green Perception, and Actively Seeking scales (see Table 4). Scales for Coca-Cola Cause-Related Marketing were created and include: Exploitation, Value and Consumer Expense scales (see Table 5). These multi-item scales are the primary dependent variables subsequent analyses unless otherwise noted.

### **Results for Research Question 1**

To answer the RQ1, yes there are clear consumer behavior differences between the different green consumer segments. Analysis of variance results comparing the four different green consumer segments confirms that the different segments display different

general consumer behaviors. Tukey's B technique was used in this and all subsequent analyses to determine which segments' mean responses were significantly different from each other.

For Price Consciousness there are significant differences between the segments ( $F=13.44$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, True Greens are the least likely to be price conscious ( $\bar{x}=2.65$ ) followed by Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.95$ ), then Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.98$ ), followed by Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.17$ ). Findings show significant differences between True Greens, Learning Greens, and Non-Greens.

The remainder of the variables regarding general consumer behaviors were analyzed at the univariate level. Analysis of variance results comparing the four different green consumer segments confirmed that different segments display different consumer behaviors. There are significant differences between the segments for impulsiveness ("I decide what to buy while I am at the store") ( $F=5.07$ ;  $p=.002$ ); specifically, True Greens sometimes buy things on impulse but do this less than the other segments ( $\bar{x}=2.07$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.21$ ), then the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.42$ ), then the Donor Greens who are the most likely to shop on impulse ( $\bar{x}=2.52$ ). Findings show significant differences between the True Greens, Non-Greens, and Donor Greens.

There are significant differences between the segments for attention to packaging ("I tend to buy products that are attractively packaged.") ( $F=3.46$ ;  $p=.016$ ); specifically, True Greens score lowest ( $\bar{x}=1.57$ ), followed by the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=1.70$ ), the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=1.82$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=1.83$ ).

There are significant differences between the segments for brand consciousness (“I prefer to buy leading brand names.”) ( $F=7.47$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, True Greens are the least brand conscious ( $\bar{x}=1.82$ ) followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.53$ ), then the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.22$ ) and finally the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.23$ ). Findings show that the True Greens are significantly different from the other three segments (Learning Greens, Non-Greens, and Donor Greens).

There are not significant differences between the segments for emotional buying (“I buy products because they make me feel better.”) ( $F=1.73$ ;  $p=.161$ ) and social acceptance (“I buy things for social acceptance.”) ( $F=1.52$ ;  $p=.208$ ).

## **Results for Research Question 2**

To answer the RQ2, yes there are clear environmental consumer behavior differences between the different green consumer segments. Analysis of variance results comparing the four different green consumer segments confirms that the different segments display different environmental behaviors. There are significant differences between the four different green consumer segments for Environmental Behaviors ( $F=119.53$ ,  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the True Greens exhibit the highest amount of environmental behavior ( $\bar{x}=1.77$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.34$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.57$ ), and then by the Non-Greens, who are least likely to exhibit environmental behaviors ( $\bar{x}=3.40$ ). There are significant differences between all four of the green consumer segments on this dependent variable.

There are also significant differences between the four different green consumer segments for Environmental Attitudes ( $F=80.19$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the True Greens are

most likely to have environmental attitudes ( $\bar{x}=1.81$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.16$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.36$ ), and then the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.01$ ). There are significant differences between all four of the green consumer segments.

There are significant differences between the four different green consumer segments for Consumer Guilt ( $F=6.72$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the Donor Greens are most likely to feel guilt ( $\bar{x}=2.54$ ), followed by the True Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.68$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.76$ ), and finally the Non-Greens who are least likely to feel guilt ( $\bar{x}=3.38$ ). There are significant differences between the Non-Greens and the other three green consumer segments on this variable.

There are significant differences between the four different green consumer segments regarding Marketer Deception ( $F=5.59$ ;  $p=.001$ ); specifically, the True Greens agree the most that marketers are deceptive ( $\bar{x}=1.93$ ), followed by the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=1.99$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.05$ ), and finally the Learning Greens who are more inclined to believe marketing claims ( $\bar{x}=2.25$ ). There are significant differences between the True Greens and the Learning Greens on this variable.

For the univariate variable “non-caring” (“I will buy products I like regardless of the environmental impact”), there are significant differences between the four green consumer segments ( $F=30.92$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the Non-Greens are least likely to care about the impact of their purchases ( $\bar{x}=2.40$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.12$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.21$ ), and finally the True Greens who are least likely to purchase a

product if it may affect the environment negatively ( $\bar{x}=3.83$ ). There are significant differences between the Non-Greens, the Donor and Learning Greens, and the True Greens on this item.

For “exaggeration” (“I believe that environmentalists make a lot of exaggerations about environmental problems.”), there are significant differences between the four green consumer segments ( $F=44.25$   $p=.000$ ); specifically, the Non-Greens are most likely to agree that environmentalist exaggerate ( $\bar{x}=2.45$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.39$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.64$ ), and finally the True Greens, who disagreed that environmentalist made exaggerations ( $\bar{x}=4.31$ ). There are significant differences between the Non-Greens, the Learning and Donor Greens, and the True Greens.

There are significant differences among the four green consumer groups regarding their friends’ perceptions of their environmental behavior (“Most of my friends think I should use products that are safe for the environment”) ( $F=28.14$ ,  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the True Greens are the most likely to agree with this statement ( $\bar{x}=2.34$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.58$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.92$ ), and finally the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.49$ ). There are significant differences between the True Greens and Donor Greens, the Learning Greens, and the Non-Greens on this item.

For the “friend” item, (“My most important factor in deciding what to buy is what my friends think”) there are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=1.73$ ,  $p=.159$ ). All of the groups stated they hardly ever considered friends as their most important factor in deciding what to buy.

### Results for Research Question 3

To answer RQ3, yes there are clear psychographic profiles for the different green consumer segments. The first analysis was conducted on demographic variables. Regarding gender results show significant distinctions between the four green consumer segments ( $\chi^2=14.34$ ;  $p=.002$ ). The True Green segment has more females. The Donor Green segment has approximate equality between males and females, as does the Learning Green segment. The Non-Greens have more males.

Age shows no relationship with level of greenness ( $\chi^2=13.86$ ;  $p=.310$ ). This result could be due to sample characteristics and will be discussed in the limitations section.

Education as well does not show a significant relationship with green segment membership ( $\chi^2=24.17$ ;  $p=.149$ ). This could be due to sample characteristics as well and will be discussed in the limitations section.

Marital status has no significant relationship to the four green consumer segments ( $\chi^2=3.31$ ;  $p=.769$ ). This could be due to sample characteristics and will be discussed in the limitations section.

Whether the respondent has children or not does not significantly related to green consumer segment membership ( $\chi^2=16.37$ ;  $p=.175$ ). This could be due to sample characteristics and will be discussed in the limitations section.

Similarly, income level is not related to green consumer segment membership ( $\chi^2=14.89$ ;  $p=.094$ ). This could be due to sample characteristics and will be discussed in the limitations section.

With regard to political parties there are clear differences among the four green consumer segments ( $\chi^2=57.42$ ;  $p=.000$ ). Results show the True Greens are much more likely to be liberal and much less likely to be conservative. The Donor Greens are much more likely to be liberal and less likely to be independent. The Learning Greens are much more likely to be conservative or even to be independent, but less likely to be liberal. The Non-Greens are more likely to be conservative, do not consider themselves independent, and are less likely to be liberal.

As far as watching television the True Greens are least likely to watch TV and the Non-Greens are most likely to watch TV ( $\chi^2=39.31$ ;  $p=.000$ ). Results for walking for pleasure show all segments, except the True Greens, are less likely to walk for pleasure. True Greens are much more likely to walk for pleasure than expected.

True Greens are more likely to be liberal or progressive. The Learning Greens are much more likely to be independent. The Donor Greens are split equally between all political affiliations.

Results show the respondents are derived from an educated population. Approximately 83.2% of the respondents have a 4-year degree or higher. A significant portion of the sample is college oriented. Those who have children were compared with those who do not, and there is not a significant relationship with level of greenness found ( $\chi^2=5.07$ ;  $p=.167$ ).

Regarding the general activities participated in by each green consumer segment do vary across segments. Regarding watching television there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $\chi^2=39.31$ ;  $p=.000$ ). The True Greens watch television

less than the other green consumer segments. The Learning Greens and the Non-Greens watch television more than expected by chance.

As for walking for pleasure, there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $\chi^2=17.85$ ;  $p=.037$ ). The True Greens are most likely to walk for pleasure. The Donor Greens are somewhat likely to walk for pleasure. The Non-Greens are less likely to walk for pleasure.

There are no significant differences between the four green consumers segments regarding family outings ( $\chi^2=14.72$ ;  $p=.257$ ).

There are significant differences between the four green consumer segments with regard to participating in individual or team sports/sports activities ( $\chi^2=17.15$ ;  $p=.046$ ). The Non-Greens are the most likely to participate in individual or team/sports/sports activities. The True Greens are somewhat more likely to frequently participate in this activity. The Learning Greens are somewhat more likely to participate occasionally in this activity.

There are significant differences between the four green consumer segments when comparing their interests in gardening ( $\chi^2=25.98$ ;  $p=.002$ ). The True Greens are much more likely to engage in gardening. The Non-Greens are the least likely to garden.

There are significant differences between the four green consumer segments with regard to reading for pleasure ( $\chi^2=34.33$ ;  $p=.001$ ). The True Greens and the Donor Greens are more likely to read for pleasure. The Learning Greens and the Non-Greens are less likely to read for pleasure.

There are no significant differences between the four different green consumer segments with regard to going out for the evening for drinks and entertainment ( $\chi^2=8.64$ ;  $p=.471$ ) or going to the movies ( $\chi^2=13.12$ ;  $p=.157$ ).

There are no significant differences between the four different green consumer segments regarding hunting ( $\chi^2=11.45$ ;  $p=.491$ ).

There are no significant differences between the four different green consumer segments regarding collecting or making something (for example, hobbies) ( $\chi^2=17.65$ ;  $p=.127$ ).

There are significant differences among the four different green consumer segments regarding attending live sporting events ( $\chi^2=42.24$ ;  $p=.000$ ). The True Greens are the least likely to attend live sporting events. The Learning Greens and the Non-Greens are the most likely to attend live sporting events.

There are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding leisure traveling ( $\chi^2=10.15$ ;  $p=.606$ ).

There are not significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding social networking ( $\chi^2=8.72$ ;  $p=.727$ ). (However, when the different segments of green consumers were asked to pick their top three interests, the Donor Greens chose social networking.)

There are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding working on the computer ( $\chi^2=10.68$ ;  $p=.298$ ).

There are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding charities/volunteer work ( $\chi^2=18.63$ ;  $p=.098$ ).

There are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding attending live concerts ( $\chi^2=8.58$ ;  $p=.738$ ).

There are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding participating in fitness activities (for example, bicycling, running swimming, working-out) ( $\chi^2=11.97$ ;  $p=.448$ ).

There are significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding watching sports on TV ( $\chi^2=46.87$ ;  $p=.000$ ). The True Greens are least likely to watch sports on TV. The Learning Greens are most likely to watch sports on TV.

The next section of results is based on the top three personal interests of each green segment. The True Greens are most personally interested in Family (46.3%), followed by the Outdoors (43.0%), then Wildlife/Environmental Issues (33.1%), and finally Education (32.2%). More than three activities are mentioned due to the closeness of percentage. The lowest areas of interest for the True Greens are Sports (7.4%), Technology (7.4%), and Religion (7.4%).

The Donor Greens show the greatest personal interest in Family (47.2%), followed by Education (32.1%), and then a three-way tie among: the Outdoors (26.4%), Sports (26.4%) and Music (26.4%). The lowest area of interest for the Donor Greens was Religion (11.3). Three other areas came in at a tie for the next two lowest areas of interest: Politics (13.2%), Wildlife/Environmental Issues (13.2%), and Gourmet/Fine Food (13.2%).

