



The Socially Conscious Consumer

Author(s): W. Thomas Anderson, Jr. and William H. Cunningham

Source: *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Jul., 1972), pp. 23-31

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1251036>

Accessed: 15-10-2019 13:18 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Marketing*

The Socially Conscious Consumer

W. THOMAS ANDERSON, JR.
and
WILLIAM H. CUNNINGHAM

Who are the socially conscious consumers?
This article typologically classifies socially conscious consumers and evaluates the relative sensitivity of demographic and sociopsychological variables in discriminating degree of social consciousness.

• ABOUT THE AUTHORS.

W. Thomas Anderson, Jr. and William H. Cunningham are assistant professors of marketing administration in the College of Business Administration, The University of Texas at Austin.

Journal of Marketing, Vol. 36 (July, 1972), pp. 23-31.

A CENTRAL question confronting corporate management today concerns the viability of social activism as a short-run marketing strategy. Some continue to see the requirements of profitability and of social action as essentially irreconcilable.¹ Social activism, in their view, simply does not yield a high rate of return in any conventional economic sense, or falls more properly within the domain of governmental or regulatory responsibility. Others, however, argue that with further amplification in the demands for social and environmental responsibility the cost to the firm of ignoring the social and environmental context in which it operates may not be profit; the cost may well be survival.²

Thus, the issue has shifted from one of corporate social responsibility to a more conventional market segmentation problem: Which consumers constitute the market for products, services, or

1. Milton Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits," *The New York Times Magazine* (September 13, 1970), pp. 32-33, 123.

2. See Lee Adler, "Symbiotic Marketing," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 44 (November-December, 1966), pp. 59-72; Robert W. Austin, "Responsibility for Social Change," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 43 (July-August, 1965), pp. 45-52; Daniel Bell, "The Corporation and Society in the 1970's," *The Public Interest*, Vol. 24 (Summer, 1971), pp. 5-32; John Davenport, "Bank of America is Not for Burning," *Fortune*, Vol. 83 (January, 1971), pp. 90-93, 152; E. T. Grether, "Business Responsibility Toward the Market," *California Management Review*, Vol. 12 (Fall, 1969), pp. 33-42; Philip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman, "Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July, 1971), pp. 3-12; Robert J. Lavidge, "The Growing Responsibilities of Marketing," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 34 (January, 1970), pp. 25-28; William Lazer, "Marketing's Changing Social Relationships," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 33 (January, 1969), pp. 3-9; Theodore Levitt, "Why Business Always Loses," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 46 (March-April, 1968), pp. 81-89; Sidney J. Levy and Philip Kotler, "Beyond Marketing: The Furthering Concept," *California Management Review*, Vol. 12 (Winter, 1969), pp. 67-73; Rodman C. Rockefeller, "Turn Public Problems to Private Account," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 49 (January-February, 1971), pp. 131-138; and Dow Votaw and S. Prakash Sethi, "Do We Need a New Corporate Response to a Changing Social Environment?" *California Management Review*, Vol. 12 (Fall, 1969), pp. 3-31.

other corporate actions that promote social and/or environmental well-being? Who, in other words, are the socially conscious consumers? This study provides a partial answer to these questions.

Research Objectives

Markets are currently segmented principally on the basis of demographic and behavioral variables.³ Personality or sociopsychological attributes, however, have received increasing emphasis as potentially more sensitive criteria for market segmentation, prompting research into the relative effectiveness of demographic, behavioral, and sociopsychological attributes in distinguishing product preference or choice. Results have been mixed.⁴

With growing consumer sensitivity to social and environmental problems, market segmentation based on consumers' societal orientation is emerging; markets will be evaluated [increasingly] according to the degree to which consumers accept the consumer-citizen concept and buy as individuals concerned not only with their personal satisfactions, but also with societal [and environmental] well-being. . . It is through the analysis of [social and] environmental developments and through new marketing policies that management responds to the pressures and opportunities presented by social/environmental change.⁵

Several studies have focused on consumer behavior in response to corporate actions in pollution abatement or reclamation of wasted human resources. Kassarian's research, for example, revealed that "with a good product based on ecological concerns, the potential for a marketer seems to be impressive." Consumers in general appeared

3. Eugene J. Kelley, "Marketing's Changing Social/Environmental Role," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July, 1971), p. 1.

