

CHAPTER 7

ETHICAL CONSUMPTION

Nil ENGIZEK*

*Assistant Professor, Istanbul University, School of Business, Department of Marketing, Istanbul, Turkey
e-mail: nilkodaz@istanbul.edu.tr

DOI: 10.26650/B/SS05.2020.002.04

Abstract

Concerns about the environment and human well-being due to consumption patterns of consumers leads to the issue of ethical consumption and this has been gaining greater attention both in the business world and the academic world. There are numerous academic papers that have been published on this topic. There are non-profit and/or governmental organizations working on it. So it certainly is worth examining the issue of ethical consumption. This chapter represents an overall understanding of “ethical consumption”. Knowing what ethical consumption is and how to separate it from other related terms are the main aims of this chapter, as there are plenty of concepts such as consumer ethics, green consumption, business ethics in the literature which can be confusing for readers. The history of ethical consumption and the ways consumers choose to become an ethical consumer are discussed. The attitude-behaviour gap is the last headline debated in the chapter. Possible reasons and solutions are mentioned.

Keywords: Ethical Consumption, Attitude-Behaviour Gap, Boycott, Buycott Ethical Fashion, Voluntary Simplicity.

1. Introduction

Consumers are becoming more sensitive to the environmental and social impacts of their consumption (De Pelsmacker, Driesden, & Rayp, 2005; Shaw & Shui, 2002). They have started to reconsider their purchase decisions and consequently attention on ethical consumption is increasing (Bray, Johns, & Kilburn, 2011; Carrigan, Szmigin, & Wright, 2004; Kim & Chung, 2011; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008). For example, consumers boycott products manufactured using real animal fur, or tested on animals. They also investigate companies' attitudes towards employing and promoting minorities and women (Roberts, 1996 cited in Papaoikonomou, 2009). In response to this conscious consumer (Titus & Bradford, 1996) firms have started to take ethical management seriously by actively promoting environmental protection and human wellbeing (Papaoikonomou, 2009). Ethical dimensions are used as a critical branding strategy by several well-known brands.

As can clearly be seen it has become very important for the business world and also academicians to understand that this consumption behaviour is vital. In this chapter, an attempt is first made to outline definitions of ethical consumption. The second aim is to distinguish it from other related but different concepts such as green consumerism, consumer ethics, voluntary simplifiers, socially responsible consumption and business ethics. Later the history of ethical consumption is presented. Ethical consumption is reflected in many academic and business publications as a new phenomenon but is it really new? The readers will find the answer in this section. In the following part, the question "how can you become an ethical consumer?" is answered. In this part boycott, buycott, fair trade, voluntary simplicity and ethical fashion are the main topics. In the final section, the attitude-behaviour gap is discussed. There is no doubt that everyone has positive attitudes towards ethical consumption and many of us agree that products which care for both the environment and human beings are the best. However when it comes to buying these products, the figures do not agree. There is a gap between attitude and behaviour. The reasons behind this are argued in this section.

2. Defining Ethical Consumption

Before examining more detailed issues related to ethical consumption, it will be useful to understand this concept and distinguish it from the other concepts which may confuse the readers. In the marketing literature, there are some concepts that hold similar meanings with "ethical consumption" or "ethical consumerism" and those words are used interchangeably. Nevertheless, if the real meaning of these terms are investigated, it is seen that they do not

imply the same “thing”. These concepts are green consumerism, consumer ethics and business ethics. So it is worth pointing out the differences between those concepts.

It is argued that the ethical consumer has emerged as a transformation of the green consumer (Smith, 1990; Strong, 1996, 1997; Uusitalo & Oksanen, 2004). Studies about green consumers mainly started to be conducted in the 1970s and the main reason for this green behaviour was the movement of alternative consumers which was appeared during that time (Chatzidakis & Mitussis, 2007). The terms green (Balderjahn, 1988; McDonagh & Prothero, 1992; Peattie, 2001), environmentally conscious (Kinnear, Taylor, & Ahmed, 1974) or ecologically concerned (Neilssen & Scheepers, 1992) consumers are used interchangeably and they describe consumers who are concerned about the environment and who, for this reason, give specific importance to environmental protection not only in their general attitudes but also in their purchasing behaviour. There are various definitions in the literature about who green consumers are. For example, according to Balderjahn (1988) the green consumer purchases environmentally friendly products. Production, distribution, use and disposal processes of these products do not damage the environment or the health of one or others, besides they keep energy, do not induce superfluous waste, and do not employ materials from species which are at risk or that include needless use of cruelty on animals. The green consumer concept is described by Shrum, McCarty, and Lowrey (1995) as “anyone, whose purchase behaviour is influenced by environmental concerns”. Another definition was given by Strong (1996) who states that the green consumer is a person who: “. . . avoids products that are likely to endanger the health of the consumer or others; causes significant damage to the environment during manufacture, uses of disposal; consumes a disproportionate amount of energy; causes unnecessary waste; use materials derived from threatened species or environments” (Strong, 1996). In conclusion, green consumer behaviour does not just prefer environmentally friendly products and/or avoid products that damage the environmental sustainability when they make purchases but also bears in mind issues such as energy saving (Elkington & Hailes, 1988 cited in Bae, 2012), recycling and composting of household waste (Vining & Ebreo, 1992), using public transportation instead of the car (Gronjoj, 2006).

Chronologically, it is debated that the change from green consumer behaviour to ethical consumer behaviour occurred around the 1990s. According to Fletcher (1990 cited in Papaioikonomou, 2009), the reason for this evolution was the main characteristics of the consumers of the 90s. Compared to the consumers of the 80s those consumers did not make their purchase decision only based on price, quality, delivery or environmental issues, but also on the ethical dimension of their purchase. They were concerned with further topics of

an additional societal welfare nature (Shaw & Shiu, 2002) such as fair trade, social injustice, and human rights (Newholm & Shaw, 2007). Ethical consumers have extra anxiety regarding the “people” themselves and being an ethical consumer implies acquiring goods that are not dangerous to both humanity and environment (Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Strong, 1996). Understanding the main difference between ethical and green consumerism is vital as the latter comprises a wider kind of issues and consequently consumers have a more complicated decision making process (Shaw & Shiu, 2002).

Ethical behaviour is covered in two different areas in consumer research studies: ethical consumer behaviour and consumer ethics (Chatzidakis & Mitussis, 2007; Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Valverde, 2011). Consumer ethics is described by Muncy and Vitell (1992) as “the moral principles and standards that guide behaviour of individuals or groups as they obtain, use and dispose of goods and services”. Consumer ethics is about how a consumer identifies and behaves when s/he encounters an unethical purchase situation like counterfeiting, pirated software usage, using an expired sales coupon, or altering price labels on goods (Chiu, Hsieh, Chang, & Lee, 2009; Vitell, 2003). Muncy and Vitell (1992) created the most commonly preferred construct for measuring consumer ethics. There are four dimensions on the scale regarding unethical behaviour. The first dimension is “actively benefiting from illegal activities”. There are various examples of unlawful activities in which consumers actively participate when they shop, such as changing a price tag of a product in a store. The following example is again gaining advantage from illegal activities but in a passive way. In this dimension, consumers are in a passive situation but still get an advantage. For example, someone made a mistake to the benefit of the consumer, such as a waiter giving much more change to the consumer by mistake, and this is a benefit for the consumer. The third is getting benefit from doubtful (nonetheless legitimate) actions. Consumers in this situation do this consciously though it is not in itself an illegal activity. For instance, giving back goods to a store by claiming that it was a present even though it was not. The fourth and the last one is “no harm/no foul” actions. In this dimension, consumers think that they do not cause any damage to anyone as mostly intangible products are in question, for example copying of movies or songs. Vitell and Muncy (2005) further developed the scale and added two new dimensions: (1) “doing good deeds” for example saying that a specific invoice has been calculated incorrectly even though it is not to the person’s benefit; and (2) environmental consciousness and recycling, such as recycling products (i.e. cans, bottles).

On the other hand, the ethical consumer is defined by Cowe & Williams (2000 cited in Ratnayake, & Jayawickrama, 2016) as “people who are affected by environmental or ethical

thoughts when selecting goods and services'. They also said that the meaning of "ethical" takes into account other conscientious things such as fair trade and animal welfare, social features as work standards. Another description was given by Harrison et al. (2005 cited in Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008) and according to the authors, ethical consumers take into account the results of their purchase decisions in terms of the how the outcome of this decision affects the world around them. In another words, ethical consumers have an extra anxiety about social issues for example child labour, animal welfare, and safe work conditions (Connolly & Shaw, 2006). According to Crane & Matten (2004, cited in Auger & Devinney, 2007), ethical consumerism is: "the conscious and deliberate choice to make certain consumption choices due to personal and moral beliefs."

Another consumer group is 'voluntary simplifiers' which is different from ethical consumers but usually it is used interchangeably with ethical consumers. The main characteristic of this group is their effort in terms of decreasing their consumption level, and having non-materialistic lifestyles (Connolly & Shaw, 2006). More detailed information is given in the following sections. However, it is worth saying that ethical consumption does not mean reducing the consumption level, it is more about thinking of yourself, people around you and the world when you make a purchase. And also Newholm and Shaw (2007) pointed out the vital association between ethical consumption behaviour and voluntary simplicity and they said that the social and environmental influences of consumption have directed numerous ethically worried consumers to review their marketplace choices. In other words, it might be said that being a voluntary simplifier is one of the ways ethical consumers choose to behave.