The Learning Greens showed the greatest personal interest in Family (53.9%), followed by a tie between Music (24.0%) and Education (24.0%), then the Outdoors (22.5%). Due to the closeness of percentages it is notable that the next highest area of personal interest was a tie between Sports (21.7%) and Self-Improvement (21.3%). The lowest areas of interest for the Learning Greens are Wildlife/Environmental Issues (4.3%), followed by Politics (8.9%), then Technology (9.3%)

The Non-Greens showed the greatest personal interest in Sports (48.0%), followed by Family (44.0%), then Music (24.0%), and finally the Outdoors (22.0%). The lowest areas of interest for the Non-Greens are Wildlife/Environmental Issues (6.0%) and Animals (8.0%).

#### **Results for Research Question 4**

In answer to RQ4, yes there are significant differences between green consumer segments when reacting to environmentally-friendly products.

When asked if the respondents had heard of Clorox *green works*® before, 66% had heard of it and 34% had not heard of it. Comparing the four different green consumer segments with regard to who had heard of this product before 76% of True Greens, 51.1% of the Donor Greens, 66.5% of the Learning Greens, and 54.8% of the Non-Greens had heard of the product.

Of the 76.6% of True Greens who had heard of the product before, 33.6% had purchased the product before. Of the 33.6% who had purchased the product before; 35.1% purchased it once, 5.4% purchased it once but will not buy it again, 40.5% purchased it more than once, and 19.9% purchase it regularly. Of the 76.6% of True Greens who had heard of the product; 66.4% of those had purchased it before. Eleven percent were likely to buy it

again, 53.4% were unlikely to buy it again, and 35.6% were not sure if they would purchase it again.

Of the 51.1% of the Donor Greens who had heard of the product before; 21.3% had purchased the product before. Of the 21.3% who had purchased the product before; 50.0% purchased it once, 10.0% purchased it one time and will not buy it again, 40.0% purchased it more than once, and 0.0% purchase it regularly. Of the 21.3% of Donor Greens who had purchased the product before; 16.2% one likely purchase it again, 29.7% find it unlikely they will purchase it again, and 54.1% are not sure if they will purchase it again.

Of the 66.5% of the Learning Greens who had heard of the product before; 29.7% had purchased the product before. Of the 29.7% who had purchased the product before, 44.4% purchased it once, 4.8% purchased it one time and will not buy it again, 39.7% purchased it more than once, 11.1% purchase it regularly. Of the 29.7% of the Learning Greens who had purchased the product before, 22.8% find it likely they will purchase the product again, 21.5% find it unlikely, and 55.7% are unsure.

Of the 54.8% of Non-Greens who have heard of this product before; 26.2% had purchased this product before. Of the 26.2% who had purchased this product before; 70.0% purchased it once, 0.0% purchased it once and will not buy it again, 1.7% purchased it more than once, and 0.8% purchase it regularly. Of the 26.2% of Non-Greens who had purchased this product before; 13.3% are likely to buy it again, 63.3% are unlikely, and 23.3% are unsure.

There are significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding Clorox's Environmental Scale ( $F=5.10$ ;  $p=.002$ ); specifically, the Learning Greens are most

likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=2.80$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.85$ ), then the True Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.02$ ), and finally the Non-Greens, who are least likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=3.13$ ). There are significant differences between the Learning Greens, the Donor Greens, and the Non-Greens.

There are no significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding Product Perception ( $F=.74$ ;  $p=.531$ ).

A univariate analysis was done with specific variables regarding Clorox *green works*®. For the Natural versus Toxic variable there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=5.07$ ;  $p=.002$ ); specifically, the Learning Greens feel it was the most natural ( $\bar{x}=3.30$ ), followed by the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.33$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.48$ ), and finally the True Greens, who feel it is toxic ( $\bar{x}=3.92$ ). There are significant differences among the Learning Greens, the Non-Greens, and the True Greens.

For the Effective versus Ineffective item there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=2.67$ ;  $p=.047$ ); specifically, the True Greens rate the product as most effective ( $\bar{x}=3.17$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.19$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.30$ ), and finally the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.80$ ). There are significant differences among the True Greens, the Learning Greens, and the Non-Greens.

For high quality versus low quality there are not significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=1.60$ ;  $p=.189$ ). For believable versus unbelievable there are not significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=2.54$ ;  $p=.056$ ).

For full strength versus diluted there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=3.63$ ;  $p=.013$ ); specifically, the True Greens answered the highest towards full strength ( $\bar{x}=3.24$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.41$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.65$ ), and lastly the Non-Greens, who feel the product is diluted ( $\bar{x}=4.03$ ). There are significant differences among the True Greens, the Learning Greens, and the Non-Greens.

For attractive versus unattractive there are not significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=2.30$ ;  $p=.077$ ).

For environmentally-friendly versus not good for the environment there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=5.98$ ;  $p=.001$ ); specifically, the Non-Greens rank the product as most environmentally friendly ( $\bar{x}=3.15$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.19$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.24$ ) and the True Greens, who feel the product is the least good for the environment ( $\bar{x}=3.86$ ). There are significant differences between the True Greens and the other three green consumer segments on this item.

### **Results for Research Question 5**

In answer to RQ5, yes there are significant differences between green consumer segments with regard to green product seals. Of the participants who answered whether they had seen this Green Good Housekeeping Seal before taking this survey, 20.7% said “yes” and 79.3% said “no.” For the True Greens, 26.4% had not seen this seal prior to the survey and 63.6% had seen it before the survey. For the Donor Greens, 17.0% had seen this seal and

80.4% had not seen this seal before the survey. For the Learning Greens, 18.8% had seen this seal and 81.2% had not seen this seal before the survey. For the Non-Greens, 10.0% had seen the seal and 90.0% had not seen this seal before the survey.

There are no significant differences between the four green consumer segments regarding Seal Deception ( $F=.904$ ;  $p=.439$ ).

There are significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding green perception ( $F=5.92$ ;  $p=.001$ ); specifically, the Donor Greens feel more inclined to perceive this seal as being green ( $\bar{x}=2.71$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.72$ ), then the Non-Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.80$ ), then the True Greens, who are the least inclined to perceive this seal as having true green claims ( $\bar{x}=2.98$ ). There are significant differences among the Donor Greens, the Learning Greens, and the True Greens.

There are significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding whether they actively seek this seal ( $F=4.22$ ;  $p=.006$ ); specifically, the True Greens are most likely to look for this seal when making a purchase ( $\bar{x}=3.28$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.35$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.40$ ), and finally the Non-Greens, who are the least likely to look for this seal when deciding what the purchase ( $\bar{x}=3.80$ ).

### **Results for Research Question 6**

In answer to RQ6, yes there are clear differences among the four green consumer segments in relation to cause-related marketing campaigns.

For Exploitation, there are significant differences between the four green consumer segments ( $F=12.09$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the True greens are most likely to agree that Coca-Cola is exploiting the environment for personal gain ( $\bar{x}=2.14$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.38$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.63$ ), and finally the Non-Greens, who are least likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=2.66$ ). There are significant differences between the True Greens, the Learning Greens, and the Non-Greens.

For Value there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=12.73$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the Donor Greens are most likely to agree that the cause-related marketing campaign adds value to the product ( $\bar{x}=2.47$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.72$ ), then the True Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.84$ ), and finally the Non-Greens, who are least likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=3.32$ ). There are significant differences between the Donor Greens and the Non-Greens.

For Consumer Expense there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=3.784$ ;  $p=.011$ ); specifically, the Non-Greens are the most likely to agree that the cost of cause-related marketing is passed on to consumers ( $\bar{x}=2.53$ ), followed by the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.60$ ), then the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=2.76$ ), and finally the True Greens, who are the least likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=2.87$ ). There are significant differences between the Non-Greens and the True Greens.

A univariate analysis was done on “It is okay for large companies to have some negative effects on the environment as long as they give back to the environment.” There are

significant differences among the four green consumer segments ( $F=12.92$ ;  $p=.000$ ); specifically, the Non-Greens are most likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=3.21$ ), followed by the Learning Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.78$ ), then the Donor Greens ( $\bar{x}=3.96$ ), and finally the True Greens, who are least likely to agree ( $\bar{x}=4.20$ ). There are significant differences between the Non-Greens and the True Greens.

## DISCUSSION

The study results provide interesting and potentially useful information about green consumer profiles. They show that particular segments have different green attitudes, respond to green products differently, react differently to cause-related marketing campaigns, and consider green seals differently when making purchases. The following section discusses the specific profiles for each green consumer segment as well as marketing implications. See Tables 6-9 for detailed profiles on each segment.

### **RQ1 & RQ2: Consumer Behavior and Environmental Behavior Implications**

The data shows there are many attitudes and behaviors that are shared among the four green consumer segments. When asked if they buy products that make them feel better, all segments claim they sometimes engage in this type of purchase behavior. This insinuates that consumers normally use other factors besides their internal emotions when shopping, but sometimes buy things just for their own happiness.

When asked if they buy things for social acceptance there is little variation among the four green consumer segments. Overall, the respondents claim they hardly ever purchase something just to “fit in. This could mean that consumers do not consider what is “socially acceptable” when making purchase decisions. However, people generally do not like to admit that they do things just because someone says they should; this could explain why the segments claim they do not consider social acceptance when shopping. This evidence is backed up when the all of the green consumer segments state that the most important factor

in deciding what to buy is “not” what their friends think. This again implies consumers think for themselves and purchase based on their own motivations.

On the other hand, there are significant differences among the green consumer segments regarding their friends’ opinions of the environment. When posed the statement, “most of my friends think I should use products that are safe for the environment,” there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments. The Non-Greens disagree with this statement, whereas the True Greens are most likely to agree. This shows that consumers often surround themselves with “like-minded” people. The Donor Greens slightly agree with this statement, which may explain why they choose to give financially to environmental causes. They do not feel like making inconvenient changes but because their friends think they should use products that are environmentally safe, they donate money to fill this void. The Learning Greens are the most neutral regarding this position. It is likely that this segment has a larger mix of friends, as their behavior has not taken a specific direction and they are unsure about how the environment will affect their behavior.

Consumer ambivalence is merely one reason to gain a more thorough understanding of the different green consumer segments. Identifying behavioral and attitudinal traits that can be directly connected to environmentally-friendly behaviors is pivotal for effectively targeting marketing communications to particular green consumer segments (P. S. Ellen, Joshua Lyle Wiener, and Cathy Cobb-Walkgren, 1991). Psychographic information influences how to target consumer segments, but also determines the nature of the message, how marketers should present the message, and how to effectively deliver the message (Shrum, et al., 1995).

### **RQ3: Psychographic Implications**

Previous research finds that consumers classified as “most green” tend to be “better educated older females with high incomes and liberal orientation.” The typical profile for a green consumer suggests these individuals are highly educated, young, high income, urban women (Straughan & Roberts, 1999). The higher income consumer can justifiably be more green-minded as their income levels allow them to bear the premiums often associated with green products and services. On the other end of the scale, those consumers considered to be “least green” tend to be “younger, apolitical, less well educated males” (Levin, 1990). These descriptions include only demographic characteristics of a consumer and leave out important lifestyle and behavioral characteristics.

Results from this study indicate that the True Greens are most likely to be women and the Non-Greens are most likely to be male. Researchers agree with the fact that women are more likely than men to hold attitudes supportive of the green movement. Research justification for this suggest that women, due to sex role differences and social development, are more likely than men to consider how their actions affect external factors (Straughan & Roberts, 1999).

The True Greens are also more likely to be liberal and the Non-Greens are more likely to be conservative. Some earlier research suggest that those consumers that support liberal causes are more likely to exhibit stronger verbal commitments than those with conservative political views. This falls in line with the perception that environmental issues are affiliated with the “liberal” mainstream (Straughan & Roberts, 1999).

Our findings show that the Non-Greens are more likely to be affiliated with the conservative party and rarely ever consider themselves to be independent. This insinuates that the Non-Greens do affiliate themselves with a political party, and hence, do not appear to be “apolitical.” However, our results are not significantly different among the green consumer segments concerning age, income, education, marital status, or the presence of children. These findings can be supported by a large number of studies which find little to no connection between the above demographic characteristics and environmental behaviors and attitudes. These studies found a greater propensity for psychographic variables to have more explanatory power (Levin, 1990). A comparison of research regarding demographic profiles can sometimes be contradictory. One explanation for this contradiction may relate the green marketing phenomenon's entrance into the maturation phase. Research shows a “snapshot” of green consumers at a particular point in time. Because most of the research comes from the era of the inception of the green marketing phase, during the early stages of the life cycle, the relationships between green marketing and consumers have changed as time has gone by. The psychographic research has shown more consistency over time than the demographic research; however, there has not been enough psychographic research to draw valid conclusions regarding the correlation of these variables with green consumer behavior (Straughan & Roberts, 1999).