4. See Robert P. Brody and Scott M. Cunningham, "Personality Variables and the Consumer Decision Process," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 5 (February, 1968), pp. 50-57; James F. Engel, David T. Kollat, and Roger D. Blackwell, "Personality Measures and Marketing Segmentation," *Business Horizons*, Vol. 12 (June, 1969), pp. 61-70; Franklin B. Evans, "Psychological and Objective Factors in the Prediction of Brand Choice: Ford versus Chevrolet," *Journal of Business*, Vol. 41 (October, 1968), pp. 445-459; Franklin B. Evans and Harry V. Roberts, "Fords, Chevrolets, and the Problem of Discrimination," *Journal of Business*, Vol. 36 (April, 1963), pp. 242-249; Robert Ferber, "Brand Choice and Social Stratification," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, Vol. 2 (February, 1962), pp. 71-78; Ronald E. Frank, William E. Massy, and Thomas M. Lodahl, "Purchasing Behavior and Personal Attributes," *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 2 (December, 1969), pp. 15-24; and Stuart U. Rich and Subhash C. Jain, "Social Class and Life Cycle as Predictors of Shopping Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 5 (February, 1968), pp. 41-49.

5. Same reference as footnote 3.

to be willing to try a pollution-reducing gasoline at premium prices.⁶

Henion echoed these conclusions:

It would appear that a latent demand for [ecologically relevant] buying information exists and that when it is presented [even] passively, buying behavior may be predictably modified.⁷

Kassarjian further noted, however, that "it [was] apparent from [the] study that there is no simple segmentation variable other than the attitude [toward pollution abatement] itself."⁸ Demographic and sociopsychological variables proved uniformly weak in discriminating degree of consumer concern over environmental pollution.

The important variable of concern to the marketer is not related to the usual segmentation criteria, but rather the level of concern about the issue at hand, whether it be nonreturnable bottles, high-phosphate detergents, aluminum cans, or excessive use of paper bags dispensed at supermarkets.⁹

Although these and other studies confirm that consumers differ in degree of concern over pollution and social inequality, none is sufficient to allow market segmentation on the basis of demographic and/or sociopsychological attributes or consumption behavior associated with social and environmental consciousness. Indeed, Kassarian's study offers only discouragement on this point. Hence, the major objective of the present study was to determine the extent to which consumers who differ by degree of social consciousness may be distinguished by selected demographic and sociopsychological attributes, in order to provide a foundation for market segmentation and criteria to gauge the probable effectiveness of alternative marketing strategies.

Given the above objective, the following research hypotheses were felt to be meaningful:

1. Consumers exhibiting a high degree of social consciousness differ significantly from consumers who do not on selected demographic attributes.
2. Consumers displaying a high degree of social consciousness differ significantly from consumers who do not on selected sociopsychological attributes.

Procedure

Sampling Frame

In April, 1971, a self-administered questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 1,200 Austin,

6. Harold H. Kassarian, "Incorporating Ecology into Marketing Strategy: The Case of Air Pollution," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July, 1971), p. 65.

7. Karl E. Henion, "The Effect of Ecologically Relevant Information on Detergent Sales," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 9 (February, 1972), p. 14.