Another concept which needs to be distinguished from ethical consumption is socially-responsible consumption. Being ethical and being socially responsible are taken by many as the same and, except for Auger, Devinney, Louviere, and Burke (2008), there was not any attempt to differentiate these two terms. According to them, the act of being socially-responsible is one of the ways for ethical consumption. Also some studies highlighted that one of the characteristics of highly motivated ethical consumers is also about monitoring socially responsible activities (Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008). So again, it can be said that, similar to the voluntary simplifier, socially-responsible consumption is a choice for ethical consumers.

In marketing, there is also a lot of research regarding business ethics and it refers to the implementation of ethical ideologies by firms and taking into consideration stakeholders: workers, customers, suppliers, local community organizations (Stakeholder Theory- Freeman, 1994 cited Bae, 2012). In one study managers were used as sampling unit on business ethics

studies (Cacioppe, Forster, & Fox, 2008). Moreover ethics in consumption is a distinct line of research concentrating on individual consumers. In other words, sampling units which are under investigation are completely different.

As it can be seen, there are a lot of terms that seems to have similar meanings but in reality they are different. Having an understanding of these concepts will be valuable for both academics and the business world and also useful for the remainder of this chapter.

3. Is “Ethical Consumption” A New Phenomenon?

Ethical consumption is generally seen as a new phenomenon, yet, is it really a new concept? It is stated by many authors that ethical consumption has been present in diverse forms for hundreds of years (Cowe & Williams, 2000; Hilton, 2004 cited in Low & Davenport, 2007; Lang & Gabriel, 2005; Micheletti, 2003). However, since the beginning of 1990s, academics, consumers, the business world and public policy makers have given more attention to this concept (Low & Davenport, 2007). Then an important question comes to mind: Why has this ethical consumer movement become such an important topic? What happened in people’s perception and/or in the world? Before answering these questions, it is worth knowing the roots of ethical consumption.

According to one view, as mentioned in the previous section, environmental concern is one of the reasons for ethical consumption behaviour. Anxiety regarding environmental issues has existed since the times of the ancient Greeks (Downs, 1972), so it can be said that the roots of ethical consumption dates back to those times.

As stated by Cowe and Williams (2000 cited in Papaoikonomou, 2009) the seeds of the ethical consumption movement spread with the help of the anti-slavery petition (1783) and ending the slave trade in the colonies (1807). Lang and Gabriel (2005) and Dubuisson-Quellier (2007) mentioned similar views in their studies and said that the free trade movement against slavery was particularly instrumental in establishing the foundation of the modern ethical consumerism.

Terragni (2007) also stated another view that the women’s activism movement is associated with the ethical consumer movement. She said that boycotts, like labour boycotts, were one of the examples for the initial periods of ethical consumer behaviour. Also she gave the “while list” campaign as an example which occurred in diverse European countries and the USA between the end of 1800 and the first years of 1900 in which women played a vital role. The aim of this campaign was to support goods which were produced in the way they

supposed to, in another words, by respecting regulations and at the same time demonstrating against products manufactured under debateable working environments (Terragni, 2007). As Dubuisson- Quellier (2007) said, due to these boycotts and/or campaigns, consumers have become aware that they can join a social group to create new solidarity in the marketplace. As Glickman mentioned, “their understandings of the social consequences of consumption and of the consequent power of long-distance solidarity, while not ends in themselves for these groups, became the means by which modern citizens believed that they could promote social change” (Glickman, 2006, cited in Dubuisson- Quellier, 2007).

Historical and geographical depth of ethical consumption were also mentioned by other authors (Cohen, 2003; Hilton 2003, 2007, 2009; Frank 2000, Micheletti, 2003 cited in Littler, 2011). Without doubt, it can be said that ethical consumption similarly has a long, and at the same time a wide history including for example a “boycott” where Gandhi insisted that individuals “buy Indian” goods in order to fight against British imperialism, or where through the “White Triangle” anti-sweatshop products were sold in the US, or where anti-slavery sugar was sold in Europe (Littler, 2011).

Gabriel and Lang (2015) made a useful classification about ethical consumption history and identified four waves in the history of consumer activism, which gave birth to the ethical consumer movement of today. These waves are called by the authors as follows: the co-operative movement, the value-for-money movement, Naderism, alternative or political activism. The co-operative movement was started in Rochdale in northwest England in 1844, which was the time when industrialization was at its highest point. This movement was started as a response to extreme costs and poor quality products, specifically in food products. The value-for-money movement appeared in its latest peak in the 1930s. Some specific organizations have recently emerged specifically to test goods for price, ease of use, security, task usefulness, toughness, in short, overall value-for-money. Readers are informed about the ‘best buy’ and cautioned regarding the goods which are not best value for the money that they pay. Generally, in the consumer organization’s private laboratories, products are tested independently and a huge amount of money is spent for this reason. The magazines Which? and Consumer Reports are examples of this movement. The third movement of consumer activism, similar to the second one, occurred in the USA. The name of this movement comes from Ralph Nader, a Harvard educated lawyer. Nader published a book under the title of *Unsafe at Any Speed* in 1965. It explains the unknown truths about the car industry. In his book, he wrote something about how automobiles are generally badly designed and have safety problems and he specifically mentioned Chevrolet Corvair as a

brand. In just one night, Nader became a consumer activist hero. The main aim of Nader was to be a consumer activist against the big corporate firms and he succeeded. Nader rapidly expanded his actions, setting up the Center for Study of Responsive Law and the Project for Corporate Responsibility in 1969. In the late 1970s, he formed a series of organizations. By the 1990s, there were 29 organizations founded by Nader or under the Nader umbrella. The shared themes of these organizations were the protection of individuals against corporate giants. According to Naderism it is believed that the consumer is moderately incapable in a world controlled by corporate companies, whether these are car or insurance companies, the health industry or the government–industry complex. Due to its attributes, commerce is in favour of big firms, and regulations and standards are needed to fight with these giants. In order to be a winner in this rigid fight, consumer activists must have some specific characteristics such as being tough, having up to date information, being well prepared and able to make best use of the mass media. The last wave appeared little by little in the 1970s and gained momentum in the 1980s. In 1995 Gabriel and Lang (2015) gave the name ‘alternative consumerism’ to this movement. They said that this fourth wave did not contain just one view like the other three waves, instead it had various components such as green, ethical, Third World solidarity, labour rights, health, animal welfare and fair trade orientations. It is called by the authors as “alternative consumerism” because it has the opposite view compared to mainstream consumerism. This new activism has brought a new thinking like ethical, social and ecological elements, into the marketplace for both consumers and companies. This new movement has been called by some other authors as political activism or political consumerism. The main aim of this fourth wave is to make people aware of consumerism itself, and of its brands, its symbols, its practices and its products; to make individuals not become the slave of consumerism. Even though it is not excluded totally from people’s lives, then at least an attempt can be made to decrease its position by recreating its meaning (Gabriel & Lang, 2015).

As can be seen, ethical consumption is not a new concept and it progressed through the improvement of a consumer culture (Terragni, 2007). The question is, what kind of changes happened in consumers’ lives and why have they seen such a big change?

The change in consumers’ consumption patterns started from the end of World War II. Before this behavioural change, people were more prone to making savings. They would spend money if they had money. For example, they would not buy houses with high mortgage rates and run up vast credit card balances. They could postpone their desires until they could have enough money to gratify them (Buchholz, 1998). During the 1950s, this behaviour

changed and a consumer society was formed. People wanted to satisfy their needs and wants immediately instead of waiting till they had money in hand. What caused this behavioural change? It might be meaningful to start with “Fordism”. The Fordist mode of manufacture dominated the United States from the end of World War II till the late 1970s. Mass production of consumer durable goods was the main feature of Fordism. Companies used economies of scale model to take full advantage of production and decrease the total product price (Jessop, 1994; Jessop & Sum, 2006 cited in Long, 2010). So with the help of companies, consumers satisfied their material needs by choosing the product that had the lowest cost. On these days, “the throwaway society” was created and people started to buy newer goods more quickly than in the past. Packaging also helped people to purchase more easily as with the improvement of packaging, products are considered to be better-looking (Buchholz, 1998). These same changes also occurred in other industrial societies in Western Europe. However, these changes brought negative consequences at the same time. It specifically affected environment and resource usage. In the 1960s, environmental anxiety started and governments made laws regarding environmental protection, especially focusing on pollution control.

In the end of 1970s, Fordism ended and was replaced with flexible production. Consumers started to place importance on quality instead of quantity and non-economic attributes of products (Long, 2010). In order to understand why consumers became more concerned about these non-economic factors, Ronald Inglehart (1977, 1990, 1997 cited in Long, 2010) developed the theory of post materialist values. The Inglehart theory of value change says that there is an extensive move from materialist principles for example economic and physical safety to “post materialist” values such as liberty of speech, citizen participation and quality of life (Dunlap & York, 2008). Inglehart combines two different theories in order to come to that conclusion. These theories are Maslowian-derived “scarcity” hypothesis which implies that people give more importance to “those things in short supply” and the other one is Mannheimian-derived “socialization hypothesis” which says that “one’s basic values reflect the conditions that prevailed during one’s pre-adult years” (Inglehart, 1990 cited in Dunlap & York, 2008). The reason why ethical consumption is more widespread in developed countries may be explained by these theories. People in these societies have already achieved the first stages of Maslow’s pyramid and their need is now self-actualization.