Although this study did not find significant differences among the green consumer groups regarding most demographic variables, researchers can look to past literature to determine if these variables may have some implication for green consumer behavior. Marketers have a general belief that the younger consumer segment is more likely to engage in environmental behaviors. This could be because these consumers have been raised in an

era of environmental concern, making them more aware; hence, they become more sensitive regarding these issues (Straughan & Roberts, 1999).

### **Psychographic Implications for Marketers**

Psychographic characteristics are important variable for marketers to use when targeting particular consumer segments. Our findings show very distinct patterns of activities for the four different green consumer segments. However, there are also similarities shared by all segments. Family is of high importance to all of the green consumer segments. This implies that companies who initiate strong family ties will have the best chance of engaging all green consumers.

*True Greens.* The True Greens are interested in individual and team sports which require their participation; however, they do not appear to participate in these activities much more than the average consumer. They are concerned about environmental issues, which support their claims that they have changed their behavior to lessen their carbon footprint. This segment also supports charities and engages in volunteer work. This also supports their claims that they have changed their behavior to support the issues of importance.

The True Greens also seem to care the most about education and read more than the average consumer. Consumers in general are hesitant to change their environmental attitudes and behaviors, which often stems from their lack of knowledge regarding the issues and how they can make a difference. The True Greens actively seek out this information by educating themselves on issues that concern them. When consumers are armed with knowledge they feel empowered to react in ways they feel will support their causes. Previous research implies that even when consumers express concern over environmental issues, this concern will not necessarily translate into action if they do not feel a sense of

empowerment (Cleveland, Kalamas, & Laroche, 2005). The True Greens may be more educated overall, which implies that marketers need to spend more time concentrating on the fundamentals of green in order to sway other consumer segments.

The True Greens are most interested in their families and spend a lot of time outdoors. They enjoy being outdoors, going on family outings and like to walk for pleasure. They are physical and like to participate in activities such as bicycling, running, swimming, and working out. This segment spends the largest amount of time outside and they enjoy camping.

The True Greens are least likely to be interested in sports and rarely watch sporting events on television. This segment is the least likely to attend a live sporting event but will go to a live concert. This shows that True Greens have no problem enjoying activities which involve large groups; however, they place little value on mass marketed sports. This segment does enjoy music but would prefer to be engaging in other activities while listening.

Technology is not of great interest to the True Greens which again indicates their active lifestyle and more physical nature. They do “work on the computer” but prefer to spend their leisure time in a more active manner. This segment does not engage in social networking as much as the other segments; therefore, marketers will need to find a more hands-on approach to reach these consumers. The True Greens do not spend much time watching television which implies that marketers must find alternative marketing outlets to reach these consumers.

The True Greens are also less interested in religion. This could be because they are more ingrained in nature and feel they receive their spirituality from other areas.

Gardening is of great interest to the True Greens, not only because they enjoy being outdoors, but also because this segment likes to have control over their consumption. The True Greens probably enjoy growing their own food so they don't have to wonder exactly what they consume. This also assists their learning process and is an activity they can share with others who share similar interests. This segment likes to engage in hobbies such as collecting things of importance to them and making things. The True Greens are active individuals who like to create usable goods for their own consumption and are unlikely to be frivolous.

The True Greens also enjoy traveling for leisure which supports their quest to learn more about new things and people. These activities broaden their horizons and provide them new ideas about how to live.

*Marketing Implications for the True Greens.* Marketers must tread lightly around these strong-willed, educated consumers. They are full of knowledge and continuously seek out companies who do well as well as companies who do not. This segment is not brand loyal and will quickly change their purchasing behaviors if they feel jilted by a company. The True Greens cannot be reached through traditional marketing and require marketing campaigns to be more transparent. Companies that support environmental causes can connect to these consumers by engaging in charity functions, sponsoring outdoor musical events (particularly those targeted at environmentally minded individuals), and creating environmental education programs. Supporting local and community causes is a good first step to catch the attention of this segment. They are hesitant to trust large companies that take action on a "mass" level. These consumers do not mind paying a premium to save the earth and do not take deception lightly. They have strong opinions on the environment and

will share them with others. The True Greens are a good target for buzz marketing because they are surrounded with like-minded people and enjoy sharing their knowledge. Marketers cannot “trick” the True Greens into becoming loyal consumers. A company must weigh the costs of engaging this segment versus the long-term benefits.

*Donor Greens.* The Donor Greens also have the most interest in their families; however, they do not appear to engage in a lot of familial activities. This could indicate that this segment spends a lot of time working which explains why they mainly support environmental causes financially. They place a lot of emphasis on education which would again explain their career stature. They do enjoy listening to music, going outdoors and playing sports. However, this study shows they do not engage in these activities any more than the average consumer. They occasionally go out to dinner and drinks to unwind when they have time away from the responsibilities. They may do this primarily because they do not have time to cook. They seldom go to the movies. They rarely walk for pleasure or go on family outings and rarely go camping.

The Donor Greens sometimes engage in physical fitness activities. Some of them occasionally engage in individual or team sports but many of them are likely to never participate. They will attend live sporting events and live concerts but no more than expected. Some of the Donor Greens watch sports on television but an equal amount claim to never watch sports on television. They do not often travel for pleasure. This segment engages in social networking to an extent but not more than expected. Some of these consumers do read for pleasure. They work on the computer less than expected. This segment does not volunteer or participate in charity events. This segment is not political and not very interested in wildlife/environmental issues. They feel they have little time or control

over these things, and therefore feel giving money justifies their inaction. This segment is not overly religious and not personally interested in gourmet/fine food.

*Marketing Implications for Donor Greens.* This segment is either lazy or busy. They claim to place a large emphasis on family but do not appear to have the time or the inclination to spend much time with their families. This could be caused by a heavy work load which could explain their limited time for outside activities. The fact that they have busy careers supports their inability to change their environmental behaviors in any manner besides donating money. This segment supports environmental causes financially because they have disposable income.

Marketers who wish to target this segment must communicate conveniently and succinctly to get their message across. Companies who make the Donor Greens feel as though their contributions make a difference, but will not inconvenience them, will be most likely to penetrate this segment. These consumers want to appease their guilt about damaging the environment by giving money to a cause or company that will take action for them. In order to change the Donor Greens' behaviors, marketers will need to convince them of simple, convenient measures they can take to make a difference. These consumers do not have the time or the will to change their lifestyles; however, educating this segment is integral to increasing market share because they have the financial ability to make a difference. As this segment grows older and their free time increases they may take more time to make conscious steps to act in an environmentally-friendly manner. Convincing this segment that environmental issues are real is important to the future of our environment as they can be pivotal in making a difference at some point in the future.

Marketers can target these consumers through social networking; however, this segment is probably inundated with cyber communication; therefore, less is more. This segment will go out on occasion for drinks and entertainment so this could be an outlet for marketers to target the Donor Greens.

*Learning Greens.* The Learning Greens are very interested in their families and spend time together going to movies. They sometimes go out to for drinks and entertainment and enjoy attending live sporting events. Considering they enjoy music this study shows they do not often attend live concerts. This segment watches a lot of television and spends a lot of time watching sports. They are interested in education, self-improvement, and will occasionally read for pleasure. This segment rarely travels for pleasure but is interested in the outdoors and sometimes goes on family outings. They occasionally participate in individual or team sports. They occasionally engage in hobbies such as collecting and creating.

The Learning Greens regularly engage in social networking. They work on the computer but no more than the average consumer. They do not often volunteer their time or engage in charity events. The Learning Greens are not particularly interested in politics or wildlife/environmental issues. They do not spend much time on technology or engaging in physical fitness activities.

*Marketing Implications for the Learning Greens.* This segment admits they are still in a learning process when it comes to environmental issues. They claim they have begun to change their environmental behaviors; however, they are unwilling to sacrifice their free time for these causes. Their interest in self-improvement shows marketers they are willing to

better themselves given the proper direction. The Learning Greens do occasionally read for pleasure but it is doubtfully the primary way they absorb information. They are heavily involved in organized sports, particularly on television; therefore, marketers can target this segment through sports sponsorship. Communications should be educational in a fundamental way because this segment is still in the introductory phase of their knowledge cycle. The Learning Greens watch a significant amount of television; therefore, marketers should use this medium to communicate with this segment.

*Non-Greens.* This study shows the Non-Greens are very sports oriented because they like to participate in individual and team sports and also enjoy physical fitness activities. Some consumers in this segment enjoy camping. They often attend live sporting events and watch a lot of sports on television. They are personally interested in their family and will occasionally go on family outings. However, they spend a significant time watching television and going out for drinks and entertainment. The Non-Greens occasionally go to sporting events, read for pleasure, and sometimes go to the movies. They like music and sometimes go to live concerts. This segment spends a lot of time working on the computer and social networking. Surprisingly, a lot of consumers in this segment volunteer and participate in charity work. It was not surprising that this segment is not particularly interested in wildlife/environmental issues or animals.

*Marketing Implications for the Non-greens.* This segment is not lazy. They engage in physical activities particularly when it involves sports and enjoyment. They are less likely to walk for pleasure or be physically active for anything other than their personal enjoyment, or sports. The Non-Greens openly admit there are environmental problems, but claim they are not changing their behavior to due to these problems. Initially marketers may blame their

attitudes on laziness; however, my research finds this lack of action is due more to skepticism than laziness. This study shows they actively engage in outside activities. The Non-Greens even volunteer and participate in charity work more than the Donor Greens and Learning Greens. This indicates they would like to help with environmental causes but may be fed up with the mass green communications and greenwashing. The Non-Greens would rather spend their time enjoying their leisure activities than worrying over the environment. They do not believe the environmental claims made by marketers and companies, so therefore, will be very difficult to target.

### **Environmental Implications for Marketers**

Previous research indicates that green consumers are interested in new products; they look for new information, and talk with other people regarding these products. This same research claims green consumers consider themselves to be opinion leaders which can lead to word-of-mouth advertising. These consumers shop carefully and do not buy on impulse. They are price conscious so companies must be careful to stay in an affordable pricing range (Levin, 1990).

This study indicates that the True Greens will sometimes buy on impulse but are not impulsive by nature. Surprisingly, the Donor Greens are most likely to buy on impulse. The Donor Greens admit they recognize there are environmental problems but combat this guilt by giving money to financial causes. They may be more impulsive because they feel spending money on an environmental product will eradicate the need for them to take more inconvenient actions, but they have limited time to plan ahead. The fact that this segment prefers to support the environment financially shows they are less willing to be

inconvenienced for the cause. Therefore, it is natural to think they look for more convenience in their general shopping patterns, which often leads to making impulsive shopping decisions. The Non-Greens are also more impulsive than the True Greens (although less impulsive than the Donor Greens). This impulsiveness could be fueled by the attitude that, although they are aware there are environmental problems, they do not feel inclined to make any changes in their behavior. This would indicate a lack of motivation to plan ahead; hence, impulsive behavior from this segment is not surprising.

Again this research conflicts with earlier findings regarding the price sensitive nature of green consumers. Our data show that the Non-Greens are the most likely to be price conscious. They often or almost always look for value for their money, buy whatever is cheapest, and buy things on sale. Although the True Greens also think about the price versus the value, this research shows being greener does not mean one is more price conscious.

Because green consumers are open to new products and information seeking in nature, companies will have to continually work to keep these customers as they are less likely to be brand loyal. The question remains whether this lack of brand loyalty is due to marketers' inability to communicate effectively or to provide good environmental products. If this is the case, providing these benefits could possibly promote brand loyalty. There is a possibility that green consumers may in fact become brand loyal to products that meet their environmental needs and communicate their benefits in an effective manner. Marketing initiatives must permeate throughout the organization to convince consumers of their environmental commitment. It is likely that consumers will react positively to companies with a "first-mover" advantage. Consumers consider these companies to be aggressively working towards these environmental issues (Laroche, 2005). Until this melding between

product and effective marketing takes place, the green industry continues to have low barriers to entry as green consumers welcome new information and products (Levin, 1990).

