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Foreword

"Changes in levels of self-categorization reflect not only differences in views of the self but also different worldviews" (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

When you enter the world of socially responsible consumption, there exists a wide array of products which use the idea of acting ethical as a sales pitch for companies as well as something to engage consumers in purchasing. When you enter the store to buy something that is produced without deprevating society or the environment, do you choose what is normatively ethically correct to enhance a feeling of being a good person, or do you perhaps want to modestly impress the check-out worker with your act of kindness?

If the purpose of buying the product is in its spirit, more than how the functionality of the product performs, we ask the following question; whom are the consumers trying to touch with such a "responsible act"?

Do we live in a world ruled by status and individualism, where one is trying to prove oneself as something bigger than a wasp in an enormous nest of other wasps? Or are we on the contrary, truly engaging for the better of the swarm, putting more emphasis on the well-being of the community more than our personal experience of being "good"?
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Purpose of research: The purpose of this research is to analyze what in theory exists regarding identity, self-image and welfare development and test such notions in relation to responsible consumption among the people of Blumenau, Brazil. The intention with this research is to give further information on how consumers are behaving, also in a certain setting of gender, age and income. The contribution of such is to give suggestions to the marketing departments of different brands strongly connoted to social responsibility, on how they could in the most effective way influence their consumers with their marketing strategy.

Research question: What aspects of the self are certain consumers mostly interested in satisfying through consuming socially responsible products?

Theoretical base: The notions of identity, image and welfare development are presented, and explored under each comparing variable, age, gender and income. The theory of each notion and variable will create hypotheses to guide the empirical research.

Methodology: The research adopts to the most part a deductive approach with certain inductive elements. A qualitative collection of theory is provided and quantitative empirical research is made. A survey has been structured and initiated both electronically and in physical form. The chapter also discusses the benefits and restrictions together with potential biases and a critical review of the chosen methodology.

Empirical research: The primary data collected through the survey is presented in numerous tables along with statistical measurements through SPSS.
Analysis: The analysis is divided into two sections. The first section discusses the notions alone and how they relate to each other as well as individually. The second section compares the notions with the variables and discusses the results of this research with the theoretical base.

Conclusion: In the final chapter the conclusions from the analysis is presented together with the authors’ reflections on the result of the research. Identity proved to be the most important aspect of the self when consuming socially responsible products but in terms of defining the consumer, age, gender and income where in most cases non-significant variables. Differences within the notions suggest further research to define identity in the cultural context of Brazil as well as what variables might be interesting to define the consumers. Apart from suggesting further research, the authors present potential biases in the empirical research.
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1.0 Introduction

In the following chapter we will introduce the topic which the following research problem identification is based upon. This problem will lead us to the research question that is central in these writings. The chapter will be concluded with its purpose and limitations as well as a clarification of important terms that will be often used in the following research.

1.1 Topic discussion

In a world that is getting more and more globalized, the demand for products has taken production and purchase across borders and dramatically increased the need for resources (Zhang & Khare, 2007). The behaviour of mankind is having a devastating effect on the earth’s capacity to support and nurture all its life forms. This is particularly evident in the voracious appetite of consumers in their consumerism behaviour (Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis & Zhao, 2015). The idea of in some way compensating or preventing such deprivation is called social responsibility. Such is according to Lloret (2016) is defined as a way of positioning oneself to adapt and adhere to the restrictions imposed by the economic, social, and environmental systems.

Sustainable development theory emphasizes that economic growth of consumption must be based on a rational exploitation of natural resources and environmental protection. Social responsibility requires people to take on social responsibility to its consumption, society and environment while achieving one's missions (Deng, 2010). The notion that acting responsibly is only a cost, can in many ways be viewed as narrow-minded. Cutting corners by consuming in a manner that might lead to pollution or using cheaper material thanks to poor worker ethics, can decrease the costs today. However, from a long-term perspective the depleading of resources actually increases costs (Elhauge, 2005). It has also been noted by researchers that socially responsible products can function as valuable in their own way (Lloret, 2016).