The other reason for the growth of ethical consumption behaviour can be associated with the concept of risk society (Long, 2010; Parkins & Craig, 2006 cited in Newholm & Shaw, 2007; Harrison et al., 2005 cited in Newholm & Shaw, 2007; Papaioikonomou, 2009). This thought was presented by Beck in his book ‘Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity’ (1992)

and additional discussions made in later papers (e.g. Beck, 2006 cited in Papaoikonomou, 2009). Beck (1992, 1995, 1996 cited in Long, 2010) claims that contemporary society is dominated by risk. With the aim of explaining his view he said that in developed countries there are two opposite situations. On the one hand, due to modernization and industrialization, people might satisfy their basic needs, there is no scarcity and therefore there is no reason to fight for it. On the other hand, he says that the industrial society has been exchanged with the new “global risk society”. He said that people are always at risk and gave the examples of CFC’s (Chlorofluorocarbons), the Chernobyl accident and the Katrina disaster (Papaoikonomou, 2009). It is not easy for an ordinary person to understand how most of the products are produced due to complex technologies. Even though it is possible to reach some information about the production, people are most of the time unable to evaluate specific risks and make their purchase decisions based on these risks. As a result of these unknown and increasing societal risks, the ethical consumer movement has speeded up and a new market segment has been born. This new market segment, comprising goods that deliver additional data to consumers about the production history of the product, is a response to unpredictable, uncompensatable global dangers. For example, organic, Fair Trade, and local food certification and labelling notify consumers about the environmental production conditions (Long, 2010; Papaoikonomou, 2009).

Due to the reasons explained above, consumers started to look for ways for ethical consumption. It is said that there are numerous methods of identifying consumption as ethical and these are discussed in detail in the following section.

4. How can one become an “ethical consumer”?

Consumers’ consciousness is rising regarding how their consumption habits affect the environment as well as humanity. This concern makes them reconsider their buying preferences. This new consumer category is called ethical consumers (Shaw & Newholm, 2002). An ethical consumer is not a person who is against consumerism. Rather than they encounter two options in their buying process. The first is whether to consume without decreasing their consumption level but being more sensitive about their product choice in terms of ethicality (Shaw & Newholm, 2002). For example, consumers who are in this first group prefer technological solutions for more sustainable consumption choices. Purchasing some green products such as catalytic converters on fuel-economic cars, clockwork radios, superefficient refrigerators, and laundry balls to replace detergents are amongst behaviours displayed by these consumer groups. Also boycott is a solution for those consumers who want to be ethical. In doing so consumers can make positive purchases, such as seeking out

fair-trade products and supporting small stores or local goods. The other option used by ethical consumers is whether to lessen levels of consumption to a more sustainable level through, for instance, being a voluntary simplifier (Shaw & Newholm, 2002).

The important point here to mention is that “what seems good or ethical for one [consumer] may not be so for another” (Cherrier, 2007). In other words what ethical issues each person supports might change and being an ethical consumer does not just mean buying fair trade products and boycotting specific firms due to their unethical behaviours. Based on Elkington’s (1998) well-known concept of a ‘Triple Bottom Line’ in Corporate Social Responsibility, Low and Davenport (2007) identified three common baselines for ethical consumers which are human rights, animal welfare and environmental welfare. Based on these baselines they segmented ethical consumers as ‘animated’, ‘clean’, ‘triple bottom line’ and ‘whole earth’ consumers together with the ethical concerns (animal welfare, environmental welfare, societal welfare) that they mentioned as their bottom line. For instance, ‘whole earth consumers’ will not use goods tested on animals and do not use non-returnable packaging. Other consumers might focus on single subjects such as anti-child labour.

As can be seen, in order to be an ethical consumer there are diverse paths and they will be discussed in more detail in the following subsections.

4.1. Boycotting and Buycotting

It might be interesting for some people that the term “boycott”, comes from the name of a person, Captain Charles Boycott. In the late 19th century, this person, who was an estate agent, was accused of evacuating some tenants. Because of his wrongdoing, Captain Boycott became the target of a collective social movement which was organized to protest. It was especially workers and merchants who reacted and refused to work with him (Oxford English Dictionary, 2016). Immediately after this incident, the word “boycott” was used by the media to symbolize the act of deliberately escaping from a person or business. Even before the word boycott officially became a concept, deliberate avoidance of an asset, product, or brand for political, social, or ethical reasons was not new a behaviour (Kam & Deichert, 2017). As Terragni (2007) stated in her study, particularly labour boycotts, was one of the examples for the initial periods of ethical consumer behaviour which was seen between the end of 1800 and the first decades of 1900.

(1999, cited in Kam & Deichert, 2017). Who has done research on the historical past of boycotts in the United States, describes boycotts as follows: “an attempt by one or more parties to achieve certain objectives by urging individual consumers to refrain from making

selected purchases in the marketplace”. In general, boycotts work in an organized manner to exclude the boycotted organization from the community in order to meet the demands of the boycotters. Consumer boycotts, more precisely, refer to the refusal to buy a particular good or service tactically to deter the target organization from its objectionable practices (Nonomura, 2017). One might find in history many consumer boycotts. For example, American buyers rebelled for universal rights of liberty in the first half of the 19th century when they boycotted tea and sugar products because in the production of these goods slave labour was used (Glickman, 2004 cited in Gulyás, 2008). Nestlé is another company which was boycotted by consumers because of unethical marketing of infant formula (Friedman, 1999 cited in Gulyás, 2008). Nike is another company faced with a boycott problem. A 1991 report on human rights activists documented the low wages and poor working conditions in Nike-related factories. Harper’s Magazine, published in 1992, also announced such news about Nike. In this article, from the inhumane working conditions of Nike in Indonesia, to lower wages than the minimum wage, workers’ unionization, overtime and dangerous working conditions and child labour were mentioned (Ballenger, 1992). Such news about Nike began to spread after the mid-1990s. At that time, university students began to establish boycotts about the brand. Michael Jordan was criticized for being paid \$20 million in endorsement fees, while factory employees received 45 cents per hour. The other examples comprise boycotts of British salt and cloth in India which Gandhi was the pioneer of this action (Smith, 1990 cited in Klein, Smith, & John, 2004) and Shell boycott in Europe due to the strategy to sink the Brent Spar oil platform at sea. As these examples show, boycotts nowadays focus extra on institutional performs than on broader socio-political objectives for example civil rights (Klein et al., 2004) and boycotts are frequently preferred as one of the greatest effective consumer activities contrary to businesses busied in unethical or unfair actions (Makarem & Jae, 2016). If it is looked at how boycott organizations impact consumer attitudes and purchase intention towards the company and its products in question, it was found that, as expected, it affects in a bad way (Ettenson & Klein, 2005; Klein, Smith, & John 2002). Accordingly, the targeted company’s financial performance and image are badly damaged (Klein et al., 2004).

There is another term which is related to boycott, “buycott”. The word “Buycott” is a combination of the word “buy” and “boycott” (Kam & Deichert, 2017). ‘Buycott’ describes the action of a customer who purposely tries to consume goods from a business since it mirrors his/her values. Such consumers, when shopping, pay attention to anti-sweatshop labour, fair wages, organic and sustainable production, and animal-safe testing, reflecting a

shift toward ‘post-materialist’ values (Acik 2013; Inglehart 1977 cited in Nonomura, 2017; Micheletti & Stolle 2008).

In the literature, it can be found that many academicians have approached boycotting and boycotting as an equal action, imagining that these two behaviours indicate a single behaviour (Newman & Bartels, 2011; Shah et al., 2007; Stolle, Hooghe, & Micheletti, 2005; Strømsnes, 2009). Nevertheless, there are fundamental discrepancies between the two concepts. Friedman (1999 cited in Copeland, 2014), the first person to make a detailed study on this subject, mentions the differences between the two concepts. According to him, the basic differences are in the degree of discussion, the kind of organizing and how much the media gives attention to these concepts. He said that in boycotts, with the aim of punishing companies, consumers withdraw their support deliberately from them. They challenge companies to make modifications regarding unpleasant or unwanted business actions by damaging the companies. On the other hand, consumers who boycott want to be customers of some companies in particular. “Fair trade”, “sweatshop free”, “buy local”, “not tested on animals”, “environmentally friendly”, “organically made” are just some of the sayings and slogans that consumers see in their everyday consumer activity and it is said that if one is deliberately choosing products or services for these labels or slogans, one is also adopting the behaviour of boycotting and making an ethical consumption.

As seen from these examples, fair trade is beginning to emerge as an equally influential category of ethical products (Moore, 2004; Nicholls, 2002, 2004; Renard, 1999; Strong, 1997; Tallontire, 2000, 2002).

Specifically for emerging countries in the third world traditional trade regulations have not been satisfactory (M.I. Khan, Khan, & Haleem, 2019). These countries do not have advantages in the production of agricultural products as the countries in developed nations do, but they also have an absolute disadvantage when trading in these products. Therefore, they are damaged due to global free trade of agricultural products (Skarstein, 2007 cited in Wang & Chen, 2019). These inequalities between developed and developing countries have created the fair trade movement. For this reason, “fair trade” indicates a guarantee of the equity for parties involved in trade (Moore, 2004 cited in Rashid & Byun, 2018). The World Fair Trade Organization (WFTO, 2019) describes fair trade as a “trading partnership, based on dialogue, transparency and respect that seeks greater equity in international trade. It contributes to sustainable development by offering better trading conditions to, and securing the rights of, marginalized producers and workers – especially in the South”. The pioneers of the fair trade movement are non-profit and cooperative organizations and in the literature

they are often mentioned as “Alternative Trading Organizations” (Becchetti & Huybrechts, 2008). How fair trade products are distributed is the responsibility of mainly those non-profit organizations. The products are bought by these organizations from producer groups in emerging countries with the aim of selling them through particular shops and retail outlets in developed countries (Gonzalez de Juan & Khanter, 2014 cited in Pérez, Garcia de los Salmones, 2018). The reason for the existence of fair trade organizations, for example the International Federation for Alternative Trade (IFAT) and the Fair Trade Labeling Organization International (FLO), is to control the fair operations and rights of workers in emerging countries and to inform consumers of ethical issues in supply chains (Moore, 2004 cited in Rashid & Byun, 2018).