Another positive aspect of being a “first-mover” green company is the lack of bad press from previous green product failures, because overcoming negative attitudes with regard to environmental issues can be quite difficult (Levin, 1990). Levin’s study results indicate that consumers making green purchases are skeptical about marketing in general. Women in particular display a larger amount of skepticism the greater their propensity to buy green products. They feel advertising insults their intelligence and would not buy products from a company whose marketing they dislike. This implies that marketers must be careful not to alienate their largest market share of consumers, females, by making deceptive claims regarding environmental products (Levin, 1990). If care is not taken regarding this issue, green consumers may develop a negative perception of a particular brand which can be devastating for the company and nearly impossible to overcome (Iyer & Banerjee, 1993).

Our research indicates the True Greens are most likely to agree that marketers are deceptive. Surprisingly the Non-Greens come in a close second to the True Greens in agreeing that marketers are deceptive. The Learning Greens are least likely to agree that marketers are deceptive. This could be due to this segment’s search for information as they are on a quest to learn more about environmental issues. The easiest, most accessible way to access product information is through the media; hence, this may explain why the Learning Greens are more open to marketing claims. Overall, each of the four green consumer segments tend to agree that marketers lie about products being truly green and believe there are a lot of products that claim to be environmentally-friendly, but are really no different from other products.

On the other hand, the findings are opposite when respondents are asked if they believe environmentalists make a lot of exaggerations about environmental problems. The Non-Greens clearly agree that environmentalists blow environmental issues out of proportion. This goes along with the Non-Green description, which states they know there are environmental problems but have taken no steps to change their behavior. This may be because the constant over exaggerations cause them to be ambivalent about how their change in behaviors and/or attitudes can truly make a difference. On the other hand, the Non-Greens could merely say they believe these issues are over exaggerated in an attempt to assuage their guilt. Another perspective on this issue is to look at responses to the question, “Would you buy products you like regardless of the environmental impact?” The Non-Greens are most likely to agree that they would buy what they want even if they knew it would impact the environment negatively. Taking these two aspects in tandem, one could say that the Non-Greens claim environmentalists over exaggerate, but even if they didn’t, they would still not change their purchase behavior.

Not surprisingly, the True Greens strongly disagree that these claims are over-exaggerated, which supports their characteristic of being highly-green and having made considerable changes in their behavior patterns to support the environment. The True Greens are also the least likely to buy products they like regardless of the environmental impact.

The Donor Greens and the Learning Greens are neutral on the question of environmentalists’ exaggerations, which indicates their ambivalence regarding how to react to environmental issues. The Donor Greens may feel their financial donations are enough to eradicate their negative effects on the environment. The Learning Greens may feel they do not have enough knowledge on what actually impacts the environment to make this decision.

Even though research shows that consumers care about the environment, this information does not always translate into a change in purchase behavior (Schlossberg, 1991). This statement holds true for the Non-Greens who acknowledge there are environmental issues but respond that they would buy products they like regardless of the environmental impact. The Donor Greens and the Learning Greens disagree with the previous statement, which shows that they are making conscious efforts to change their patterns. The True Greens are the least likely to buy something if it could affect the environment in a negative way. The True Greens show the most motivation for going out of their way to make a difference.

Each of the four segments exhibit significantly different opinions with regard to their overall environmental behavior. The True Greens pay attention to environmental advertising and buy environmentally-friendly products. Their friends also make environmentally-friendly decisions and they often engage in groups or clubs with an environmental theme. They feel a moral obligation to educate themselves about the products they buy and will switch brands for ecological reasons. Therefore, the True Green segment is the least likely to be brand loyal when making environmental purchases. These consumers are advocates for their cause and spread the word to their friends, family, and acquaintances. They make personal sacrifices for the good of the environment and feel enthusiastic about new green products and their environmentally-friendly decisions. They feel consumers should care about the consequences of their purchasing behavior. The True Greens always want to learn more about environmental issues and solutions. This is a challenge for marketers when targeting this audience because they must continuously update their communications with

applicable environmental information. Marketers who let their guard down when advertising to this segment will quickly lose customers.

The Donor Greens also exhibit environmental behaviors but not to the extreme extent seen in the True Green segment. These consumers admit there are environmental issues to the extent they will sacrifice financially for the cause, but they are less inclined to inconvenience themselves to make a difference. This segment exhibits the same opinions as the True Greens; however, they are less radical in their approach. The Learning Greens also respond in a positive way to the environmental behavioral questions but to a lesser extent than the Donor Greens. The Learning Greens are in a state of flux between realizing there is a problem and determining how they will take action on this new found information. This segment will eventually transition to one of the other three segments. It is unlikely the Learning Greens will move backwards into the Non-green segment unless they are thwarted by marketer deception and misinformation. More than likely, the Learning Greens will move up to either the Donor Green or True Green segment. If the Learning Greens feel it takes too much effort to be environmentally-friendly or if they become ambivalent, they may land in the Donor Green segment. However, if they encounter understandable and valuable information which makes them feel they can make a difference, they may move to the more extreme spectrum of the True Greens.

When comparing environmental attitudes of the four green consumer segments, there again are very significant differences between each segment. The True Greens feel environmental issues are serious and problems are probably worse than we have yet to understand. They believe we should sacrifice our comfort to preserve natural resources and would inconvenience themselves to recycle. They are upset that the government does not do

more to stop the environmental injustices and feel public schools should include courses dealing with the environment and conservation in the curriculum. They are driven by fear of what it to come particularly since the recent BP oil spill. They will consciously stop purchasing products from companies who are guilty of pollution and feel the government should enforce a surcharge for products which damage the environment.

As with environmental behaviors, the Donor Greens fall slightly behind the True Greens with regard to their environmental attitudes. They have the same feelings as the True Greens but are less likely to inconvenience themselves to make a difference. The Learning Greens are right behind the Donor Greens, as they also agree there are issues but are still unsure of the proper action they should take to alleviate the problems. The Non-Greens believe environmental issues are blown out of proportion and that much more fuss is being made about pollution than is justifiable. They are not concerned about the problem of pollution and will not normally change their behaviors based on the mishaps of a company. They do not feel it is the government's problem and do not care to make any changes which would help the environment.

Guilt is often a driver of consumer behavior and an indicator of how consumers will react in certain circumstance. The Donor Greens show the largest amount of guilt regarding their environmental behavior. They feel ashamed they do not try harder to be environmentally-friendly and feel guilty they do not buy more environmentally-friendly products. This segment may not feel that giving financially is equivalent to taking personal actions to change the environment. The True Greens also experience consumer guilt but not to the same extent as the Donor Greens. The True Greens' actions are probably driven by the internal guilt they feel about their existence and its negative effects on the environment.

Regardless of how many actions a True Green takes to be environmentally-friendly, they will probably still experience consumer guilt because it is part of their personal characteristics. The Learning Greens also experience consumer guilt, but not quite to the extent of the Donor Greens and True Greens. This is probably due to the fact that because they are still in the learning phase and admit they are in the process of making changes to their environmental behaviors, they feel like they are moving in the right direction. Non-Greens feel significantly less consumer guilt. They admit there are environmental problems but also admit they do not change their behaviors due to these issues. Therefore, it comes as no surprised that they do not feel ashamed or guilty that they are not trying harder to be environmentally-friendly and buy greener products. This supports their claim that they realize there are problems but have not changed their behavior. This segment blames others for the environmental situation.

One useful indication of consumer behavior is ‘perceived consumer effectiveness’ which is defined as, “the individual’s belief that his or her efforts will make a difference” (Rex & Baumann, 2006, p. 569). This continues to be a problem in green marketing where consumers have difficulty determining how their efforts affect the environment. History shows that the initial excitement surrounding green marketing was quickly squashed by negative publicity, reports of problems, and premium-profit erosion. Consumers are less willing to pay extra for green products as anticipated because they are unsure that their extra dollars are truly going towards a value-added purpose. Research indicates that the market share for green products has not seen the increase anticipated due to consumer skepticism about environmental claims in advertisements, resistance from regulatory agencies, and sometimes even legal action barriers. This industry continues to experience consumer distrust and suspicion with regard to environmental claims (Rex & Baumann, 2006).

Consumers' perception of marketer deception weighs heavily on their ability to accept new green products and environmental ideas. All of the green consumer segments agree in some form that marketers are untruthful regarding environmental claims. The surprising outcome is that the True Greens, the Non-Greens, and the Donor Greens answer almost identically on this question. These segments agree that marketers lie about products being truly green and that many of these products are no different from regular products. Each of these segments may have different underlying reasons for agreeing that marketers are deceptive when making green claims. This comes as no surprise for the True Greens who feel the strongest regarding this question. Their quest to better themselves environmentally, by constantly learning and supporting causes, would explain their skepticism of marketing claims. The fact that the Non-Greens came in second on agreeing that marketers are deceptive may explain why they fail to take action regarding environmental issues. This segment openly admits there are environmental problems but they are not doing anything about it. Why? Some may say it is due to laziness, but could it be due to the fact they feel jilted by inaccurate claims and corporate misconceptions? If marketers placed more emphasis on education and process explanation versus green-hype and exaggeration, even the Non-Greens may sit up and take notice. The Donor Greens also agree that marketers are deceptive, although they agree slightly less than the previous two segments. This could explain why they simply give financially to causes instead of taking higher action. They are confused about how to make a difference and do not feel they can trust mass media; therefore, they donate money to lessen their guilt. The segments which experienced the most significant differences with regard to marketer deception are the True Greens and the Learning Greens. Although the Learning Greens still agree somewhat that marketers are

deceptive, they are more likely to believe the claims made by advertisements. Because the Learning Greens are in a “learning” phase, they place a greater emphasis on outside information. This is their primary basis for gathering the information they need to determine how they will react to environmental issues and whether they will make any lasting behavioral changes for the environment. This points to the absolute importance that marketers deliver an accurate account of the product claims. The Learning Greens are not yet jaded to inconsistencies and untruths. Marketers can most easily target this segment to become brand loyal if done in an appropriate manner. Companies must educate this segment in a fundamental way and stand behind their claims. Corporate social responsibility will also sway this segment as they will be more likely to affiliate with a company that is environmentally-friendly if they engage in cause-related marketing campaigns.

#### **RQ4: Green Product Implications**

Approximately three fourths of the True Greens had heard of Clorox *green works*® before taking this survey. Of the four green consumer segments they are the most likely to have purchased this product before. Most of them had purchased it more than one time and many of them purchase it frequently.

Approximately two thirds of the Learning Greens acknowledged they had heard of this product. This could be due to the fact that this segment is in the learning process and actively seeking environmentally-friendly products. About one third of them had purchased this product before, but over half of them are unsure if they would buy it again. Most of them had either purchased it once or more than once. This shows that they are still in the learning mode and are not quite sure how to adjust their behavior to a regular pattern.

Approximately half of the Donor Greens had heard of Clorox *green works*® before taking this survey. Only about a fifth of those who had heard of the product purchased it and half of those purchased it only once, with the other 40% purchasing it more than once. None of the respondents purchase this product regularly. This behavior exhibits the financial motives of this segment to pay for something they feel may be environmentally-friendly but not change their regular shopping patterns.

A little over half of the Non-Greens had heard of Clorox *green works*® before taking this survey. Of those who had heard of it a little over a quarter of them actually purchased the product; most of them had purchased it only once. Surprisingly, none of this segment stated they had only bought the product once and would not purchase it again. This indicates they are not unhappy with the product but for some reason are unlikely to purchase the product again.

None of the four green consumer segments felt strongly that this Clorox *green works*® product was good for the environment. For the most part they did not feel having this product made Clorox a better company because they did not feel this product helps the environment. Overall, they did not connect with this product and did not find the ad meaningful. These segments do not feel buying this product shows concern for the environment. Of the four green consumer segments the Learning Greens experienced the most ambivalence with regard to this product as their responses sometimes ranged in neutral territory. The most significance between the segments occurred between the Learning Greens and the Non-Greens. The Non-Greens disagreed that Clorox is a better company for having this product and that this product is actually good for the environment. Again, this could support the hypothesis that the Non-Greens do not have environmentally-friendly

behaviors because they do not believe the claims of green products. The True Greens also disagree with the claims, although not quite as vehemently as the Non-Greens. The True greens disagree because they are more educated about the processes and impacts products have on the environment.