Lloret (2016) describes these products as a mean of competitive value. It is not just a matter of following regulation, but a mean of gaining attention from doing something good. Virvilaite and Daubaraite (2011) found that marketing professionals emphasize the importance of socially responsible products when regarding consumer’s decision making process. Due to the fact that social responsibility is becoming more popular on a global scale, social responsibility is seen as crucial in creating an attractive corporate image. Acting accordingly can provide a competitive advantage and differentiation, leading to business success (Hackett, 1992; Virvalaite & Daubaraite, 2011). Many researchers agree that social responsibility can work as a way of attracting consumers.

The globalized consumers of today may have a greater need for international products and are consuming more, but they are also more informed. The globalization of products serve a permission on various aspects of life in contemporary society. It has opened up the ability of sharing, from technical innovations, economic development and lifestyles, to communication patterns all over the world. Consumers are aware of big global brands and trends in the world. To consume is often a way of finding identification in the self which becomes a reflection in the choice of products. The heart of the product becomes a reflection of what we want to reflect as individuals (Zhang and Khare, 2007).
1.2 Problem identification

Initial years have been debating whether or not social responsibility is an impetus for product purchase. Previous research coalesces around a fairly clear sense that consumers are more likely to enjoy the products that they perceive to be socially responsible. They also choose them over other products. It is important for companies to understand consumers’ attitudes towards socio-environmentally friendly products (Mostafa, 2007). In recent years, consumers have grown conscious about the environment and are willing to pay a higher price for socio-environmentally friendly products which tells us how we should handle our portraying of such products (Mostafa, 2007); At the same time as consumers are choosing these products, however, there remains a sense that consumers sometimes act irrationally against what they say is intended (Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016). Some say that there is a lack of awareness when purchasing, awareness for what kind of brands actually are the responsible ones (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008).

It may be used as a way to sort out similar products, but in many cases it is the product features that are prioritized in the attraction to a certain product (Fletcher, Drewberry & Goggin, 2001). In cases where social responsibility actually becomes a vital part of consumption is when it is used not as only a complimentary in the product. When responsibility becomes a representation of the entire brand it is when one has incorporated sustainability in the core of the business. If there is a believable connection between the ethical act and the brand, studies have shown that people think fondly of these products and it becomes an important part of their decision (Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016; Kuo & Hamilton, 2015). However, little research has been made regarding the true motives of the self, especially on a global scale (Gleim, Smith, Andrews & Cronin, 2013). Cotte and Trudel (2009) points to the fact that 90% of the consumer studies in this area only relates to North American and European consumers.

A research conducted by Lenartowicz and Roth (2001) found when researching Brazil, especially in separated areas, that the south part of Brazil tended to be much more individualistic and opportunistic in comparison to the other parts of the country. Such gives the argument that culture is an influencing factor in psychological phenomena. Hofstede et al. (2001) made a solid notice where in general, Brazil may conclude as a highly collectivistic country in comparison to other countries when regarding ethical consumer choices. However, research has different opinions depending on the time and context of it (Arnould & Thompson, 2005).

William James argued in the 19th century that material possessions play an important role in defining the self (Zinkhan, 1992; Cisek, Sedikides, Hart, Godwin, Benson & Liversedge, 2014). Since then, numerous studies have been written regarding consumer behaviour and how it relates to the consumption of emotionally charged products (related to status, nostalgia or even discomfort per say). The problem according to Arnould and Thompson (2005), which they concluded when summarizing an overview of the past 20 years within the area of consumer behaviour, is that behaviour can not be described by rational models. The value is almost impossible to summarize in a predictable model since many actions are based on purchase situation, cultural context and the product itself (Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Luna & Gupta, 2001).
1.3 Approaching the problem

When conducting the exploratory research regarding this area, the authors found that the occurring theme within consumer behaviour and value was the notion of *identity, image* and *welfare development*. These terms will be further explained in section 1.4 (definitions) and exemplified in chapter 2 (theory). The first two terms connect to extrinsic self-perspective (Sen et. al., 2016), meaning that it has to do with gaining a sense of accomplishment, or being able to show others of such value. The latter term, welfare development, refers to the act for progress that address social risks of the population, in order to assure a common well-being for all (Cruz-Martinez, 2014). Though a pattern of recurrence was noticed which identified terms, the theory of each notion was often contradictory to another notion or it was not explored further. This takes us to the research gap which Arnould and Thompson (2005) and many others have tried to contribute answers to and this time the authors have chosen to put it in a cultural context. This research reviews the substantial body of work on social responsibility and more clearly, to summarize the diverse findings and explore further on what is the gained value for the consumer when buying socially responsible products.