With the purpose of doing business in fair trade markets, fair trade labels are needed for alternative trade organisations or producers to distinguish their products from the rest. This labelling also helps consumers to understand the differences between competing product options and also gives them comforts in terms of selecting the most environmentally, socially acceptable option (Castaldo, Perrini, Misani, & Tencati, 2009). With the aim of giving this label, the Fairtrade certification agency established the standards that must be fulfilled by the products (Steinrücken & Jaenichen, 2007). Fair trade certifications give warranty that goods are produced within the boundaries of ethical values such as economic, social and environmental criteria that are established by those fair trade agencies. The fundamental economic aim of this movement is that fair trade manufacturers get in any case a minimum amount of money which will help them covering the cost of manufacturing (Loureiro & Lotade, 2005).

These ethical certifications are also communication tools for brands which promote ethical principles (Carrington, Neville, & Whitwell, 2010). However, studies showed that it is not easy for consumers to distinguish fair trade label on the products as there are more recognizable items on the packages for instance nutrition and ingredient information, brand name, or price (De Pelsmacker et al., 2005; Obermiller, Burke, Talbott, & Green, 2009). There is an interesting result regarding these kinds of ethical certifications. Ethical trait evidence delivered by those certifications is expected to be distinguishable by consumers in countries where corporate social responsibility campaigns are well spread. In other countries where corporate social responsibility activities are not so common, consumers may be less informed about ethical qualifications and consequently it may be more possible to neglect products’ ethical characteristics (Mukherjee & Hoyer, 2001). Also there are other studies showing that consumers tend to have fewer favourable attitudes concerning goods produced

in emerging countries, nevertheless this approach may change once the brand displays fair trade messages on its goods (Rashid, 2017; Rudell, 2006).

Even though some studies found that implementing fair trade principles may increase the product price (Campbell, Heinrich, & Schoenmüller, 2015; Hustvedt & Bernard, 2010), Loureiro and Lotade (2005) concluded that consumers were keen to pay extra for coffee labelled as fair trade than for coffee labelled, for instance, organic. Other academics have inspected fair trade labels on buying purpose of consumers concerning premium-priced products (Loureiro & Lotade, 2005; Rashid & Byun, 2018). It was found that the rise in the price of fair trade products is observed as reasonable by buyers and does not have an undesirable influence on buying behaviour (Campbell et al., 2015).

4.2. Voluntary Simplicity

In addition to the individuals limiting their consumption because of financial inadequacy, there are consumers who deliberately consume less although they have sufficient financial means. There are extensive studies concerning the diverse lifestyles or groups of those people. Anti-consumption, frugal consumption and voluntary simplicity are the main headlines studied under this topic (Chatzidakis & Lee, 2013; Elgin & Mitchell, 1977; Lastovicka, Bettencourt, Hughner, & Kuntze, 1999). Iyer and Muncy (2009) said that from those, voluntary simplifiers are a particular group who commonly decrease their total levels of consumption. Gregg (1936 cited in Chang, 2018) was the first person who introduced this concept. After that several definitions were made regarding who those voluntary simplifiers actually are (Johnston & Burton, 2003). A lot of researchers (Ballantine & Creery, 2010; Craig-Lees & Hill, 2002; Etzioni, 1998; Huneke, 2005; Iyer & Muncy, 2009; Zavestoski, 2002) studied this topic and said that the main aims of those voluntary simplifiers are to decrease their consumption level, give away items that they have and choose to live a less materialistic life. One of the important points to mention here is that these people are financially well-off, highly educated and have good jobs (Craig-Lees & Hill, 2002; Etzioni, 1998; Huneke, 2005; Zavestoski, 2002). Thus this means that even though they are in a financially good position, they still deliberately prefer to consume less or the reason for their behaviour is not due to changing economic environments (Iyer & Muncy, 2009). As Craig-Lees and Hill (2002) mentioned in their study, "Voluntary simplifiers have access to resources such as wealth, education and unique skills that could be traded for high income". For these reasons, Zavestoski (2002) said that voluntary simplicity should be taken as a belief system and a behaviour. And also some researchers said that (Peyer, Balderjahn, Seegebarth, & Klemm, 2017) searching for a spiritual life is the main motivation for those voluntary

simplifiers and this feature may distinguish them from people whom motivations are environmentalism and social responsibility (Chang, 2018). In conclusion, voluntary simplicity is a belief system and a practice which includes choosing to decrease material consumption (Zavestoski, 2002).

If one were to look at the particular activities made by those people, it might be seen that they decrease their overall consumption practices by, for instance, using a communal laundry, changing their transport preferences such as cycling or car sharing, reusing and repairing goods with the aim of increasing their life span, buying second-hand products, or making clothing and household furnishing by themselves (Alexander & Ussher, 2012; Arens et al., 1995 cited in Shaw & Moraes, 2009; Ballantine & Creery, 2010; Cooper, 2005; Dobscha, 1998; Durning, 1992 cited in Shaw & Newholm, 2002; Papanek, 1995 cited in Shaw, & Moraes, 2009; Pendle, 2000 cited in Shaw & Newholm, 2002). Also the study conducted by Shaw & Newholm (2002) showed that choosing a simplified diet or vegetarianism life style, consuming organically produced goods and avoiding processed or genetically modified foods are the other activities preferred by voluntary simplifiers. Alexander and Ussher (2012) also found that organic, local, Fairtrade, and green products are the goods that simplifiers prefer spending their money on, and also they use renewable energy and long-life products. They also usually have a more activist approach such as boycotting and buycotting compared to non-simplifiers (Nelson, Rademacher, & Paek, 2007; Shaw & Moraes, 2009; Zamwel, Sasson-Levy, & Ben-Porat, 2014).

So what are the motivations behind voluntary simplicity? This is an important question to be answered by academia. If one does not know the factors that make consumers choose this way of life one cannot serve them properly as a marketer. In the literature, concerns regarding environment, health or religion related matters, ethical anxieties about consumption, human values, unhappiness with high-stress lives, and general anticonsumption attitudes, consideration of future consequences are some of the reasons mentioned (Chang, 2018; Craig-Lees & Hill, 2002; Ebreo & Vining 2001; Kortenkamp & Moore, 2006; Milfont & Gouveia, 2006; Ottman, 1995; Pierce, 2003 cited in Huneke, 2005; Shaw & Newholm, 2002; Strong, 1997).

Also Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is used by some academics to explain voluntary simplicity behaviour (Etzioni, 1998; Huneke, 2005; Zavestoski, 2002). As is well known this theory says that physiological needs, which are at the lowest level of a hierarchy, must be satisfied first, then love needs will appear, followed by the need for esteem including self-esteem and esteem from others. Maslow said that "if all previous needs are relatively met

humans will feel a “new discontent and restlessness . . . unless the individual is doing what he is fitted for” (Maslow, 1943b, cited in Huneke, 2005). This is called the need for self-actualization. Etzioni (1998) states that Maslow’s hierarchy clarifies why while some people prefer voluntary simplicity and others do not. According to him, voluntary simplicity is preferred by those whose lower level needs are satisfied and move to the top level of hierarchy and he gave a good example about it: “Voluntary Simplicity is thus a choice a successful corporate lawyer, not a homeless person, faces . . .”. As it is declared that self-actualization is at the top of this hierarchy, according to Zavestoski (2002) self-actualization has two separate aspects: the need for efficacy and the need for authenticity. An individual’s needs might be satisfied through consumption except authenticity.

The degree to which a person chooses a lifestyle of voluntary simplicity differs because of the motivations this person has behind her/his behaviour. There are some academics who specifically studied these different segments of voluntary simplifiers. Elgin and Mitchell (1977) were the pioneers in this topic and they identified four categories of voluntary simplicity: full, partial, sympathizers, indifferent, unaware, or opposed. After these researchers, Etzioni (1998, 1999 cited in McDonald, Oates, Young, & Hwang, 2006) followed their study and outlined three groups: downshifters, strong simplifiers, and holistic simplifiers. Downshifters do not usually decrease their consumption; instead they look for different consumption. Strong simplifiers decrease their consumption level, change their lifestyles; for example they change their job if they have too much stress, and prefer spending their time with family and on leisure. The last category is holistic simplifiers. People in this group wish to be part of the simple-living movement and their consumption is decreased and motivated by social, ethical, and environmental values (McDonald et al., 2006). Researcher who identified voluntary simplifiers based on their motivations are Leonard-Barton and Rogers (1980 cited in Bekin, Carrigan, & Szmigin, 2005). Three groups were identified by the authors which are named as Conservers, Crusaders, and Conformists. Huneke (2005) found two groups in his study. The first group, which is called extremely dedicated simplifiers, is compared to individuals who are less dedicated. He found that highly committed individuals have more regular practices even though they need a continuing effort to behave in this way. McDonald et al. (2006) said that particular interest should be given to individuals who are between the two extreme groups. They labelled this groups as beginner voluntary simplifiers (BVS). The main characteristics of this group are that they do care regarding their own consumption levels but they are not against consumption.