With regard to the product perception that Clorox *green works*® is a good value for the money and cleans well, there are no significant differences among the segments. For the most part all segments to disagreeing with these statements. This could be because they feel natural products are diluted and thus cheaper to make, which makes them less effective in cleaning. When asked to rate this product on a scale between being full strength and diluted, there are differences among the segments. The Non-Greens respond that they feel the product is diluted, which supports the idea that they do not buy environmentally-friendly products because they do not believe the green claims. The True Greens respond in a more neutral zone as they do not feel this product is full strength; however, they answer the closest to full-strength out of all the segments. None of the four green consumer segments feel this product is full-strength.

Although the True Greens do not feel this product is full strength they do respond that they feel the product is toxic when asked to gauge natural versus toxic. Clorox bleach has been a staple cleaning item in households for decades. It is very difficult for a company to switch consumer mindsets that they are a toxic chemical producing company to the perception that they are a natural green company. The Clorox *green works*® advertisement (Appendix C) displays all of the natural ingredients incorporated into this product and displays the Green Good Housekeeping Seal. The bottle is clear and the liquid is green. It

appears that consumers have a hard time overcoming pre-conceived notions of a company when rating their new green products.

When asked to rate the effectiveness of the product all respondents' answers range more towards ineffective. The True Greens are most likely to feel the product is effective. This is could be because this segment feels the product is of higher-strength and more toxic, so it is more likely to be effective. The Learning Greens come in next on the effective scale. This could be because they are in the learning phase and absorb more of the information to make their decisions because they have no pre-conceived notions. The Non-Greens feel the strongest about this product being ineffective. This supports the assumption that this segment does not believe the claims of green products, or it could be that they could not want to believe the claims so they do not feel guilty about not taking action.

There are no significant differences between the four green consumer segments regarding the quality of Clorox *green works*®. All respondents answer primarily in the neutral area ranging slightly towards the low quality spectrum. They do not feel it is effective and feel it is toxic and slightly diluted. It is surprising that their responses are not more towards the low-quality end. Clorox's brand recognition alone could be a determinant as to why the respondents hesitate to consider a product they produce as a "low-quality" product.

There are also not considerable differences among the segments regarding the believability of the advertisement. The respondents range slightly from just under neutral towards unbelievable. Again this could be caused by the previous toxic association with Clorox, or it could be their inability to trust green ads. The ad did include hype about the

product; however, it also listed the actual ingredients. Either respondents failed to review the survey adequately or they just do not believe what they see.

On the other hand the respondents do feel the package is slightly attractive. There are no significant differences between the four green consumer segments; however, the only segment that moved past neutral towards unattractive are the Non-Greens. Given the nature of the responses this may be a ray of hope for Clorox's *green works*®. At least it's not ugly; maybe they'll buy it.

When asked to rate Clorox *green work's*® environmental friendliness, the True Greens answered significantly differently compared to the other segments. The True Greens feel this product is not good for the environment. This could be because they feel the ingredients are too strong and toxic. Another rationalization for this fact could be that the True Greens are not inclined to feel a company is environmentally-friendly simply because they roll out a line of green products.

The fact that Clorox continues to produce harmful chemically denied products in their other lines is enough to make this True Greens anti-Clorox when looking at the whole picture. None of the segments feel this product is environmentally-friendly and this could be for the same reasons as the True Greens. The Non-Greens are least likely to feel this product is environmentally-friendly again, underlining their skepticism of green products.

#### **RQ5: Eco-Label Implications for Marketers**

When questioned about their previous knowledge of the Green Good Housekeeping Seal, a little over a quarter of the True Greens had seen this emblem before taking this survey. This was the highest percentage followed by the Donor Greens, the Learning

Greens, and then the Non-Greens. There are no significant differences among the segments regarding seal deception. All four green consumer segments slightly agree that this is another form of marketer deception and is easy to get for most products, even if a company has to pay for it. They somewhat agree that the government should tighten rules regarding the use of terms like green, environmentally-friendly, and natural. They also slightly agree that products with this seal are more expensive. This insinuates that consumers, as a whole, are somewhat wary of green seals. Even green seals bearing an established name, such as Good Housekeeping, may not be enough to sway customers without a standard set of guidelines for a third-party certification.

There are some differences among the segments regarding how they perceive the greenness of this seal. The True Greens are least likely to believe that a product is green if it bears this seal. They also disagree that products must have certain green standards and be recyclable/biodegradable in order to attain this seal. The True Greens are less likely to buy into mass marketing hype and are wary of green stamps. They succumb more to factual data and a company's social awareness and processes. The Non-Greens are next in line to disagree with these statements which again emphasizes their skepticism of all things green. The Donor Greens and the Learning Greens respond almost identically that they do not really believe these claims either, but are not quite as extreme as the True Greens. The Donor Greens and Learning Greens want to believe these claims because it makes it easier for them to spot environmentally-friendly products; however, this shows they too are leery of green seals.

None of the four green consumer segments look for the Green Good Housekeeping Seal (or a comparable seal) when choosing between alternatives. The Non-Greens are the

least likely to look for green seals when making a purchase because they do not believe the claims made by third party certifications. Although the Good Housekeeping Seal has been around for over a century, the Green Good Housekeeping Seal has only been in existence since 2009 and is still attempting to gain momentum. There is skepticism between the segments regarding the substance behind these eco-label claims. There need to be laws and regulations passed that regulate these claims; until this happens it is a free-for-all.

Research suggests that using negative eco-labels (i.e., labels which signal a products disadvantage to the environment) may have a larger effect on mass consumers. In general, consumers react more quickly to things inherently harmful. Positive eco-labels (i.e., signals that a product is preferable to alternatives not bearing an eco-label) primarily appear to those consumers already evolved to a higher green stage (Grankvist, Dahlstrand, & Biel, 2004).

#### **R6: Cause-Related Marketing Implications for Marketers**

Past research shows that most consumers react positively to socially responsible companies and products (RSW, 1996). If price and quality are homogenous across the alternatives, consumers are most likely to choose the company that engages in responsible business practices. CRM effects are anticipated to have greater effects under inter-brand homogeneity, when there are no trade-offs between important features. When all else is equal, CRM can be one of the only causes for differentiation. On the other hand, in the case of inter-brand heterogeneity, when there are differences in price and quality, consumers must make a trade-off. Consumers may have to accept a higher price and/or a lower quality brand in order to choose the company perceived to support social causes for more congruent

reasons. The question remains whether consumers are willing to make this trade-off and if so, at what cost (Barone, et al., 2000).

However, after reviewing the literature pertaining to CRM there seem to be inconsistent opinions and findings. One such reason for consumer ambivalence could be derived from their opinions on whether the CRM campaign is thought to be beneficial or exploitative to the cause (Drumwright, 1996). As more companies engage in CRM skepticism seems to be decreasing; however, consumers will always remain critical of these initiatives as they demand to know whether the company's support of a social cause is created to primarily benefit the cause or the company (Smith & Stodghill, 1994).

Past findings show that two thirds of consumers intend to switch to a brand that engages in CRM campaigns, but only if the quality and price are equivalent to their competitors ("Report: Consumers Swayed by Good Causes," 1997). On the other hand there is research which shows that consumers' primary purchase indicators are price and performance, but CRM remains a relatively unimportant influence on their decision making process (Smith & Stodghill, 1994).

The current research findings show there are significant differences among the four green consumer segments regarding Coca-Cola's use of cause-related marketing. Contrary to previous research we find that respondents feel that these tactics are sometimes used merely for company gain. The True Greens are most likely to agree that Coca-Cola uses environmental causes to make themselves look better and exploits the environment for their own gain. They also feel the company harms the environment and only pretends to be interested in this cause to make themselves look better. The True Greens are more likely to

be armed with prior knowledge of negative situations where Coca-Cola's actions have caused harm to the environment, which explains their feelings of exploitation. The Learning Greens and the Non-Greens are the least likely to agree with these statements, although they do not disagree. Surprisingly the Non-Greens are least likely to feel that Coca-Cola exploits the environment. This segment may be searching for something they feel is factual with regard to company initiatives to do better.

When looking at the four green consumer segments with regard to the value that cause-related marketing campaigns bring to a company the segments vary. The Donor Greens are most likely to feel that Coca-Cola is adding value to their product and are most likely to buy products that support environmental causes. They also respond that this type of marketing makes a difference in how they think about these products and prefer companies that support causes which identify with their brand image. This segment chooses to do business with companies that invest money into environmental causes. The Donor Greens also support environmental causes financially, which explains why they are the most likely to agree that this type of activity adds value to a brand. Supporting cause-related marketing campaigns justifies the Donor Greens' actions. The Non-Greens do not feel that these campaigns add value to a company. This could be because the Non-Greens are wary of companies which claim to support the environment while, at the same time, harm the environment through their production process. The Learning Greens and True Greens feel more neutral about these claims, although they somewhat agree there is some value to these campaigns. Consumers want to feel good about purchasing products which contribute to environmental causes but feel ambivalent about the difference these companies can make

when they are simultaneously harming the environment through their production and disposal processes.

Companies that engage in cause-related marketing campaigns are obviously spending revenues that could otherwise be added to their profits. They often do this in anticipation of higher sales due to this association; however, consumers are aware of these additional costs and unsure of who bears these burdens. The Non-Greens are the most likely to agree that companies who spend money on environmental causes charge more for their products and pass on these costs to their customers. This is yet another example of how the Non-Greens are skeptical of “do-gooders” and feel they are being taken advantage of when dealing with environmental causes and issues. The True Greens are unsure about who bears the burdens of these costs. Because this segment is supportive of environmental causes and they sacrifice time and money to support environmental issues they may think that the costs are balanced, and as companies spend more on these campaigns they gain more customers; hence the costs are shared.

## **Conclusion**

If marketers continue to rely on eco-labels, cause-related marketing, and existing green consumers the market share for green products will not see a dramatic increase. To achieve a greener world through mass green purchases and consumption patterns, marketers must address a broader range of consumers rather than focusing on those already green segments. Activities such as analyzing consumer needs and wants, and developing better promotions should assist in broadening the scope of green marketing and exploring new marketing opportunities (Rex & Baumann, 2006).

Few researchers doubt that the overall market for green products and services is large enough to facilitate company profitability. These green consumer segments are accessible logistically and through properly targeted communications (Straughan & Roberts, 1999).

### **Limitations**

Generalization from this study to the consumer population as a whole should be made with caution. The sample, while fairly diverse, was relatively small and drawn largely from the student body at a single Southern United States university. The respondents are restricted to users of social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter) and faculty/staff at Appalachian State University; it would be prudent, given sample limitations, to consider the results as not completely representative of all green consumers.

The sample used in the study does not reflect the general population on several variables (e.g., income, education, marital status, and presence of children). This could be due to the fact that the majority of respondents are derived from a University setting. The generalizations of these results are limited by this lack of representativeness.

History shows a gap between consumer behaviors and consumer attitudes. Many consumers may say they are green because it is the socially acceptable thing to do, but in reality may make no real attempt to change their behaviors. This gap tends to grow wider when using self-reporting methods to collect data regarding environmentally-friendly behaviors and attitudes. Another issue is the ability of consumers to estimate the frequency with which they engage in particular behaviors. Needless to say there are considerable social pressures involved with changing any type of behavior, particularly green consumer behavior (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995).

Research indicates that self-reported information may not be the best collection measure when engaging in green research. Both attitudinal and behavioral measures can be difficult to accurately quantify when consumers feel pressured to engage in green consumer behavior. Future research on this topic would be more accurate by studying actual consumer behaviors (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995).

Limitations of this research includes respondent attrition and fatigue. The survey indicated it would take 10 minutes to complete; however, after review of the start time and end time of the survey respondents it took approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey indicated an approximation of 10 minutes to complete based on two pretests with undergraduate consumer behavior students.