1.4 Definitions

*Socially responsible consumption* -
The notion of in some way compensating or preventing resource deprivation by consumption and to choose products that are produced to adapt and adhere to the restrictions imposed by economic, social, and environmental systems (Lloret, 2016).

*Extrinsic motives* -
To act on something for the purpose of personal gain and maximizing one's own profit (Cruz-Martinez, 2014).

*Intrinsic motives* -
To act on something for the well-being of others, distancing oneself from personal gains (Cruz-Martinez, 2014).

*Individualistic* -
people of individualistic cultures tend to experience ego-focused emotions such as pride through their actions, because these emotions affirm an individual’s internal state, experience and expression, that is their identity (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

*Collectivistic* -
Decisions are judged as how it is influences our strongest tied relationships with others (Hofstede, 1980, in Bochner, 1994). Individuals seek to define themselves in terms of their immersion in relationships with others and with larger collectives and derive much of their self-evaluation from such social identities (Breckler & Greenwald, 1986; Greenwald & Breckler, 1985 in Brewer & Gardner, 1996).
The self -
The self comes from the synthesis of “I” and “Who I am” in regards to the incoming information from the world. Our beliefs on who we are or want to be, is connected to the internal aspects of self. The self also represents our constructed persona. Such self is socially formulated and varies with each social context, asking questions as ”Who do I want others to perceive me as?” (Wearing, Stevenson & Young, 2010).

Identity -
Individuals with an independent construal of the self tend to define themselves in terms of attributes that make them unique and distinct from others. This self-definition includes copying mental representations of one’s own traits, abilities, motives, values, and the motivation to be independent (Markus & Kitayama 1991; Lee, Aaker & Gardner, 2000).

Self-image -
Our actions are affected by the constellation of thoughts, feelings, and actions concerning the relationship of the self in how it connects to others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Research has shown that the idea of self-image in purchase behavior argues how our product express us in social settings (Kressmann et. al., 2006). Such social settings involve per example the attitudes of friends, family and other groups deemed important to a consumer (Childers & Rao, 1992).

Welfare development -
Having values extended beyond the self and actions become more about societal values rather than merely individual ones (Lorek & Fuchs, 2013). Welfare development emphasize the importance of philanthropy, to act for something other than the self (Scharf, 2009 in Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antunes, 2014).

1.5 Research question

The discussed problems above have identified the following research question:
What aspects of the self are certain consumers mostly interested in satisfying through consuming socially responsible products?

1.6 Purpose of research

The purpose of this research is to analyze what in theory exists regarding identity, self-image and welfare development and test such notions in relation to responsible consumption among the people of Blumenau, Brazil. This type of research has not yet been done. The consumers have yet not been defined and neither their relation to the notions. The idea is that the aspect of interest when regarding the self could differ among certain groups of consumers, both geographically and demographically (Cotte & Trudel, 2009). The intention with this research is to give further information on how consumers are behaving, also in a certain setting of gender, age and income. The contribution of such is to give suggestions to the marketing departments of different brands strongly connoted to social responsibility, on how they could in the most effective way influence their consumers with their marketing strategy.
1.7 Limitations

There is limited understanding about socio-environmentally friendly initiatives in emerging economies (Khare, 2015), including Brazil (Ritter, Borchardt, Vaccaro, Pereira & Almeida, 2014; Cotte & Trudel, 2009). Such intentions are predicted by a personal evaluative construct and a normative construct (Malhotra & McCort, 2001). One can then infer that different cultures have different normative standards, as well as specific individual norms from a culture, suggesting a close connection between culture and behaviour (Triandis, 2001). Understanding the influence of cultural background on moral emotions is important for the success of multinational companies (Erffmeyer, 1999), since it helps them to understand which views on moral behaviour relative to consumption are culturally specific and which are not (Erffmeyer, 1999). The lack of previous research on the understanding of perceived consumer value, in particular Brazil, intrigued the authors in conducting this type of research.