Studying and knowing the characteristics of voluntary simplifiers is important for marketers. This new consumption effort cannot be overlooked by marketers, as green consumption and resource conservation are important issues in marketing (Chang, 2018). Today, microsegments are becoming important and satisfying the needs of this particular group before the competitors is a significant asset for the success of a company. Also as trend watcher Gerald Celente mentioned, “Voluntary simplicity, an unrealizable counterculture ideal in the ‘70s, will become a reality and a significant trend in the new millennium (Celente, 1997, cited in Craig-Lees & Hill, 2002). For this reason, with the aim of advancing marketing strategies on this new micro segment, understanding them is very important.

4.3. Ethical Fashion

The fashion industry is criticised in social dimension because of working conditions, sweat shops and child labour engaged by companies such as Nike, Gap and Levi Strauss (Shen, Wang, Lo, & Shum, 2012). Consequently, academics and the business world pays attention on how companies can become ethical (De Brito, Carbone, & Blanquart, 2008; Lueg, Pedersen, & Clemmensen, 2015; Seuring & Müller, 2008; Turker & Altuntas, 2014). Additionally, consumers’ increasing awareness about these issues since the 1980s created an ethical fashion concept (Emberley 1998 cited in Joy, Sherry, Venkatesh, Wang, & Chan, 2012; Moisander & Personen, 2002; Shen et al., 2012). Consequently, ethical consumption has entered the fashion industry and the demand towards ethical fashion is now growing (Domeisen, 2006).

Concerns regarding the negative influences of the applications in the fashion business on environmental and social areas are increasing (Birtwistle & Moore, 2007; Carter & Rogers, 2008; Fineman, 2001; Jackson, 2004; Niinimaki, 2010). If the environmental practices in the fashion industry are examined, big amounts of chemical materials are needed during processes for example dyeing, tanning or finishing applied in the production stage and this creates an adverse effect on the environment (Caniato, Caridi, Crippa, & Moretto, 2012). If the production of a cotton T-shirt is taken as an example, it is said that 10% of the annual worldwide usage of all synthetic pesticides is used during the cotton production (Gam, Cao, Farr, & Kang, 2010). An important volume of gasoline is spent between the parties in a supply chain or in the process of delivery from the members of supply chains to final consumers, which is seriously damaging the environment (Fletcher, 2013 cited in Da Giau, et al, 2016). Also it is mentioned by some authors that dry cleaning and home laundry might have environmental damage due to chemicals used during these processes (Chouinard & Brown, 1997).

Ethical fashion is defined by Joergens (2006) as “fashionable clothes that incorporate fair trade principles with sweatshop-free labour conditions while not harming the environment or workers by using biodegradable and organic cotton”. When ethical fashion is mentioned, companies usually prefer, for example, environmentally friendly, recycled materials and organic fibres, which obey the rules regarding fair trade (Joergens, 2006). However, in the literature there are some other terms which are used interchangeably with ethical fashion and this makes consumers confused. In order to make a clear distinction, a taxonomy is recommended by Mintel, a UK market research company (Magnussen, 2009 cited in Carey & Cervellon, 2014), and they said that all of these concepts must be gathered under a single umbrella term – “ethical fashion”:. So what are these distinct conceptions? As mentioned above ethical clothing is about thinking about both the environment and people during their production and trade. Eco clothing means producing all clothing using environmentally friendly procedures such as producing organic textiles and using sustainable ingredients. Organic clothing implies producing clothes where a minimum amount of chemicals is used with minimum damage to the environment during the production process.

It is said that one of the main reasons why ethical consumption in the fashion industry has become popular in recent years is because of fast fashion (Chan & Wong, 2012; Joy et al., 2012; Paulins & Hillery, 2009 cited in Shen et al., 2012). The main philosophy behind fast fashion business model which is used by Zara, H&M, GAP, is producing fashionable items in a very short time, and increasing the number of fashion seasons with lower cost materials and labour (Bhardwaj & Fairhurst, 2010; Fletcher, 2010 cited in Jung, & Jin, 2014) and this movement has controlled the clothing business since the turn of the twenty-first century (Wiggin, 2008 cited in Carey, & Cervellon, 2014). Because of this low price, fashion consumption of consumers is increasing. (Cline, 2012 cited in Jung, & Jin, 2014). Together with low pricing strategies, reduced durability in products and quick fashion make people buy more than one item of clothing at a time (Fletcher, 2010 cited in Jung, & Jin, 2014). Also in order to stay in the market, some retailers have started to sacrifice ethical standards such as fair working practices (McAspurn, 2009 cited in Carey & Cervellon, 2014).

As a result, some designers in the UK have started a new movement in reaction to this cheap, homogenous and quantity focused fashion, and they called it “slow fashion” which means a slow and more sustainable style to designing and producing clothes (Jung & Jin, 2014). The “slow fashion” movement was first introduced by Fletcher in 2007 (Jung & Jin, 2014). The logic behind this movement is similar to that of slow food, founded by Carlo Petrini in Italy in 1986 (Jung & Jin, 2014) with the aim of responding to fast food and fast

life, the disappearance of local food traditions (Heitmann, Robinson, & Povey, 2011). The slow food movement says that “all citizens have rights to enjoy clean (unpolluted), fairly traded food that has been produced in a sustainable manner with consideration for all stakeholders, including the animals being eaten and the planet itself” (Heitmann et al., 2011). In the same manner, the aim of slow fashion is to take into account environmental and social sustainability during clothing production and the trade process, producing attractive and sensible goods at a lower speed (Clark, 2008; Fletcher, 2010). It does not mean slowing down the textile and apparel supply chain speed (Clark, 2008; Fletcher, 2010). As Fletcher (2007) said this is a socially conscious movement which aims to make consumers place emphasis on quality rather than quantity and buy less often but prefer high quality items. A study made by Jung and Jin (2014) showed that for slow fashion consumers, authenticity and craftsmanship are more important. According to Clark (2008), “the slow approach offers more sustainable and ethical ways of being fashionable that have implications for design, production, consumption and use”. Recent studies have shown that consumers’ concerns are increasing in the fashion market (Joergens, 2006; Shaw, Hogg, Wilson, Shiu, & Hassan, 2006; Valor, 2007) and therefore it is appropriate to examine slow fashion thought in more detail (Pookulangara & Shephard, 2013).

When one looks at consumer attitudes towards ethical fashion, the literature indicates that consumers are conscious regarding the ethical issues in the industry and also they have positive attitudes towards companies who have ethically produced products. However when it comes to purchase of these ethical fashion products, it is found that instead of ethical features, a product’s visual appearance is more important for consumers (Gam, 2011). This situation is called in the literature “attitude-behaviour” gap and it will be discussed in detail in the following section. However there are some studies showing that if the ethical dimensions of these products are clearly realized by consumers, it is more probable that those products will be bought (Dickson, 2001). The absence of knowledge regarding the social and environmental effect of consumer behaviour is also the other reason for this gap (Morgan & Birtwistle, 2009). Another study (Choi et al., 2012) found that consumers are ready to support ethical fashion products but they do not have enough knowledge about them. In other words, in order to increase awareness, educating consumers is essential. As Da Giau et al. (2016) highlighted, the web is the dominant communication channel used in sustainability initiatives. Social media channels are the most widely used initiatives to reach a broader audience and to allow companies to reach consumers who were interested in this subject before (Han et al., 2017 cited in Vehmas, Raudaskoski, Heikkilä, Harlin, & Mensonen, 2018). Marketers of

these ethical clothing products are strongly recommended to use social channels to educate and reach their target market.

As there is no doubt that clothing production affects the environment and human well-being, and in order to overcome the social and environmental challenges facing the industry, consumers, designers, retailers and other stakeholders in the industry need to take responsibility all together.

5. Are you really ready to buy ethical products? (Intention – behaviour gap in ethical consumption)

In recent years, there is no doubt that popularity of ethical consumerism has been increasing and this has made researchers understand ethical consumer behaviour by trying to develop and understand new models concerning this subject. These models are built on present attitude-behaviour models (Arvola et al., 2008; Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith, 2007; Shaw & Shiu 2003; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008). Ajzen's (1985) Theory of Planned Behaviour is one of the models used in ethical consumer behaviour (Chatzidakis et al., 2007). The main proposition in this theory is that a person's attitudes and subjective norms describe his/her behavioural intention. It is assumed that people act the way as they are expected to act. However, researchers found that even though consumers have positive attitudes regarding the issue, when it comes to purchasing these ethical products, the number of people who buy them is really a small percentage (Auger & Devinney, 2007; Belk, Devinney, & Eckhardt, 2005; Boulstridge & Carrigan 2000; Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Carrington et al., 2010; Shaw, Shiu, Hassan, Bekin, & Hogg, 2007). This difference between attitude and actual behaviour is called the attitude behaviour gap (Boulstridge & Carrigan 2000; Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Sheeran, 2002). Cowe and Williams (2000 cited in Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Ginieis, 2011) called this situation as "the 30:3 syndrome". It means even though 30% of the consumers say that they will purchase ethical products, just a niche of 3% really purchases them.