8. Same reference as footnote 6.

9. Same reference as footnote 6.

Texas households developed from the 1971 Austin metropolitan area telephone directory; 412 questionnaires were completed and returned in useable form, with the lowest socioeconomic strata slightly underrepresented. The survey instrument contained questions not relating to the dependent and independent variables reported in the research. Subjects were told they were participating in a study sponsored by the Department of Marketing at The University of Texas. Anonymity of responses was assured. Given the scope of the questionnaire and the time and financial constraints under which the research was conducted, a mail survey was considered the only viable option.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable consisted of the eight-item Social Responsibility Scale developed by Berkowitz and Daniels and further tested by Berkowitz and Lutterman.¹⁰ The scale is reported to measure an individual's traditional social responsibility; i.e., the willingness of an individual to help other persons even when there is nothing to be gained for himself. Berkowitz and Lutterman's research indicates that individuals who score high on the Social Responsibility Scale are more likely to (1) make financial contributions to religious and educational institutions; (2) be active in community, church, or other organizations or activities; (3) show intense interest in national and local political events; and (4) vote in elections, and know the names of contending candidates. However, subjects who score high on the test are also more likely to oppose government intervention in unemployment problems and are more likely to be opposed to extending social security.¹¹ Therefore, it can be assumed that socially conscious individuals, whose orientations are reflected in a variety of socially responsible behaviors, would manifest social consciousness in consumption decisions. Hence, it is reasonable to expect that socially conscious individuals would be more sensitive to and more likely to purchase products geared toward the enhancement of social or environmental welfare.

The Berkowitz-Daniels Social Responsibility Scale required subjects to indicate their extent of agreement along a five-point continuum from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with each

of the below listed items. The socially responsible direction is indicated in parentheses.

1. It is no use worrying about current events or public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyway. (Disagree)
2. Every person should give some of his time for the good of his town or country. (Agree)
3. Our country would be a lot better off if we didn't have so many elections and people didn't have to vote so often. (Disagree)
4. Letting your friends down is not so bad because you can't do good all the time for everybody. (Disagree)
5. It is the duty of each person to do his job the very best he can. (Agree)
6. People would be a lot better off if they could live far away from other people and never have to do anything for them. (Disagree)
7. At school I usually volunteered for special projects. (Agree)
8. I feel very bad when I have failed to finish a job I promised I would do. (Agree)

The Berkowitz-Daniels scale was derived in part from a personality scale developed by Harris, which was highly similar to a scale developed by Gough, McClosky, and Meehl.¹² The Harris scale was designed to contrast the attitudinal responses of school children who had a reputation for socially responsible behavior with students who did not have such a reputation. The Gough et al. scale was a social responsibility index which utilized items similar to the Harris scale to measure socially responsible attitudes among high school and college students. The responsible students were characterized as having a "deep concern over broader ethical and moral problems, . . . a strong sense of justice, with a rather high, but somewhat rigid, set of self demands and standards . . . and a strong and unflagging sense of confidence in self and in the basic rightfulness of the larger social world."¹³ The validity of the Gough et al. scale is substantiated by laboratory findings.¹⁴

Berkowitz and Daniels' index was constructed by combining items from the Harris scale with new test items developed by Berkowitz and Daniels. This pool of test items was subjected to several item analysis tests, using college students as a sample. Berkowitz and Daniels then selected eight items which were administered to 766 Wis-

10. Leonard Berkowitz and Louise R. Daniels, "Affecting the Salience of the Social Responsibility Norm," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68 (March, 1964), pp. 275-281; and Leonard Berkowitz and Kenneth G. Lutterman, "The Traditional Socially Responsible Personality," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 32 (Summer, 1968), pp. 169-185.

11. Berkowitz and Lutterman, same reference as footnote 10.

12. Dale B. Harris, "A Scale for Measuring Attitudes of Social Responsibility in Children," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 55 (November, 1957), pp. 322-326; and Harrison G. Gough, Herbert McClosky, and Paul E. Meehl, "A Personality Scale for Social Responsibility," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 47 (January, 1952), pp. 73-80.