### **Future Directions**

In the future it would be advantageous to include a question which asks “If a company is to produce a green product that I understood and could trust; I would buy it if it was reasonably priced.” This would help determine if the Non-Greens would make environmentally-friendly decisions based on information they felt was factual, as well as not costing them a lot more money.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angelidis, J. P., & Ibrahim, N. A. (1993). Social demand and corporate strategy: a corporate social responsibility model. *Review of Business*, 15(1), 4.
- Banerjee, S., Gulas, C. S., & Iyer, E. (1995). Shades of green: A multidimensional analysis of environmental advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 21-31.
- Barlow, T. (2009). Is Good Housekeeping's Green Seal the Color of Money? *Green Shopping*., Retrieved from <http://www.walletpop.com/2009/09/11/is-good-housekeepings-green-seal-the-color-of-money/>
- Barone, M., Miyazaki, A., & Taylor, K. (2000). The influence of cause-related marketing on consumer choice: Does one good turn deserve another? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 248-262. doi: 10.1177/0092070300282006
- BeGreenCertified. (2011). *Green certified*, Retrieved from <http://www.begreencertified.com/>
- Bentley, M., Fien, J., & Neil, C. (2004). Sustainable Consumption: Young Australians as agents of change. *National Youth Affairs Research Scheme Report*., Retrieved from <http://www.tigggroups.org>
- Big Room Incorporated. (2011). *EcoLabels*, Retrieved from <http://www.ecolabelindex.com>
- Boulstridge, E., & Carrigan, M. (2000). Do consumers really care about corporate responsibility? Highlighting the attitude-behavioral gap. *Journal of Communication Management*, 4(4), 13.
- Bromer, P. (1998). Ambivalent attitudes and information processing. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 57, 19.
- Bronn, P. S., & Vrioni, A. B. (2001). Corporate social responsibility and cause-related marketing: An overview. *International Journal of Advertising*, 20, 15.
- Bruner, G. C., & Hensel, P. J. (1998). *Marketing scales handbook* (Vol. II). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

- Chase, D., & Smith, T. K. (1992). Consumers keen on green but marketers don't deliver. *Advertising Age*, 63(June 29), 2.
- Cleveland, M., Kalamas, M., & Laroche, M. (2005). Shades of green: Linking environmental locus of control and pro-environmental behaviors. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22(4/5), 198.
- Collins, M. (1993). Global corporate philanthropy--marketing beyond the call of the duty? *European Journal of Marketing* 27(2), 12.
- Connell, S., Fien, J., Lee, J., Sykes, H., & Yencken, D. (1999). If it doesn't directly affect you, you don't think about it: A qualitative study of young people's environmental attitudes in two Australian cities. *Environmental Education Research*, 5(1), 18.
- Coyle, K. J. (2004). Understanding environmental literacy in America: And making it a Reality. Washington, D. C.: National Environmental Education & Training Foundation.
- Doane, D. (2005). The myth of CSR. *Stanford Social Innovation review*, 7.
- Drumwright, M. E. (1996). Company advertising with a social dimension: The role of noneconomic criteria. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(October), 60.
- Duncan, T., & Moriarty, S. (1997). *Driving brand value: Using integrated marketing to manage profitable stakeholder relationships*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dunn, C. (2008). *Introducing Clorox's Green Works Cleaners.*, Retrieved from <http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/01/clorox-green-works.php>
- Ellen, P. S., Wiener, J. L., & Cobb-Walgren, C. (1991). The role of perceived consumer effectiveness in motivating environmentally conscious behaviors. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 10, 16.
- Enderly, G., & Tavis, A. L. (1998). A balanced concept of the firm and the measurement of its long-term planning and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(11), 15.
- Federal Trade Commission. (1998). Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. *Commercial Practices*, Retrieved from <http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text->

[idx?c=ecfr&sid=5de11e010afaa51af478dbd337f0cad6&rgn=div5&view=text&node=16:1.0.1.2.24&idno=16](http://www.globalreporting.org/AboutGRI/WhatIsGRI/?c=ecfr&sid=5de11e010afaa51af478dbd337f0cad6&rgn=div5&view=text&node=16:1.0.1.2.24&idno=16)

Global Reporting Initiative. (2007). *What is GRI?*, Retrieved from <http://www.globalreporting.org/AboutGRI/WhatIsGRI/>

Good Housekeeping Research Institute. (2011). Eco Label Index. *Green Good Housekeeping Seal.*, Retrieved from <http://www.ecolabelindex.com/ecolabel/greengoodhousekeeping>

Grankvist, G., Dahlstrand, U., & Biel, A. (2004). The impact of environmental labelling on consumer preference: negative vs. positive labels. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 27(2), 17.

Hearst Communications. (2011a). Better Homes & Gardens. *Green Good Housekeeping Seal.*, Retrieved from <http://www.goodhousekeeping.com/product-testing/seal-holders/green-seal/green-gh-seal-cleaning-and-beauty-products>

Hearst Communications. (2011b). *Green Good Housekeeping Seal: A Brief Summary of the Application*, Retrieved from <http://www.goodhousekeeping.com/product-testing/history/green-good-housekeeping-seal-application-summary>

Iyer, E., & Banerjee, B. (1993). Anatomy of green advertising. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 7.

Kanter, L. D., & Mirvis, H. P. (1989). *Cynical americans: Living and working in an age of discontent and disillusionment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Boss.

Kay, J. (1993). *Foundations of corporate success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). *Attitude strength: Anecedents and consequences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lerner, D. L., & Fryxell, E. G. (1988). An empirical study of the predictors of corporate social performance: a multi-dimensional analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7, 9.

Levin, G. (1990). Consumers turning green: JWT Survey. *Advertising Age*, 61(Nov 12), 1.

- Magrath, A. J. (1992). The marketing of the green. *Sales and Marketing Management*, 133(12), 2.
- McMilker. (2008). *Clorox benefits from the FDA's decision on natural*, Retrieved from <http://ecochildsplay.com/2008/01/15/clorox-benefits-from-fdas-decision-on-natural/>
- Meyer, A. (2001). What's in it for the customers? Successfully marketing green clothes. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10, 13.
- Minton, A. P., & Rose, R. L. (1997). The effects of environmental concern on environmentally friendly consumer behavior: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Research*, 40, 37-48.
- Molyneaux, M. (2007). *Health and wellness trends and those specific to personal care*. Harleysville, PA: The Natural Marketing Institute.
- Mullen, J. (1997). Performance-based corporate philanthropy: How 'giving smart' can further corporate goals. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 42(2), 6.
- Natural Marketing Research Institute. (2010). *The mainstreaming of sustainability in the U.S.*. Corvallis, OR: The Natural Marketing Institute.
- Neff, J. (2009, April 20, 2009). Green-marketing revolution defies economic downturn, Periodical/Cover Story, *Advertising Age*, p. 2. Retrieved from <http://0-proquest.umi.com/wncln.wncln.org/pqdweb?did=1688736691&sid=5&Fmt=3&clientId=15105&RQT=309&VName=RQD>
- Oxford University Press. (2011). *Oxford dictionary*. Oxford: Author: Oxford University Press.
- Peattie, K. (1992). *Green marketing*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Raposo, M. L. B., & Finisterra do Pacdo, A. M. (2008). Determining the characteristics to profile the "green" consumer: An exploratory approach. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 5, 129-140. doi: 10.1007/s12208-008-0010-9
- Report: Consumers Swayed by Good Causes. (1997). *Marketing News*(February 17).

- Rex, E., & Baumann, H. (2006). Beyond ecolabels: What green marketing can learn from conventional marketing. *Journal of Cleaner Products*, 15, 9.
- RSW. (1996). *The Green Gauge Reports*. New York: RSW Inc.
- Schlossberg, H. (1991). *Innovation seems to elude 'green marketers'*. *Marketing News*, 25(April 15), 4.
- Shrum, L. J., McCarty, J. A., & Lowrey, T. M. (1995). Buyer characteristics of the green consumer and their Implications for advertising strategy. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 12.
- Silverman, D. (2009). Going green: Challenges and opportunities. *WWD*, 198(15), 8.
- Smith, G., & Stodghill, R., III. (1994). Are good causes good marketing? *Business Week*, March 22, 64, 66.
- Soler, C. (1995). *Ecologically-friendly buying*. Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.
- Sparks, M. C. a. P. (2002). Ambivalence and attitudes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12, 33.
- Stisser, P. (1994). A deeper shade of green. *American Demographics*, 6.
- Straughan, R. D., & Roberts, J. A. (1999). Environmental segmentation alternative: A look at green consumer behavior in the new millennium. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16(6), 17.
- Szykman, R. L., Bloom, N. P., & Levy, S. A. (1997). A proposed model of the use of package claims and nutrition labels. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 16(2), 13.
- Tate, N. T. (1995). And now a word from our sponsor. *American Demographics*, 1.
- The Coca-Cola Company. (2010), Retrieved from <http://polarbears.thecoca-colacompany.com/polarbearsupportfund/wwf/>

The Hartman Group. (2007), Retrieved from <http://www.hartman-group.com/hartbeat/sustainability-what-green-now>

Wilson, H. (2007). Have you got green fatigue?, *The Independent*, p. 4.

Zinkhan, G. M., & Carlson, L. (1995). Green advertising and the reluctant consumer. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 1-6.

**Table 1: Price Consciousness Scale (Factor Analysis Loadings)**

<b>Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.60</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• When I buy something I mainly care about the value for the money (.78)</li><li>• I tend to buy whatever is cheapest (.72)</li><li>• I like to buy things on sale (.70)</li></ul>

**Table 2: General Environmental Scales (Factor Analysis Loadings)**

<b>Environmental Behavior Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.95</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I buy products to do something good for the planet (.73)</li> <li>• Most of my friends think I should use products that are safe for the environment (.57)</li> <li>• I usually notice advertisements about environmentally friendly products (.59)</li> <li>• I would consider joining a group or club which is concerned with the environment (.55)</li> <li>• I feel a personal, moral obligation to read and compare package labels for environmentally safe ingredients when I shop (.74)</li> <li>• I have switched brands for ecological reasons (.79)</li> <li>• I feel obligated to buy environmentally friendly products for my household (.79)</li> <li>• I often talk to my family, friends, and acquaintances about various environmentally friendly products and/or activities (.72)</li> <li>• I give money to an environmental cause or group (.62)</li> <li>• I am willing to change my buying habits to have a positive impact on the environment (.62)</li> <li>• I feel enthusiastic about making environmentally friendly decisions (.67)</li> <li>• I pay attention to advertisements about products which are safe for the environment (.65)</li> <li>• I would be willing to make personal sacrifices for the sake of slowing down pollution even though I may not see immediate results (.58)</li> <li>• Consumers should be interested in the environmental consequences of the products they purchase (.56)</li> <li>• I am excited about the new green products on the market (.64)</li> <li>• I am interested in learning more about environmental issues and solutions (.57)</li> <li>• When there is a choice I choose the product that causes the least amount of pollution (.66)</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Attitude Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.79</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental issues are blown out of proportion (-.77)</li> <li>• Natural Resources must be preserved even if people must do without some products (.59)</li> <li>• Public schools should require all students to take a course dealing with environmental and conservation problems (.59)</li> <li>• I am prepared to walk or drive out of my way to take my trash to the nearest recycling bin (.51)</li> <li>• Much more fuss is being made about air and water pollution than is really justified (-.79)</li> </ul>

- I feel angered that the government does not do more to help control pollution (.65)
- I am very concerned about the problem of pollution in general (.63)
- I am scared for future generations because of environmental deterioration (.64)
- The recent BP oil spill really upsets me (.58)
- I would be willing to stop buying products from companies guilty of polluting the environment even though it might be inconvenient for me (.53)
- The government should enforce a surcharge for products which pollute the environment (.64)

**Consumer Guilt Scale (Reliability  $\alpha=.88$ )**

- I feel ashamed that I do not try harder to be environmentally friendly (.85)
- I feel guilty that I do not buy more environmentally friendly products (.83)

**Marketer Deception Scale (Reliability  $\alpha=.80$ )**

- I believe marketers lie about products being truly green (.89)
- I believe there are a lot of products that claim to be environmentally friendly but are really no different from other products (.90)

**Table 3: Product Value Perception Scales (Factor Analysis Loadings)**

<b>Perceived Greenness Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.88</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I think the production process for this product is environmentally safe (.64)</li><li>• Having this product makes Clorox a better company (.76)</li><li>• Using this product helps the environment (.75)</li><li>• The information in this ad is meaningful to me (.58)</li><li>• I feel like I can connect with this product (.69)</li><li>• Buying this product shows concern for the environment (.77)</li><li>• Clorox's production of this line of environmentally friendly products makes me feel the company cares about saving the earth (.82)</li></ul>
<b>Perceived Value (Reliability <math>\alpha=.76</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I feel this product is a good value for the money (.66)</li><li>• I believe this product cleans well (.79)</li></ul>