In ethical consumerism literature, with the purpose of finding solutions to this gap, two perspectives are suggested by academicians (Newholm & Shaw, 2007). The first view says that the reason behind this disparity between attitudes and actual buying behaviour is because of the methodological approaches that are used to evaluate consumers' ethical product buying intentions (Auger & Devinney, 2007; Carrigan & Attalla, 2001) as sometimes a self-reported survey is employed. According to these authors, in studies including those on ethical issues, attitudes and intentions, people try to give socially acceptable "right answers". For this reason some studies have been conducted using qualitative research methods in order to overcome

this problem (Bray et al., 2011; Chatzidakis et al., 2007; Chatzidakis, Hibbert, Mittusis, & Smith, 2004; McDonald et al., 2006; Moraes, Carrigan, & Szmigin, 2012; Shaw, McMaster & Newholm, 2016; Wiederhold & Martinez, 2018). In the second perspective, researches try to identify factors that influence this attitude-behaviour gap directly and indirectly (Boulstridge & Carrigan 2000; Carrigan & Attalla 2001; Chatzidakis et al., 2007; De Pelsmacker & Janssens, 2007; Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Ginieis, 2011; Shaw & Shiu, 2002; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008).

When looking at the literature to find out the reasons behind this attitude behaviour gap it is seen that information is one of the mostly mentioned factors which prevent consumers from buying ethical products. It is found that consumers prefer better product labelling, gaining information regarding the production process of the goods easily and at the same time not wanting to be exposed to too much information (Carrigan & Attalla 2001; Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Ginieis, 2011; Sen & Bhattacharya 2001; Shaw & Clarke 1999; Uusitalo & Oksanen; 2004). Another problem about the information is consumers' concerns about quality and credibility of the existing information (Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Ginieis, 2011). Consumers do not distinguish clearly between firms which are truly ethical and those which are not and this makes them worry (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Folkes & Kamins, 1999). Current ethical products' high prices is mentioned as another reason for the gap (Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Ginieis, 2011). Also consumers highlighted their dissatisfaction with these products in the study of Papaoikonomou, Ryan, and Ginieis (2010) and this result is consistent with previous findings (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Hamzaoui Essoussi & Linton, 2010). Consumers have anxiety about the quality of ethically produced goods and it is suggested that without improving the utilitarian value or decreasing functional risk, marketing of these products might be difficult.

6. Conclusion

There is no doubt that ethical consumption is increasing all around the world. People are becoming more conscious and aware of how the environment and human well-being are affected due to their consumption decisions. Many firms have begun to pay attention to these anxieties of consumers and they have made changes in their missions, visions, value statements, products' content and even packaging.

Even though this phenomenon gets an important place in consumers' life, the business world and academia, there is still confusion about what exactly ethical consumption is and how it differs from other terms related with it. In order to show what this concept comprises

of, the other related ones defined firstly which are green consumer, consumer ethics, voluntary simplicity, socially-responsible consumption and business ethics. After making clear what those terms are, what kinds of activities are included in ethical consumption, and whether or not is it really a new concept are discussed. The studies showed that ethical consumption is not a new phenomenon and it has a long history.

Also our studies showed that there is an attitude-behaviour gap in ethical consumption which means that people have positive attitudes towards it but they hesitate buying these products. This might make this topic reasonable to study. It is believed that, specifically for marketing managers, knowing the possible factors behind the gap is really important. This is because markets are becoming more fragmented, and producing goods to satisfy even just one person better than competitors is really vital for companies. Knowing this specific segment deeply, understanding their fears, hesitations and motivations can give a competitive advantage to firms.

References

- Acik, N. (2013). Reducing the participation gap in civic engagement: Political consumerism in Europe. *European Sociological Review*, 29(6), 1309-1322.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In *Action control* (pp. 11-39). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Alexander, S., & Ussher, S. (2012). The voluntary simplicity movement: A multi-national survey analysis in theoretical context. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 12(1), 66-86.
- Arvola, A., Vassallo, M., Dean, M., Lampila, P., Saba, A., Lähteenmäki, L., & Shepherd, R. (2008). Predicting intentions to purchase organic food: The role of affective and moral attitudes in the theory of planned behaviour. *Appetite*, 50(2-3), 443-454.
- Auger, P., & Devinney, T. (2007). Do what consumers say matter? The misalignment of preferences with unconstrained ethical intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76, 361-383.
- Auger, P., Devinney, T., Louviere, J., & Burke, P. (2008). Do social product features have value to consumers? *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 25 (3), 183-191.
- Bae, S. Y. (2012). *Understanding ethical consumers: Assessing the moderating effects of price sensitivity, materialism, impulse buying tendency, and clothing involvement* (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University Libraries). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1532869)
- Balderjahn, I. (1988). Personality variables and environmental attitudes as predictors of ecologically responsible consumption patterns. *Journal of Business Research*, 17(1), 51-56.
- Ballenger, J. (1992). The new free trade heel: Nike's profits jump on the backs of Asian workers'. *Harpers* (August, 1992), 46-47.
- Ballantine, P. W., & Creery, S. (2010). The consumption and disposition behaviour of voluntary simplifiers. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 9(1), 45-56.
- Becchetti, L., & Huybrechts, B. (2008). The dynamics of fair trade as a mixed-form market. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81, 733-750.

- Belk, R., Devinney, T., & Eckhardt, G. (2005). Consumer ethics across cultures. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 8(3), 275-289
- Bekin, C., Carrigan, M., & Szmigin, I. (2005). Defying marketing sovereignty: Voluntary simplicity at new consumption communities. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 8(4), 413-429.
- Bhardwaj, V., & Fairhurst, A. (2010). Fast fashion: response to changes in the fashion industry. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 20(1), 165-173.
- Birtwistle, G., & Moore, C. M. (2007). Fashion clothing—where does it all end up?. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 35(3), 210-216.
- Boulstridge, E., & Carrigan, M. (2000). Do consumers really care about corporate responsibility? Highlighting the attitude—behaviour gap. *Journal of Communication Management*, 4(4), 355-368.
- Bray, J., Johns, N., & Kilburn, D. (2011). An exploratory study into the factors impeding ethical consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(4), 597-608.
- Buchholz, R. A. (1998). The ethics of consumption activities: a future paradigm?. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(8), 871-882.
- Cacioppe, R., Forster, N., & Fox, M. (2008). A survey of managers' perceptions of corporate ethics and social responsibility and actions that may affect companies' success. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(3), 681.
- Campbell, C. L., Heinrich, D., & Schoenmüller, V. (2015). Consumers' reaction to fair trade motivated price increases. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 24, 79-84.
- Carrigan, M., & Attalla, A. (2001). The myth of the ethical consumer—do ethics matter in purchase behaviour?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(7), 560-578.
- Carrigan, M., Szmigin, I., & Wright, J. (2004). Shopping for a better world? An interpretive study of the potential for ethical consumption within the older market. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(6), 401-417.
- Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2010). Why ethical consumers don't walk their talk: Towards a framework for understanding the gap between the ethical purchase intentions and actual buying behaviour of ethically minded consumers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(1), 139-158.
- Caniato, F., Caridi, M., Crippa, L., & Moretto, A. (2012). Environmental sustainability in fashion supply chains: An exploratory case based research. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 135(2), 659-670.
- Carey, L., & Cervellon, M. C. (2014). Ethical fashion dimensions: pictorial and auditory depictions through three cultural perspectives. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 18(4), 483-506.
- Carter, C. R., & Rogers, D. S. (2008). A framework of sustainable supply chain management: moving toward new theory. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 38(5), 360-387.
- Castaldo, S., Perrini, F., Misani, N., & Tencati, A. (2009). The missing link between corporate social responsibility and consumer trust: The case of fair trade products. *Journal of business ethics*, 84(1), 1-15.
- Chan, T. Y., & Wong, C. W. (2012). The consumption side of sustainable fashion supply chain: Understanding fashion consumer eco-fashion consumption decision. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 16(2), 193-215.
- Chang, H. H. (2018). Exploring consumer behavioural predispositions toward voluntary simplicity. *Current Psychology*, 1-13.
- Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S., Mittusis, D., & Smith, A. (2004). Virtue in consumption?. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 20(5-6), 526-543.
- Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S., & Smith, A. P. (2007). Why people don't take their concerns about fair trade to the supermarket: The role of neutralisation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(1), 89-100.