13. Gough, McClosky, and Meehl, same reference as footnote 12, at p. 77.

14. Berkowitz and Lutterman, same reference as footnote 10, at p. 174.

consin adults by the University of Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. Analysis of the data indicated that the scale was internally quite consistent.¹⁵ The social responsibility test was scored in a Likert manner. Respondents were classified as belonging to the upper or lower half of the sample according to their test scores.¹⁶

Independent Variables

The independent variables consisted of six demographic and six sociopsychological variables. The demographic variables consisted of (1) occupation of the household head; (2) total family income for 1970; (3) education of the household head; (4) family socioeconomic status (the weighted average of occupation, education, income);¹⁷ (5) age of the household head; and (6) stage in the family life cycle (indexed by the age of oldest child). These were selected because they represent generally accepted demographic segmentation criteria. The following sociopsychological variables were included: (1) Alienation—a feeling of isolation from one's community, society, and/or culture;¹⁸ (2) dogmatism—one's degree of open- or close-mindedness;¹⁹ (3) conservatism—one's adherence to traditional attitudes and values;²⁰ (4) status consciousness—a concern for social recognition, esteem, or prestige;²¹ (5) cosmopolitanism—a global, nonparochial perspective and orientation;²² and (6) personal competence—

a feeling of mastery of one's personal life and environment.²³

The sociopsychological variables ranged from a six-item alienation test to a ten-item dogmatism test. Each of the six sociopsychological scales was scored in a Likert manner. These variables were selected because several had been previously employed in consumer behavior research²⁴ and appeared to the authors to be significantly related to one's likely level of social consciousness.

Data Analysis

Linear discriminant analysis was used to analyze the data.²⁵ This technique permits the analyst to examine a set of independent variables to determine which, if any, are able to distinguish between two or more predetermined dependent variables or classification categories. This is accomplished by letting the individual's discriminant score be a linear function of the independent variables and then classifying the respondent as belonging to one of the categories based on his respective discriminant score and the discriminant classification boundary.²⁶

A strong upward bias, which results in an overstated percentage of the respondents correctly classified, develops with discriminant analysis if the discriminant coefficients from one sample are used to compute the discriminant scores from the same sample. This problem can be alleviated by dividing the sample into two subsamples. The discriminant coefficients are derived from the first subsample and are used to compute the discriminant scores from the second subsample.²⁷

The predictive power of the several sets of independent variables was tested by drawing a random subsample of 60% of the 412 respondents. From this sample discriminant coefficients were developed which were then used to compute the discriminant scores for the remaining 40% of the

15. Berkowitz and Lutterman, same reference as footnote 14.

16. Precedents for dichotomizing the respondents in this manner and for using linear discriminant analysis to analyze the dichotomized data may be found in John Harvey, "What Makes a Best Seller?" in *Motivation and Market Behavior*, Robert Ferber and Hugh G. Wales, eds. (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1958), pp. 361-381; in Robert Hogan, Donald Mankin, John Conway, and Sherman Fox, "Personality Correlates of Undergraduate Marijuana Use," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 35 (August, 1970), pp. 58-63; and in W. T. Tucker and John J. Painter, "Personality and Product Use," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 45 (October, 1961), pp. 325-329.

17. U. S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Socioeconomic Status*. Final Report PC (2)-5C (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

18. Russell Middleton, "Alienation, Race, and Education," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28 (December, 1963), pp. 973-977.

19. Verling G. Troidahl and Fredric A. Powell, "A Short-form Dogmatism Scale for Use in Field Studies," *Social Forces*, Vol. 44 (December, 1965), pp. 211-214.

20. Herbert McClosky, "Conservatism and Personality," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 52 (March, 1958), pp. 27-45.

21. Walter C. Kaufman, "Status, Authoritarianism, and Anti-Semitism," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42 (January, 1957), pp. 379-382.

22. Thomas R. Dye, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics," *Social Forces*, Vol. 41 (March, 1963), pp. 239-246.

23. Angus Campbell, Paul E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, *The American Voter* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960).

24. See Jacob Jacoby, "Personality and Innovation Prone-ness," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 8 (May, 1971), pp. 244-247; William H. Cunningham and William J. E. Crissy, "Market Segmentation by Motivation and Attitude," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 9 (February, 1972), pp. 100-102; Douglas S. Longman and Henry O. Pruden, "Alienation from the Market Place: A Study in Black, Brown and White," in *Combined Proceedings 1971 Spring and Fall Conferences*, Fred C. Allvine, ed. (Chicago, Ill.: American Marketing Association), pp. 616-619.