**Table 4: Green Seal Perception Scales (Factor Analysis Loadings)**

<b>Seal Deception Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.60</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I believe this is another form of deception by marketers (.59)</li><li>• I believe the government should tighten rules regarding the use of terms like green, “environmentally-friendly”, and “natural” (.52)</li><li>• I believe this seal is easy to get for most products (.70)</li><li>• Products that have this seal are more expensive (.56)</li><li>• Companies can pay to get this seal on their product(s) (.72)</li></ul>
<b>Green Perception Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.63</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I believe a product bearing this seal is truly a green product (.73)</li><li>• If this seal is labeled on a product then it is biodegradable and/or recyclable (.65)</li><li>• Products must have certain green standards to be awarded this seal (.76)</li></ul>

**Table 5: Cause-Related Marketing Scales (Factor Analysis Loadings)**

<b>Exploitation Perception Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.86</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coca-Cola is just using environmental causes to make themselves look better (.78)</li><li>• I believe companies exploit the environment for their own gain (.76)</li><li>• Coca-Cola affects the environment in a negative way (.77)</li><li>• Coca-Cola is only pretending to be interested in the environment to make their company look good by supporting environmental causes (.79)</li></ul>
<b>Value Perception Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.82</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This type of marketing makes a difference in how I think about Coca-Cola's products (.64)</li><li>• I prefer companies that support causes which identify with their brand image (.72)</li><li>• Coca-Cola is adding value to their product by supporting environmental causes (.69)</li><li>• I am more likely to buy a product that supports environmental causes (.84)</li><li>• I choose to do business with companies that invest money into environmental causes (.82)</li></ul>
<b>Consumer Expense Scale (Reliability <math>\alpha=.70</math>)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Companies that spend money on environmental causes charge more for their products (.84)</li><li>• Coca-Cola passes on the costs of cause related campaigns to their customers (.81)</li></ul>

## **Table 6: True Green Profile**

### **Demographics:**

- More likely to be female

### **Political Disposition:**

- More likely to be liberal

### **Activities:**

- Like to spend time with their family
- Enjoy being outdoors walking, gardening and camping
- Spend time volunteering and doing charity work
- Like to read
- Least likely to engage in social networking and religious activities
- Spend less time watching television

### **Interests:**

- Tend to have hobbies or collections
- Not very interested in sports, religion or technology
- Tend to be interested in education and learning new things
- Interested in wildlife and environmental issues

### **Opinions:**

- This segment likes to tell their friends and acquaintances their opinions
- Believe marketers are deceptive but tend to believe environmentalists' claims.

## **True Green Profile (continued)**

### **Consumer Behavior:**

- Least likely to be a price conscious.
- Rarely buy on impulse
- Do not care about the attractiveness of product packaging
- Are not brand conscious or brand loyal

### **Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors:**

- They do not feel environmentalists exaggerate the seriousness of environmental issues
- Consider environmental issues when they make their purchases
- Most likely to exhibit environmentally-friendly behaviors and attitudes
- Believe their friends think they should use environmentally-friendly products
- Least likely to buy products that have a negative environmental impact
- Most likely to agree that Clorox green works is effective and full strength but also toxic and not good for the environment
- Least likely to believe that the Good Housekeeping Green Seal means a product is truly green; however, this segment is most likely to look for eco-labels when shopping
- Believe that Coca-Cola is exploiting the environment for personal gain and do not feel that large companies can compensate for their environmental damage by giving back to environmental causes
- Do not believe that the cost of cause-related marketing is passed on to consumers
- Most likely to notice advertisements with environmental themes
- Will switch brands for ecological reasons
- Feel morally obligated to educate themselves regarding environmental problems and how they can make a difference
- Willing to make personal sacrifices to protect the environment
- Believe the government should do more to protect the environment and educate children for future protection
- Want companies to be transparent in their quest for environmentally-friendly marketing

## Table 7: Donor Green Profile

### **Demographics:**

- Equally likely to be male or female
- Tend to have disposable income

### **Political Disposition:**

- Not very interested in politics
- Spread out across all political affiliations

### **Activities:**

- Very busy with limited free time
- Like to go out for dinner and drinks when time permits
- Not physically active
- Like to listen to music and attend sporting events
- More likely to engage in social networking

### **Interests:**

- Family
- Education
- Outdoors
- Sports
- Not very religious

### **Opinions:**

- Feel like it is okay to donate money rather than be active
- Feel guilty for lack of action
- Not sure whether or not to believe environmentalists' claims
- Skeptical of marketers' environmental claims

## **Donor Green Profile (continued)**

### **Shopping Behavior:**

- Most likely to shop impulsively
- More likely to buy products attractively packaged
- Most likely to be brand conscious

### **Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors:**

- Most likely to feel guilty and ashamed about their lack of behavior change to support the environment
- Most likely to agree that the Good Housekeeping Green seal is a true indicator of the product being green
- Most likely to agree that Coca-Cola's use of cause-related marketing campaigns adds value
- Sometimes consider environmental impact when purchasing products
- Willing to sacrifice financially to support the environment but unwilling to change their other behaviors

## **Table 8: Learning Green Profile**

### **Demographics:**

- Equally likely to be male or female

### **Political Disposition:**

- More likely to be conservative or independent but not overly interested in politics

### **Activities:**

- Sports lovers who enjoy going to a game or watching it on television
- Like spending time with family and being outdoors
- Watch television

### **Interests:**

- Music
- Self-improvement
- Not interested in technology

### **Opinions:**

- Tend to believe marketers' claims
- They will intake information that is easily understood
- May change their behaviors if they are having fun while doing it

## **Learning Green Profile (continued)**

### **Shopping Behavior:**

- Shopping patterns vary among consumers in this segment
- Their shopping patterns shift according to the situation

### **Environmental Attitudes & Behaviors:**

- Learning about the environment but not actively engaged
- They want an easy, fun way to support the environment that does not require them to make big changes in their behavior
- Most likely to agree that Clorox green works is environmentally-friendly and natural
- Sometimes consider environmental impact when purchasing products
- Not sure whether or not to believe environmentalists' claims

**Table 9: Non-Green Profile**

**Demographics:**

- More likely to be male

**Political Disposition:**

- More likely to be conservative
- Least likely to be liberal

**Activities:**

- Love to watch television
- Most likely to participate in individual and group sporting activities
- Most likely to be sports fans
- Most likely to attend sporting events and watch broadcast sports
- Not active unless it involves sports

**Interests:**

- Sports
- Family
- Music

**Opinions:**

- Think environmentalists are blowing things out of proportion
- Believe environmentalists exaggerate
- Believe marketers are deceptive
- Skeptical

## **Non-Green Profile (continued)**

### **Shopping Behavior:**

- Tend to be price conscious
- Often shop impulsively

### **Environmental Attitudes & Behaviors:**

- Do not care about wildlife/environmental issues or animals
- Least likely to exhibit environmentally-friendly behaviors and attitudes
- Least likely to feel guilty over environmental problems and feel no guilt over the possibility that they may be impacting the environment in a negative manner
- Do not feel their friends think they should use environmentally-friendly products
- Recognize there are environmental problems but will buy products regardless of their environmental impact
- Do not believe that Clorox green works is an environmentally friendly product
- Most likely to believe that Clorox greens works is ineffective and diluted
- Least likely to look for green seals when shopping
- Unconcerned with how Coca-Cola's use of cause-related marketing campaigns may exploit the environment.
- Least likely to agree that Coca-Cola's use of cause-related marketing adds value and tend to believe that the cost of cause-related marketing is passed on to the consumers by charging higher prices.
- Believe it is okay for large companies to have some negative effects on the environment as long as they give back to the environment

## **Appendix A: Questionnaire Items (Minton)**

### **Search for Information**

1. How often do you compare package label information about the environmental safety of the product and/or package while you are?  
in the grocery store?
2. How often do you notice advertisements about environmentally-friendly products?
3. How often do you actually pay attention to advertisements about products which are safe for the environment?
4. How often do you talk to your neighbors about various environmentally-friendly products or activities?
5. How often do you talk to your close personal friends about various environmentally-friendly products or activities?
6. How often do you talk to your coworkers about various environmentally-friendly products or activities?
7. How often do you talk to your family members about various environmentally-friendly products or activities?

### **Injunctive Environmental Norm Measure**

1. Most of my friends think I should use household products that are safe for the environment.
2. Most of my friends think I should recycle household garbage.
3. Most of my neighbors think I should use environmentally-friendly household products.
4. Most of my neighbors think I should recycle.
5. Most of my coworkers think I should use environmentally-friendly household products.
6. Most of my coworkers think I should recycle.
7. Most of my family members think I should use environmentally-friendly products.
8. Most of my family members think I should recycle.
9. The leaders of my community encourage us all to be good to the environment.

### **Personal Environmental Norm Measure**

1. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to buy environmentally-friendly products for your household?
2. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to recycle household waste?
3. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to pay attention to advertisements about products which are safe for the environment?
4. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to read and compare package labels for environmentally safe ingredients when you shop?
5. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to buy products made with recycled ingredients?
6. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to buy larger size products in order to reduce waste?
7. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to do whatever you can to help improve the environment?

8. Do you feel a personal, moral obligation to buy products made by companies known for being environmentally responsible?

### **Environmental Concern Measure**

1. I think we are not doing enough to save scarce natural resources from being used up.
2. Natural resources must be preserved even if people must do without some products.
3. I feel sorry that the government does not do more to help control pollution of the environment.
4. (Reversed) Much more fuss is being made about air and water pollution than is really justified.
5. I feel angry and frustrated when I think about the harm being done to plant and animal life by pollution.
6. I think the government should devote more money toward supporting conservation and environmental programs.
7. Consumers should be interested in the environmental consequences of the products they purchase.
8. Consumers should pay higher prices for products which pollute the environment.
9. Non-recyclable containers should be taxed to reduce waste.
10. The government should subsidize research on technology for recycling waste products.
11. Manufacturers should be required to use recycled materials in their operations whenever possible.
12. Commercial advertising should be required to mention the environmental disadvantages of products.
13. Products which pollute the environment during manufacturing or consumption should be taxed.
14. Public schools should require all students to take a course dealing with the environment and conservation problems.
15. I feel angry and frustrated when I think of the ways industries are polluting the environment.
16. (Reversed) Environmental issues are overrated and do not concern me.