- Chatzidakis, A., & Lee, M. S. (2013). Anti-consumption as the study of reasons against. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 33(3), 190-203.
- Chatzidakis, A., & Mitussis, D. (2007). Computer ethics and consumer ethics: the impact of the internet on consumers' ethical decision-making process. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 6(5), 305-320.
- Cherrier, H. (2007). Ethical consumption practices: co-production of self-expression and social recognition. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 6(5), 321-335
- Chiu, H. C., Hsieh, Y. C., Chang, S. H., & Lee, W. R. (2009). Exploring the effects of anticounterfeiting strategies on customer values and loyalty. *Ethics & Behaviour*, 19(5), 403-413.
- Choi, T. M., Lo, C. K., Wong, C. W., Yee, R. W., Shen, B., Wang, Y., & Shum, M. (2012). The impact of ethical fashion on consumer purchase behaviour. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*.
- Chouinard, Y., & Brown, M. S. (1997). Going organic: converting Patagonia's cotton product line. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 1(1), 117-129.
- Clark, H. (2008). SLOW+ FASHION—an Oxymoron—or a Promise for the Future...?. *Fashion Theory*, 12(4), 427-446.
- Connolly, J., & Shaw, D. (2006). Identifying Fair Trade in Consumption Choice. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 14, 353-368.
- Cooper, T. (2005). Slower consumption reflections on product life spans and the “throwaway society”. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 9(1-2), 51-67.
- Copeland, L. (2014). Conceptualizing political consumerism: How citizenship norms differentiate boycotting from buycotting. *Political Studies*, 62, 172-186.
- Craig-Lees, M., & Hill, C. (2002). Understanding voluntary simplifiers. *Psychology & Marketing*, 19(2), 187-210.
- Crane, A. & Matten D. (2004) *Business Ethics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, NY.
- Da Giau, A., Macchion, L., Caniato, F., Caridi, M., Danese, P., Rinaldi, R., & Vinelli, A. (2016). Sustainability practices and web-based communication: an analysis of the Italian fashion industry. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 20(1), 72-88
- De Brito, M. P., Carbone, V., & Blanquart, C. M. (2008). Towards a sustainable fashion retail supply chain in Europe: Organisation and performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 114(2), 534-553.
- De Pelsmacker, P., Driesden, L., & Rayp, G. (2005). Do consumers care about ethics? Willingness to pay for fair-trade coffee. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 39, 363-395.
- De Pelsmacker, P., & Janssens, W. (2007). A model for fair trade buying behaviour: The role of perceived quantity and quality of information and of product-specific attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75(4), 361-380.
- Dickson, M. A. (2001). Utility of no sweat labels for apparel consumers: Profiling label users and predicting their purchases. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 96-119.
- Dobscha, S. (1998). The lived experience of consumer rebellion against marketing. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Domeisen, N. (2006, July). When ethics meet fashion. In *International Trade Forum* (No. 3). International Trade Centre.
- Downs, A. (1972). Up and down with ecology- “the issue-attention cycle”. *Public Interest*, 28, 38-50.

- Dubuisson-Quellier, S. (2007). From consumerism to the empowerment of consumers. The case of ethic food movements in France. *Nordic Consumer Policy Research Conference 2007: Towards a new consumer policy?*
- Dunlap, R. E., & York, R. (2008). The globalization of environmental concern and the limits of the post materialist values explanation: Evidence from four multinational surveys. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 49(3), 529-563.
- Ebreo, A., & Vining, J. (2001). How similar are recycling and waste reduction? Future orientation and reasons for reducing waste as predictors of self-reported behaviour. *Environment and Behaviour*, 33(3), 424-448.
- Elgin, D., & Mitchell, A. (1977). Voluntary simplicity. *Planning Review*, 5(6), 13-15.
- Elkington, J. (1998). Partnerships from cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business. *Environmental Quality Management*, 8(1), 37-51.
- Ettenson, Richard and Jill Gabrielle Klein. 2005. The Fallout from French Nuclear Testing in the South Pacific: A Longitudinal Study of Consumer Boycotts. *International Marketing Review*, 22(2), 199-224.
- Etzioni, A. (1998). Voluntary simplicity: Characterization, select psychological implications, and societal consequences. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 19(619), 643.
- Fineman, S. (2001). Fashioning the environment. *Organization*, 8(1), 17-31.
- Fletcher, K. (2007). Slow fashion. *The Ecologist*, 37, 61.
- Fletcher, K. (2010). Slow fashion: An invitation for systems change. *Fashion Practice*, 2(2), 259-265.
- Folkes, V. S., & Kamins, M. A. (1999). Effects of information about firms' ethical and unethical actions on consumers' attitudes. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 8(3), 243-259.
- Freestone, O. M., & McGoldrick, P. J. (2008). Motivations of the ethical consumer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(4), 445-467.
- Friedman, M. (1991). Consumer boycotts: A conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(1), 149-168.
- Gabriel, Y., & Lang, T. (2015). *The Unmanageable Consumer* (3rd ed.). London: Sage, chapter The Consumer as Activist.
- Gam, H. J., Cao, H., Farr, C., & Kang, M. (2010). Quest for the eco-apparel market: a study of mothers' willingness to purchase organic cotton clothing for their children. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(6), 648-656.
- Gronjof, A. (2006). Communication about consumption: a family process perspective on 'green' consumer practices. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5(6), 491-503.
- Gulyás, E. (2008). Interpretations of ethical consumption. *Review of Sociology*, 14(1), 25-44.
- Hamzaoui Essoussi, L., & Linton, J. D. (2010). New or recycled products: how much are consumers willing to pay?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 27(5), 458-468.
- Harper, G. C., & Makatouni, A. (2002). Consumer perception of organic food production and farm animal welfare. *British Food Journal*, 104(3/4/5), 287-299.
- Heitmann, S., Robinson, P., & Povey, G. (2011). Slow food, slow cities and slow tourism. *Research Themes for Tourism*, 114-127.
- Huneke, M. E. (2005). The face of the un-consumer: An empirical examination of the practice of voluntary simplicity in the United States. *Psychology & Marketing*, 22(7), 527-550.
- Hustvedt, G., & Bernard, J. C. (2010). Effects of social responsibility labelling and brand on willingness to pay for apparel. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(6), 619-626.

- Iyer, R., & Muncy, J. A. (2009). Purpose and object of anti-consumption. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 160-168.
- Jackson, T. (2004). Models of Mammon: a cross-disciplinary survey in pursuit of the sustainable consumer. *ESRC Sustainable Technologies Programme Working Paper, 1*.
- Jin Gam, H. (2011). Are fashion-conscious consumers more likely to adopt eco-friendly clothing?. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 15(2), 178-193.
- Jo, Littler. "What's wrong with ethical consumption?." *Ethical Consumption*, 27(37). ROUTLEDGE in association with GSE Research, 2011. 27-37.
- Joergens, C. (2006). Ethical fashion: myth or future trend?. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 10(3), 360-371.
- Johnston, T. C., & Burton, J. B. (2003). Voluntary simplicity: Definitions and dimensions. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 7(1), 19-36.
- Joy, A., Sherry Jr, J. F., Venkatesh, A., Wang, J., & Chan, R. (2012). Fast fashion, sustainability, and the ethical appeal of luxury brands. *Fashion Theory*, 16(3), 273-295.
- Jung, S., & Jin, B. (2014). A theoretical investigation of slow fashion: sustainable future of the apparel industry. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 38(5), 510-519.
- Kam, C. D., & Deichert, M. A. (2017, March). Boycotting, buycotting, and the psychology of political consumerism. In *annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL*.
- Khan, M. I., Khan, S., & Haleem, A. (2019). Compensating Impact of Globalisation through Fairtrade Practices. In *Globalization and Development* (269-283). Springer, Cham.
- Kim, H. Y., & Chung, J. E. (2011). Consumer purchase intention for organic personal care products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 28(1), 40-47.
- Kinnear, T., Taylor, J., & Ahmed, S. (1974). Ecologically concerned consumers: who are they?. *Journal of Marketing*, 38(2), 20-24.
- Klein, Jill G., Craig Smith, and Andrew John. 2002. Exploring Motivations for Participation in a Consumer Boycott. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 29(1): 363-369.
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C., & John, A. (2004). Why we boycott: Consumer motivations for boycott participation. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(3), 92-109.
- Kortenkamp, K. V., & Moore, C. F. (2006). Time, uncertainty, and individual differences in decisions to cooperate in resource dilemmas. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(5), 603-615.
- Lang T., & Gabriel Y. (2005). A brief history of consumer activism. In *The Ethical Consumer*, Harrison R, Newholm T, Shaw D (eds). Sage Publications: London.
- Lastovicka, J. L., Bettencourt, L. A., Hughner, R. S., & Kuntze, R. J. (1999). Lifestyle of the tight and frugal: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(1), 85-98.
- Long, M. A. (2010). *Analysis of ethical consumption participation and motivation, An* (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University. Libraries). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI Number: 3419059)
- Lueg, R., Pedersen, M. M., & Clemmensen, S. N. (2015). The role of corporate sustainability in a low-cost business model—A case study in the Scandinavian fashion industry. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 24(5), 344-359.
- Loureiro, M., & Lotade, J. (2005). Do fair trade and eco-labels in coffee wake up the consumer conscience? *Ecological Economics*, 53, 129-138.

- Low, W., & Davenport, E. (2007). To boldly go... exploring ethical spaces to re-politicise ethical consumption and fair trade. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 6(5), 336-348.
- Makarem, S. C., & Jae, H. (2016). Consumer boycott behavior: An exploratory analysis of twitter feeds. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 50(1), 193-223.
- McDonald, S., Oates, C. J., Young, C. W., & Hwang, K. (2006). Toward sustainable consumption: Researching voluntary simplifiers. *Psychology & Marketing*, 23(6), 515-534.
- McDonagh, P., & Prothero, A. (1992). Producing Environmentally Acceptable Cosmetics? The Impact of Environmentalism on the United Kingdom Cosmetics and Toiletries Industry. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 8(2), 147-166.
- Micheletti M. (2003). *Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*. Palgrave/St. Martin's: London.
- Micheletti, M., & Stolle, D. (2008). Fashioning social justice through political consumerism, capitalism, and the internet. *Cultural Studies*, 22(5), 749-769.
- Milfont, T. L., & Gouveia, V. V. (2006). Time perspective and values: An exploratory study of their relations to environmental attitudes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 26(1), 72-82.
- Moisander, J., & Pesonen, S. (2002). Narratives of sustainable ways of living: constructing the self and the other as a green consumer. *Management Decision*, 40(4), 329-342.
- Moore, G. (2004). The fair trade movement: Parameters, issues and future research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1-2), 73-86.
- Morgan, L. R., & Birtwistle, G. (2009). An investigation of young fashion consumers' disposal habits. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(2), 190-198.
- Moraes, C., Carrigan, M., & Szmigin, I. (2012). The coherence of inconsistencies: Attitude-behaviour gaps and new consumption communities. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28(1-2), 103-128.
- Mukherjee, A., & Hoyer, W. D. (2001). The effect of novel attributes on product evaluation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 462-472.
- Muncy, J. A., & Vitell, S. J. (1992). Consumer ethics: An investigation of the ethical beliefs of the final consumer. *Journal of Business Research*, 24, 297-311.
- Neilssen, N. & Scheepers, P. (1992). Business Strategy and the Environment. The Need for Information about Environmental Consciousness and Behaviour. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 1(2), 13-23.
- Nelson, M. R., Rademacher, M. A., & Paek, H. J. (2007). Downshifting consumer= upshifting citizen? An examination of a local freecycle community. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611(1), 141-156.
- Newholm, T., & Shaw, D. (2007). Studying the ethical consumer: A review of research. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6(5), 253-270.
- Newman, B. J. and Bartels, B. L. (2011) 'Politics at the Checkout Line: Explaining Political Consumerism in the United States', *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(4), 803-17.
- Nicholls, A. J. (2002). Strategic options in fair trade retailing. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 30(1), 6-17.
- Nicholls, A. (2004). New product development in fair trade retailing. *Service Industries Journal*, 24(2), 102-117.
- Niinimäki, K. (2010). Eco-clothing, consumer identity and ideology. *Sustainable Development*, 18(3), 150-162.