25. Donald J. Veldman, *FORTAN Programming for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967), pp. 268-279.

26. Donald G. Morrison, "On the Interpretation of Discriminant Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 6 (May, 1969), pp. 156-163.

27. Ronald E. Frank, William F. Massy, and Donald G. Morrison, "Bias in Multiple Discriminant Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 2 (August, 1965), pp. 250-258.

sample. In order to avoid the problem of an unrepresentative random sample, this process was repeated four times for each set of independent variables. The results of each replication are reported in Table 1. This table will be discussed in greater detail later in the article.

The demographic variables were examined first, the sociopsychological variables second, and the combined demographic and sociopsychological variables third. It was felt that an independent examination of the demographic and sociopsychological variables would make it possible to derive some conclusions as to the research hypotheses.

Findings

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables were able to differentiate between the high and the low socially responsible consumers. As Table 2 indicates the independent variables "occupation of the household head," "socioeconomic status," and "age of the household head" yielded consistently strong correlations with the discriminant scores for each of the four replications. The correlation coefficients show only how strongly the particular variables relate to the discriminant score. They do not indicate whether a particular independent variable is capable of discriminating between the respondent groups. Rather they merely indicate a measure of the part the respective variables play in whatever discrimination is achieved. The demographic variables were scaled such that a correlation of > 0 implies that the variable is associated with high social responsibility, while a correlation of < 0 implies that the variable is associated with low social responsibility.

The F-ratio column in Table 2 shows the results of an F-test of the differences between group means for each of the six demographic variables. This is a test of individual attributes rather than a multivariate test. The same demographic variables which had high correlations with the discriminant scores found statistically significant differences between the two respondent groups. The only exception was the variable "socioeconomic status" in the second replication which was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The high socially responsible group was characterized by higher occupational attainment and socioeconomic status, and by younger household heads than was the low socially responsible group.

The results of the four cross-validated replications of the discriminant analysis which were performed on the six demographic variables are presented in Table 1-I. The second column in Table 1-I gives the results of an F-test of the Wilks' lambda value, which is a test of the ability of the discriminant function to significantly differentiate the high and low socially responsible groups.

Statistically, Wilks' lambda takes the following form:

$$\Lambda = |W| / |T|$$

where W represents the pooled within-group deviation score cross-products matrix and T represents the total sample deviation score cross-products matrix.²⁸ The first, second, and fourth replications were significant at the .05 level, while the third replication was significant at the .01 level. The Wilks' lambda tests were based on the 60% of the sample which was drawn independently four times to determine the discriminant coefficients for each replication.

Since the respondent groups were of equal size it would have been expected that 50% of the subjects in the cross-validated samples would have been correctly classified by chance. The third column in Table 1-I presents the results of a t-test of the significance of the percent of the subjects correctly classified. Because the respondents in the cross-validated samples were not included in the 60% samples which made up the discriminant coefficients, the data is effectively cross validated.

The second and third cross-validated replications were significant at the .01 level, while the fourth replication was significant at the .05 level. The first replication was not statistically significant. The findings of the t- and F-tests would seem to indicate that the demographic variables were able to differentiate between the high and low socially conscious respondents.

Sociopsychological Variables

The sociopsychological variables appear to be more effective in differentiating between the high and low socially responsible consumers than were the demographic variables. As Table 3 shows, dogmatism, conservatism, status consciousness, and cosmopolitanism all had strong correlations with the discriminant scores. The sociopsychological variables were scaled such that a correlation of > 0 implies that the variable is associated with high social responsibility, whereas a correlation of < 0 is associated with low social responsibility. Alienation and personal competence were not as strongly correlated with the discriminant scores as were the other sociopsychological variables.