### **Behavioral Intentions Measures**

1. I would be willing to sign a petition to support an environmental cause.
2. I would consider joining a segment or club which is concerned with the environment.
3. I would be willing to pay more taxes to support greater government control of pollution.
4. I would be willing to pay more each month for electricity if it meant cleaner air.
5. I would be willing to stop buying products from companies guilty of polluting the environment even though it might be inconvenient for me.
6. I would be willing to make personal sacrifices for the sake of slowing down pollution even though the immediate results may not

## Appendix B: Copy of Raposo and Paco's Survey Questions

I read the labels to see if the products are environmentally safe

I am willing to stop buying products from firms that are guilty of polluting

I try to buy energy efficient household appliances

When there is a choice, I choose the product that causes the least pollution

I have switched products/brands for ecological reasons

I usually buy products made from recycled materials

I make a special effort to buy biodegradable products

I buy products in refillable containers

I will not buy products that have excessive packaging

I prefer to buy products not tested on animals

I use environmentally safe soaps and detergents

I avoid buying products in aerosol containers

I prefer to buy durable goods

I am interested in reading reports/articles on environmentally-friendly products

I help a group whose main aim is to preserve the environment

I give money to a cause or an environmental group

I have taken part in a protest or demonstration related to an environmental cause

I know how to preserve and not cause damage to the environment

I know the meaning of "global warming"

I know the meaning of "acid rain"

I know what the problem of ozone depletion is

I know that plastic bags take many years to decompose and cause pollution

I am very concerned about the problem of pollution in general

I am very concerned about air pollution and the problem of ozone depletion

I become angry when I think about the harm being caused to life by pollution

When I think of the ways in which industries pollute, I get frustrated and angry

I usually hand in at the chemist's any medicine that is left over or past its sell-by date

I usually keep separate piles of rubbish for RE

I am prepared to walk several blocks to take my rubbish to the nearest recycling bins

I have convinced members of my family and friends to recycle

I feel the government should pass legislation making recycling mandatory

When contaminated, a

river or the sea cleans itself through the flow of the water, so I see no need to worry (R)

In Portugal, pollution is not a serious problem, so I see no need to worry (R)

I believe that environmentalists make a lot of exaggerations about the environment (R)

It is very difficult for one consumer alone to do anything for the environment (R)

As one person alone cannot have any effect upon pollution and the problems of natural resources, it does not make any difference what I do (R)

I conserve energy by turning off lights and electrical appliances when I am not using them

I try to reduce the amount of water I use

I try to reduce the amount of rubbish I produce

Economic development is less important than protecting the environment

I am willing to pay more for green products

I am willing to pay more taxes to protect the environment

Most of the environmental claims made on package labels or in advertising are false and/or confusing

The environmental claims made on package labels or in advertising should be regulated more closely

Products labelled as "environmentally safe" or "ecological" are just another selling point

Almost everything we do in modern life harms the environment

Rubbish dumps and landfill sites are a danger to the people living closest to them

I am aware that most of the air pollution in cities is caused by motor vehicles

I reuse plastic bags or use an "environmentally friendly" bag

I use public transport whenever that choice is possible

I would be more willing to recycle if there are a monetary reward for doing so (R)

## Appendix C: Copy of Survey

### Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Choose the description below that you feel most closely captures your behaviors and attitudes as a consumer:**

- I am an environmental activist who cares deeply about reducing my carbon footprint and am adjusting my behavior to be environmentally friendly.
- I am concerned about the environment to the extent I support environmental causes financially; however, I have not really changed my behavior due to environmental concerns and still buy products that are not necessarily environmentally friendly.
- I am learning about environmental concerns and starting to make some changes in my behavior and/or purchasing habits.
- I have not adjusted my behavior or purchase patterns for environmental reasons, even though I acknowledge that there may be environmental problems.
- I do not really care if there are environmental problems.

## Segmenting Green Consumers

DIRECTIONS: There are no right or wrong answers to the following statements. Please indicate your personal opinion by choosing your level of agreement with each statement.

**\* When answering these questions think about your normal shopping behavior.**

	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
When I buy something I mainly care about the value for the money.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I decide what to buy while I am at the store.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tend to buy products that are attractively packaged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I pick up items while I am waiting in the check out line.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tend to buy whatever is cheapest.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I prefer to buy leading brand names.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I buy products for quality reasons.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I buy products because they make me feel better.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I like to buy things on sale.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am an impulse shopper.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I buy things for social acceptance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My most important factor in deciding what to buy is what my friends think.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I search for factual information before buying a new product.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Segmenting Green Consumers

\* Please read each of the following statements and select the answer which most accurately reflects your opinion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I buy products to do something good for the planet.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Most of my friends think I should use products that are safe for the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I usually notice advertisements about environmentally friendly products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Environmental issues are blown out of proportion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would consider joining a group or club which is concerned with the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Natural resources must be preserved even if people must do without some products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel a personal, moral obligation to read and compare package labels for environmentally safe ingredients when I shop.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public schools should require all students to take a course dealing with environmental and conservation problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have switched brands for ecological reasons.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel obligated to buy environmentally friendly products for my household.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often talk to my family, friends, and acquaintances about various environmentally friendly products and/or activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I give money to an environmental cause or group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am prepared to walk or drive out of my way to take my trash to the nearest recycling bin.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to change my buying habits to have a positive impact on the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I will buy products I like regardless of the environmental impact.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Much more fuss is being made about air and water pollution than is really justified.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel angered that the government does not do more to help control pollution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Please read the following statements and select the answer the most appropriately describes your feelings.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am very concerned about the problem of pollution in general.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel enthusiastic about making environmentally friendly decisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that environmentalists make a lot of exaggerations about environmental problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I pay attention to advertisements about products which are safe for the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would be willing to make personal sacrifices for the sake of slowing down pollution even though I may not see immediate results.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel ashamed that I do not try harder to be environmentally friendly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consumers should be interested in the environmental consequences of the products they purchase.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe marketers lie about products being truly green.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am excited about the new green products on the market.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe there are a lot of products that claim to be environmentally friendly but are really no different from other products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am scared for future generations because of environmental deterioration.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am interested in learning more about environmental issues and solutions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The recent BP oil spill really upsets me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would be willing to stop buying products from companies guilty of polluting the environment even though it might be inconvenient for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When there is a choice I choose the product that causes the least amount of pollution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The government should enforce a surcharge for products which pollute the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel guilty that I do not buy more environmentally friendly products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Segmenting Green Consumers

Take a moment to review the ad below. You will be asked to answer questions regarding this ad.

hello deep clean. goodbye harsh chemicals & fumes.



### Clorox green works: glass and surface cleaner

*Live Life Naturally*

- Contains no phosphorus or bleach
- Works on grease, grime, dirt, soils
- Cleans multiple surfaces throughout kitchens, bathrooms, and the workplace
- Cleaning power derived from most effective natural source, such as coconut-based cleaning agent, essential lemon oils, citric acid, corn-based alcohol, and filtered water
- Primary and secondary packaging is recyclable

Ingredients: alkyl polyglucoside, ethanol, colorant, fragrance with essential oils, glycerine, sodium hydroxide, sodium octyl sulfate

Page 6

## Segmenting Green Consumers

\* Have you heard of this product before?

Yes

No

## Segmenting Green Consumers

\* Have you purchased this product before?

No

Yes

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* How likely is it that you will purchase this product in the future?**

- Likely
- Unlikely
- Not sure

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Please indicate how often you have purchased this product.**

- Purchased it once
- Purchased it one time and will not buy again
- Purchased it more than once
- Purchase it regularly

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Now that you have reviewed the Clorox green works ad, please answer the questions below even if you have not purchased or used this product before.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I feel this product is a good value for the money.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe this product cleans well.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think using this product will negatively affect the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe this product smells good.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think the production process for this product is environmentally safe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This is an expensive product.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having this product makes Clorox a better company.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This product is a high status product.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This product works better than regular Clorox house cleaners.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Using this product helps the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The information in this ad is meaningful to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel like I can connect with this product.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Buying this product shows concern for the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clorox's production of this line of environmentally friendly products makes me feel the company cares about saving the earth.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Segmenting Green Consumers

\* I believe this product is:

Effective Ineffective

•

\* I believe the messages in this ad are:

Believable Unbelievable

•

\* I believe this product is:

Full Strength Diluted

•

\* The product in the ad is:

High Quality Low Quality

•

\* I believe this product is:

Attractive Unattractive

•

\* The ingredients in this product are:

Natural Toxic

•

\* I believe this product is:

Environmentally Friendly Not Good for the Environment

•

Whether or not you are familiar with this seal please answer the questions below.



\* I have seen this seal before taking this survey.

Yes

No

\* After reviewing the above seal please answer the questions below based on your personal opinion of the statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I believe a product bearing this seal is truly a green product.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I look for this seal (or a comparable green seal) when choosing between alternatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe this is another form of deception by marketers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If this seal is labeled on a product then it is biodegradable and/or recyclable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe the government should tighten rules regarding the use of terms like "green", "environmentally-friendly", and "natural".	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe this seal is easy to get for most products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Products that have this seal are more expensive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Companies can pay to get this seal on their product(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Products must have certain "green" standards to be awarded this seal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Segmenting Green Consumers

Please review the below information and answer the questions on the next page.

*The Coca-Cola Company*

HOME ABOUT IMPACT DONATE POLAR BEAR POPULATIONS TAKE ACTION OUR COMMITMENTS SEND AN E-CARD

*The Coca-Cola Company*  
**POLAR BEAR SUPPORT FUND**

It's time for us all to take action.  
To reduce our human impact on global climate change.  
To help support the polar bear.

Join Coca-Cola and World Wildlife Fund in our partnership  
to support polar bears.

SEE HOW YOU CAN GET INVOLVED

**SUPPORT**  
Your participation can make a difference. Symbolically "adopt" a polar bear or donate to World Wildlife Fund.  
+ [Donate now](#)

**LIVE**  
Live with less impact. Learn small steps that add up—and slow down climate change.  
+ [Get tips for positive living](#)

**SHARE**  
Share your love and support of polar bears with friends and family.  
+ [Send an e-card](#)

Page 14

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* After reviewing Coca-Cola's cause-related campaign please answer the questions below based on your personal opinion.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
This type of marketing makes a difference in how I think about Coca-Cola's products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I prefer companies that support causes which identify with their brand image.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coca-Cola is adding value to their product by supporting environmental causes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am more likely to buy a product that supports environmental causes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I choose to do business with companies that invest money into environmental causes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Companies that spend money on environmental causes charge more for their products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coca-Cola passes on the costs of cause related campaigns to their customers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is okay for large companies to have some negative effects on the environment as long as they give back to the environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coca-Cola is just using environmental causes to make themselves look better.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe companies exploit the environment for their own gain.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coca-Cola affects the environment in a negative way.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe Coca-Cola is giving back to the environment as much, if not more, than they take.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coca-Cola is only pretending to be interested in the environment to make their company look good by supporting environmental causes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Please check the frequency in which you engaged in the following activities in the past two months. Check only one answer for each possible leisure activity.**

	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Not Sure
Watching television	<input type="radio"/>				
Walking for pleasure	<input type="radio"/>				
Going on family outings	<input type="radio"/>				
Participating in individual or team sports/sports activities	<input type="radio"/>				
Gardening	<input type="radio"/>				
Reading books for pleasure	<input type="radio"/>				
Going out for the evening for drinks and entertainment	<input type="radio"/>				
Going to the movies	<input type="radio"/>				
Hunting	<input type="radio"/>				
Collecting or making something (for example, hobbies)	<input type="radio"/>				
Attending live sports events	<input type="radio"/>				
Leisure traveling	<input type="radio"/>				
Social networking	<input type="radio"/>				
Working on the computer	<input type="radio"/>				
Charities/volunteer work	<input type="radio"/>				
Attending live concerts	<input type="radio"/>				
Participating in fitness activities (for example, bicycling, running, swimming, working-out)	<input type="radio"/>				
Watching sports on TV	<input type="radio"/>				
Camping	<input type="radio"/>				

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Pick the top 3 categories that express your personal interests**

- Sports
- Politics
- Wildlife/Environmental Issues
- The outdoors
- Technology
- Animals
- Family
- Music
- Self-Improvement
- Gourmet/Fine Food
- Religion
- Education

**\* Would you consider yourself to be...**

- Liberal
- Conservative
- Progressive
- Independent
- None of the above

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* Are you Male or Female?**

- Male  
 Female

**\* What is your age?**

- Younger than 18  
 18-24  
 25-34  
 35-44  
 45-64  
 65+

**\* What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

- Less than High School  
 High School/GED  
 Some College  
 2 Year Degree (Associates)  
 4 Year Degree (Bachelors)  
 Masters  
 Doctoral  
 Professional (MD, JD)

**\* What is your marital status?**

- Single, Never Married  
 Married  
 Separated/Divorced/Widowed

## Segmenting Green Consumers

**\* How many children below 18 live in your household?**

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4+

**\* What is your income level?**

- I struggle to pay my bills and sometimes need help.
- I have just enough money to pay my bills every month.
- I have some money left over every month after my bills are paid.
- I do not really have to worry about money.

## VITA

Tara McBride Mintz was born in Lexington, Kentucky, on August 20<sup>th</sup>, 1976. She attended elementary schools in Morganfield, Kentucky and graduated from Union County High School in 1994. She entered Cape Fear Community College, in Wilmington, NC, in the fall of 1996 and went on to enroll at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington in the fall of 1998. In December 2001 she was awarded the Bachelor of Science degree with a concentration in Marketing. In the summer of 2010, she was accepted into Appalachian State University's Master of Business Administration program and began study toward a Master of Science degree with a concentration in Sustainable Business.

Ms. Mintz is a member of Phi Kappa Phi and Beta Gamma Sigma. Her home address is 36C Spruce Ct, Banner Elk, NC. Her parents are Barbara Dykes and Alan McBride of Kentucky.