- Nonomura, R. (2017). Political consumerism and the participation gap: are boycotting and 'buycotting' youth-based activities?. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 20(2), 234-251.
- Obermiller, C., Burke, C., Talbott, E., & Green, G. P. (2009). 'Taste great or more fulfilling': The effect of brand reputation on consumer social responsibility advertising for fair trade coffee. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(2), 159-176.
- Ottman, J. (1995). Today's consumers turning lean and green. *Marketing News*, 29(23), 12-13.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online*. 2016. "boycott, v." March 2016. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/22329?rskey=M1TcdE&result=2>.
- Papaioikonomou, E. (2009). *Understanding the ethical consumer. Collective and individual projects and derived meanings. An exploratory study in the cooperatives of responsible consumption* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Rovira i Virgili).
- Papaioikonomou, E., Ryan, G., & Ginieis, M. (2011). Towards a holistic approach of the attitude behaviour gap in ethical consumer behaviours: Empirical evidence from Spain. *International Advances in Economic Research*, 17(1), 77-88.
- Papaioikonomou, E., Ryan, G., & Valverde, M. (2011). Mapping Ethical Consumer Behavior: Integrating the Empirical Research and Identifying Future Directions. *Ethics & Behavior*, 21(3), 197-221.
- Peattie, K. (2001). Golden goose or wild goose? The hunt for the green consumer. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10(4), 187-199.
- Pérez, A., & García de los Salmones, M. D. M. (2018). How Do Consumers Face the Decision to Buy Fair Trade Products? A Marketing Approach. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(5), 1057-1080.
- Peyer, M., Balderjahn, I., Seegebarth, B., & Klemm, A. (2017). The role of sustainability in profiling voluntary simplifiers. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 37-43.
- Pookulangara, S., & Shephard, A. (2013). Slow fashion movement: Understanding consumer perceptions—An exploratory study. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 20(2), 200-206.
- Rashid, M. S. (2017). Weakening the effect of unfavorable country of origin: A process-and parameter-associated theoretical framework. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 30(2), 87-98.
- Rashid, M. S., & Byun, S. E. (2018). Are consumers willing to go the extra mile for fair trade products made in a developing country? A comparison with made in USA products at different prices. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 41, 201-210.
- Ratnayake, N., & Jayawickrama, D. C. (2016). Manifestation of Ethical Consumption Behaviour through Five Precepts of Buddhism. In *Leadership and Personnel Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1591-1611). IGI Global.
- Renard, M. C. (1999). The interstices of globalization: The example of fair coffee. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39(4), 484-500.
- Rudell, F. (2006). Shopping with a social conscience: Consumer attitudes toward sweatshop labor. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 24(4), 282-296.
- Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 225-243.
- Seuring, S., & Müller, M. (2008). From a literature review to a conceptual framework for sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(15), 1699-1710.
- Shah, D. V., McLeod, D. M., Kim, E., Lee, S. Y., Gotlieb, M. R., Ho, S. S., & Breivik, H. (2007). Political consumerism: How communication and consumption orientations drive "lifestyle politics". *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611(1), 217-235.

- Shaw, D., & Clarke, I. (1999). Belief formation in ethical consumer groups: an exploratory study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 17(2), 109-120.
- Shaw, D., Hogg, G., Wilson, E., Shiu, E., & Hassan, L. (2006). Fashion victim: the impact of fair trade concerns on clothing choice. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 14(4), 427-440.
- Shaw, D., McMaster, R., & Newholm, T. (2016). Care and commitment in ethical consumption: An exploration of the 'attitude-behaviour gap'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(2), 251-265.
- Shaw, D., & Moraes, C. (2009). Voluntary simplicity: an exploration of market interactions. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(2), 215-223.
- Shaw, D., & Newholm, T. (2002). Voluntary simplicity and the ethics of consumption. *Psychology & Marketing*, 19(2), 167-185.
- Shaw, D., & Shiu, E. (2002). An assessment of ethical obligation and self-identity in ethical consumer decision-making: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 26(4), 286-293.
- Shaw, D., & Shiu, E. (2003). Ethics in consumer choice: a multivariate modelling approach. *European journal of marketing*, 37(10), 1485-1498.
- Shaw, D., Shiu, E., Hassan, L., Bekin, C., & Hogg, G. (2007). Intending to be ethical: An examination of consumer choice in sweatshop avoidance. *Association for Consumer Research*, 34, 31-38.
- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-behaviour relations: a conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 1-36.
- Shen, B., Wang, Y., Lo, C. K. Y., & Shum, M. (2012). The impact of ethical fashion on consumer purchase behaviour. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 234-245.
- 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), 71-82.
- Smith, G. (1990). How green is my valley?. *Marketing and Research Today*, 18(2), 76-82.
- Steinrücken, T., & Jaenichen, S. (2007). The fair trade idea: Towards an economics of social labels. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 30(3), 201-217.
- Stolle, D., Hooghe, M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the supermarket: Political consumerism as a form of political participation. *International Political Science Review*, 26(3), 245-269.
- Strømsnes, K. (2009) 'Political Consumerism: A Substitute for or Supplement to Conventional Political Participation?', *Journal of Civil Society*, 5(3), 303-14.
- Strong, C. (1996). Features contributing to the growth of ethical consumerism- a preliminary investigation. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 14(5), 5-13.
- Strong, C. (1997). The problems of translating fair trade principles into consumer purchase behaviour. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 15(1), 32-37.
- Tallontire, A. (2000). Partnerships in fair trade: reflections from a case study of Café Direct. *Development in Practice*, 10(2), 166-177.
- Tallontire, A. (2002). Challenges facing fair trade: which way now?. *Small Enterprise Development*, 13(3), 12-24.
- Terragni, L. (2007). From the White Label campaign to the No sweat initiatives. A journey at the roots of political consumerism. In P. Repo & E. Pylvanainen (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Nordic Consumer Policy Research Conference 2007: Towards a new consumer policy?* (pp. 103-111). Helsinki: The Nordic Consumer Policy Research Conference.

- Titus, P. A., & Bradford, J. L. (1996). Reflections on consumer sophistication and its impact on ethical business practice. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 30(1), 170-194.
- Turker, D., & Altuntas, C. (2014). Sustainable supply chain management in the fast fashion industry: An analysis of corporate reports. *European Management Journal*, 32(5), 837-849.
- Uusitalo, O., & Oksanen, R. (2004). Ethical consumerism: a view from Finland. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 28(3), 214-221.
- Valor, C. (2007). The influence of information about labour abuses on consumer choice of clothes: a grounded theory approach. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(7-8), 675-695.
- Vehmas, K., Raudaskoski, A., Heikkilä, P., Harlin, A., & Mensonen, A. (2018). Consumer attitudes and communication in circular fashion. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 22(3), 286-300.
- Vermeir, I., & Verbeke, W. (2008). Sustainable food consumption among young adults in Belgium: Theory of planned behaviour and the role of confidence and values. *Ecological Economics*, 64(3), 542-553.
- Vining, J., & Ebreo, A. (1992). Predicting recycling behavior from global and specific environmental attitudes and changes in recycling opportunities. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1580-1607.
- Vitell, S. J. (2003). Consumer ethics research: Review, synthesis and suggestions for the future. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(1-2), 33-47.
- Vitell, S. J., & Muncy, J. (2005). The Muncy–Vitell consumer ethics scale: A modification and application. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62(3), 267-275.
- Wang, E. S. T., & Chen, Y. C. (2019). Effects of perceived justice of fair trade organizations on consumers' purchase intention toward fair trade products. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 50, 66-72.
- Wiederhold, M., & Martinez, L. F. (2018). Ethical consumer behaviour in Germany: The attitude-behaviour gap in the green apparel industry. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42(4), 419-429.
- World Fair Trade Organization (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://wfto.com/who-we-are>.
- Zamwel, E., Sasson-Levy, O., & Ben-Porat, G. (2014). Voluntary simplifiers as political consumers: Individuals practicing politics through reduced consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14(2), 199-217.
- Zavestoski, S. (2002). The social–psychological bases of anticonsumption attitudes. *Psychology & Marketing*, 19(2), 149-165.