The second column in Table 3 shows that each of the six sociopsychological variables was able to differentiate significantly between the high and the low socially responsible groups. The F-test of the difference in group means indicates that dogmatism, conservatism, status consciousness, and cosmopolitanism found significant differences at the .001 level, while personal competence was significant at the .01 level, and alienation at the

28. William W. Cooley and Paul R. Lohnes, *Multivariate Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 61.

TABLE 1
F-TEST AND T-TEST AND DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES

Repli- cation	I Demographic Variables			II Sociopsychological Variables			III Demographic Plus Sociopsychological Variables		
	F- ratio	Percent Correctly Classified	Value of t ^d	F- ratio	Percent Correctly Classified	Value of t ^d	F- ratio	Percent Correctly Classified	Value of t ^d
1	2.52 ^a	55.5%	1.42	7.42 ^c	62.8%	3.29 ^b	4.64 ^c	55.5%	1.42
2	2.65 ^a	62.8%	3.29 ^b	5.62 ^c	72.6%	5.80 ^c	3.68 ^c	72.6%	5.80 ^c
3	3.30 ^b	60.4%	2.67 ^b	9.44 ^c	70.7%	5.32 ^c	5.84 ^c	73.2%	5.96 ^c
4	2.64 ^a	58.5%	2.19 ^a	7.24 ^c	71.3%	5.48 ^c	4.23 ^c	62.8%	3.29 ^b
Average Correct Classifi- cation		59.4%			69.5%			66.0%	

^aSignificant at the .05 level

^bSignificant at the .01 level

^cSignificant at the .001 level

^dt = $\frac{\text{proportion correctly classified} - .5}{\sqrt{\frac{.5(1 - .5)}{n}}}$

$$\sqrt{\frac{.5(1 - .5)}{n}}$$

TABLE 2
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH THE DISCRIMINANT SCORE AND F-TEST FOR THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variables	Run 1		Run 2		Run 3		Run 4	
	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio
Occupation of the household head	.79	9.34 ^b	.72	8.19 ^b	.62	7.40 ^b	.62	5.98 ^a
Annual family income	.30	1.35	.24	.88	.32	1.92	.38	2.22
Education of the household head	.45	3.03	.41	2.57	.56	6.08 ^a	.39	2.34
Socioeconomic status	.54	4.22 ^a	.48	3.60	.55	5.73 ^a	.60	5.56 ^b
Age of the household head	-.58	4.95 ^a	-.70	7.68 ^b	-.72	10.01 ^b	-.84	11.39 ^b
Stage in the family life cycle	-.19	.55	-.14	.28	.11	.21	-.09	.13

^aSignificant at the .05 level

^bSignificant at the .01 level

TABLE 3
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH THE DISCRIMINANT SCORE AND F-TEST FOR THE SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES

Variables	Run 1		Run 2		Run 3		Run 4	
	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio
Alienation	-.58	13.48 ^c	-.39	4.51 ^a	-.59	17.92 ^c	-.48	8.99 ^b
Dogmatism	-.80	27.47 ^c	-.66	14.04 ^c	-.85	39.67 ^c	-.81	26.97 ^c
Conservatism	-.65	17.30 ^c	-.73	17.67 ^c	-.64	20.38 ^c	-.71	20.65 ^c
Status Con- sciousness	-.65	17.27 ^c	-.71	16.39 ^c	-.65	21.24 ^c	-.65	16.96 ^c
Personal Competence	-.42	7.04 ^b	-.56	9.95 ^b	-.46	10.34 ^b	-.46	8.22 ^b
Cosmopolitanism	.76	24.51 ^c	.79	20.84 ^c	.66	21.87 ^c	.83	28.68 ^c

^aSignificant at the .05 level

^bSignificant at the .01 level

^cSignificant at the .001 level

TABLE 4
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS WITH THE DISCRIMINANT SCORE AND
F-TEST FOR THE DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES

Variables	Run 1		Run 2		Run 3		Run 4	
	Correlation Coefficient	F-ratio						
Occupation of the household head	.44	9.33 ^a	.45	8.19 ^b	.36	7.40 ^b	.37	5.98 ^a
Annual family income	.17	1.35	.15	.88	.19	1.92	.23	2.22
Education of the household head	.25	3.02	.26	2.58	.33	6.08 ^a	.23	2.33
Socioeconomic status	.52	13.48 ^c	.34	4.51 ^a	.54	17.93 ^c	.45	8.99 ^b
Age of the household head	-.32	4.95 ^a	-.44	7.67 ^b	-.41	10.01 ^b	-.50	11.39 ^b
Stage in the family life cycle	-.10	.55	-.08	.28	.06	.21	.05	.12
Alienation	-.72	27.47 ^c	-.58	14.03 ^c	-.78	39.67 ^c	-.74	26.97 ^c
Dogmatism	-.57	17.30 ^c	-.65	17.68 ^c	-.58	20.39 ^c	-.66	20.65 ^c
Conservatism	-.59	17.27 ^c	-.62	16.39 ^c	-.59	21.24 ^c	-.60	16.96 ^c
Status Consciousness	-.38	7.05 ^b	-.49	9.95 ^b	-.42	10.35 ^b	-.43	8.22 ^b
Personal Competence	-.69	24.51 ^c	-.70	20.84 ^c	-.60	21.87 ^c	-.76	28.69 ^c
Cosmopolitanism	.30	4.22 ^a	.30	3.60	.32	5.72 ^a	.35	5.56 ^a

^aSignificant at the .05 level

^bSignificant at the .01 level

^cSignificant at the .001 level

.05 level. The high socially responsible group was more cosmopolitan, but less alienated, less dogmatic, less conservative, less status conscious, and less personally competent than was the low socially responsible group.

Table 1-II presents the results of the discriminant analysis of the sociopsychological variables. As column one indicates, each replication's F-test of the respective Wilks' lambda value was significant at the .001 level. This would tend to indicate that the discriminant function was able to differentiate between the two respondent groups.

The second column in Table 1-II indicates that the percentage of the cross-validated sample correctly classified tended to be higher when the sociopsychological variables were used to distinguish the groups than when the demographic variables were used. The mean percent correctly classified for the sociopsychological variables was 69.5, while the mean percent correctly classified for the demographic variables was 59.4. The t-test of the percent correctly classified for the sociopsychological variables was significant at the .01 level for the first replication and at the .001 level for the second, third, and fourth replications.

Sociopsychological and Demographic Variables

The sociopsychological and demographic variables combined were not as effective in differen-

tiating high from low socially responsible groups as were the sociopsychological variables alone. Table 4 lists the correlations of the variables with the discriminant function and the F-test of the differences between the group means. It is apparent that the same variables which correlated highly with the discriminant scores in the previous tests correlated highly with the discriminant score when all 12 variables were utilized. The statistical differences between group means remained essentially unchanged from the previous tests.

Table 1-III shows that the F-ratio tests of the Wilks' lambda values were significant at the .001 level for each of the four replications. The mean percent correctly classified for the combined sets of independent variables was 66.0, which was less than when only the sociopsychological variables were utilized. This was expected because it was previously found that the demographic variables were not as effective in differentiating the high and low socially conscious respondents as were the sociopsychological variables. That is, combining both categories of independent variables resulted in a loss in the power of sociopsychological variables to differentiate between high and low socially conscious consumers. The t-test of the significance of the percentage correctly classified was significant at the .001 level for the second and third

TABLE 5
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED VARIABLES AND SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Variable	High Social Consciousness	Low Social Consciousness
Occupation of the household head	Higher status occupations	Lower status occupations
Annual family income	N.S.	N.S.
Education of the household head	N.S.	N.S.
Socioeconomic status	Above average socioeconomic status	Average and lower socioeconomic status
Age of the household head	Pre-middle age	Middle age and older
Stage in the family life cycle	N.S.	N.S.
Alienation	Less alienated	More alienated
Dogmatism	Less dogmatic	More dogmatic
Conservatism	Less conservative	More conservative
Status Consciousness	Less status conscious	More status conscious
Personal Competence	Less personally competent	More personally competent
Cosmopolitanism	More cosmopolitan	Less cosmopolitan

cross-validated replications, and at the .01 level for the fourth replication. The first replication was not significant.

Conclusions

The demographic variables analyzed provided partial support for the first research hypothesis. Socioeconomic status was found to be significant in discriminating between high and low social responsibility; social consciousness tended to vary directly with socioeconomic status. Stage in the family life cycle, by contrast, failed to significantly discriminate respondents as to degree of social responsibility. Occupation and age of the household head proved to be highly sensitive discriminators of social responsibility, social consciousness varying directly with occupational status and inversely with age. Education of the household head produced mixed results with only one instance of significant discrimination. Annual family income was uniformly poor as a discriminator of social responsibility. In general, it would appear that socioeconomic status, occupation, and age of the household head provide significant discriminators of social consciousness.

Of the sociopsychological variables analyzed, dogmatism, conservatism, cosmopolitanism, and status concern proved equally effective as discriminators of social responsibility, tending to substantiate the second hypothesis. Social consciousness tended to vary inversely with dogmatism, conservatism, and status consciousness, and directly with cosmopolitanism. Alienation and

personal competence were only slightly less effective in discriminating degree of social responsibility; both varied inversely with social consciousness. Overall, the sociopsychological variables analyzed yielded more sensitive discriminators of social consciousness than either the demographic variables alone or the demographic and sociopsychological variables combined.

Briefly, the image of the socially conscious consumer emerging from the research is that of a pre-middle age adult of relatively high occupational attainment and socioeconomic status (see Table 5). He is typically more cosmopolitan, but less dogmatic, less conservative, less status conscious, less alienated, and less personally competent than his less socially conscious counterpart. Alternatively, consumers displaying low social consciousness may be characterized as intermediate or lower in occupational attainment and in socioeconomic status, and are of middle age or older. They are characteristically more dogmatic, more conservative, more status conscious, more alienated, more personally competent, and less cosmopolitan than are socially conscious consumers.

The findings of the research support the conclusion that markets can be segmented on the basis of consumers' social consciousness. Both demographic and sociopsychological attributes provide criteria for market segmentation, although it would appear that sociopsychological variables are more sensitive discriminators of social consciousness.

The present findings suggest some directions for further research. It would be useful to de-

termine whether consumption patterns are different between high and low scorers on the Berkowitz-Daniels Social Responsibility Scale, particularly with respect to products and/or brands which claim environmental benefits. Specific hypotheses between degree of social consciousness and various aspects of buyer behavior may be derived from the sociopsychological and demographic correlates of social consciousness. For example, it was found that socially conscious consumers appear to be open-minded, aware, and

exhibit a general orientation toward progress or change. But are they willing to pay a higher price for products and services which enhance social or environmental well-being? Does their open-mindedness and progressiveness result in receptivity to new products which are compatible with the environment? What types of promotional appeals, information channels, and distribution systems are best suited for this particular market? These questions remain unanswered at present, and additional research is needed.

MARKETING MEMO

Consumer Responsibility, a Two-way Street . . .

Business, to survive, must merit the confidence of its customers. If the consumer activists have done nothing else, they have aroused business men and women all over the country to a greater awareness of their responsibility to eliminate the shady practices which flourish on the fringes of the business community. As business people, we cannot afford to close our eyes to violations of sound business principles, and there is much evidence that the business community is accepting increasing responsibility in this direction. . . .

But consumers, too, share the responsibility for ethical standards in the marketplace. Some "perfectly honest" people seem to think it's all right to cheat Business. Defraud the telephone company, for instance, by placing long distance calls for fictitious names which, by pre-arrangement, convey their message. There's the grocery shopper who deliberately damages vegetables; and the shoplifters, who each year, pilfer two and a half billion dollars worth of merchandise from stores in the United States. All such acts cost you and me money as Consumers. The losses from these petty crimes are necessarily part of the cost of doing business and they add to the price we all must pay for the goods and services we buy.

Honesty and integrity thus are mandatory on both sides of the counter if we are to maintain a healthy, mutually beneficial business-consumer relationship.

—Mercedes S. Wood, "Business and the Consumer," *The Journal of Business* (published by the Bureau of Business Research, Seton Hall University), Vol. 10 (December, 1971), pp. 21-25, at p. 23.