With Brazil being the fifth largest country in the world, with immigrants descending from Europe, Asia and Africa just to name a few, it may be more interesting to look at different regions within the nation rather than to search for a common generalization of Brazil. These represent regional societies generally assumed to differ culturally, economically and socially (Hofstede, de Hilal, Malvezzi, Tanure & Vinken, 2010). This gives the belief that it is more interesting to find differences among the respondents, whereas the authors have chosen to compare age, gender and level of income as factors influencing value perception.

Sen et al. (2016) came across such differences when researching social responsibility. Discussing strict environmental practices, they found that such are more closely linked to companies in the northern areas of Brazil. Social and community practices are more related to companies primarily in the southern and northeastern regions of the country (Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016; Kuo & Hamilton, 2015). Therefore, what the authors believe will raise the generalizability and making this research more reliable, is to apply the limitation a given area - the city of Blumenau, Santa Catarina in Brazil.

1.8 Hypotheses summary

To answer the main research question of this research, the authors will conclude their hypotheses based on three variables taken from theory. When looking at the previous research conducted on the area of consumer behaviour, the authors distinguished two areas of perceived value for the self; consumer values that are more extrinsic and self-centred, such as identity and self-image (Zinkhan, 1992; Cisek, Sedikides, Hart, Godwin, Benson & Liversedge, 2014; Hahnel, Gölz & Spada, 2014), The authors also found a third notion coming across the theory of acting for something intrinsic, which differently from the others, has nothing to do with perception of the self. This is the act for the common good, outside the value of our persona which in research will be noted as welfare development (Cruz-Martinez, 2014).

The variables chosen for comparison of the respondents in Blumenau, are age, gender and income along with identity, self-image and welfare development. The authors conclude the following hypotheses from theory and also two null hypotheses concluded through the lack of theory regarding the corresponding notion:
**Age**

Identity
1. There exists a negative correlation between age and the searched value on identity.

Self-image
2. There exists a positive correlation between age and the searched value on self-image.

Welfare development
3. There exists no statistically significant influence between age and the searched value for welfare development.

**Gender**

Welfare development
1. Women are more concerned on welfare development than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products.

Self-image
2. Men are more concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products.

3. Women are more concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products.

Identity
4. There exists no statistically significant influence between gender and the searched value on identity.

**Income**

Self-image
1. There exists a positive correlation between income and the searched value on self-image.

Identity
2. There exists a positive correlation between income and the searched value on identity

Welfare development
3. People of lower income are more concerned about welfare development than other notions.
2.0 Theoretical base

The following chapter has collected what the authors deem to be relevant theory closely related to the area to research further on. The notions of identity, image and welfare development are presented, and explored under each comparing variable, age, gender and income. The theory of each notion and variable will create hypotheses to guide the empirical research.

2.1 Identity

Often when talking about socially responsible consumption, there is an unrecognized dimension in existing literature. In addition, the socio-environmental considerations to motivate and guide responsible consumers, the presence of a more personal dimension has also been noticed. Individuals with an independent construal of the self tend to define themselves in terms of attributes that make them unique and distinct from others. This self-definition includes copying mental representations of one’s own traits, abilities, motives, values, and the motivation to be independent (Markus & Kitayama 1991; Lee, Aaker & Gardner, 2000). Pro-environmental self-identity refers to individuals possessing a sense of self that embraces socially responsible actions and in turn affects how they consume products (Van Der Werff, Steg & Keizer, 2013).

Markus and Kitayama (1991) argued that people of individualistic cultures tend to experience ego-focused emotions such as pride because these emotions affirm an individual’s internal state, experience and expression - that is their identity (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Arnett, German and Hunt (2003) showed that some people also donate time to feel proud or happy of themselves as a result of supporting a worthy cause. Ego-focused emotions are associated with an individual’s internal state, to the exclusion of others and are consistent with the need for individual awareness, experience, and expression (Aaker & Williams, 1998).

To varying degrees, before deciding to buy a product as well as afterwards, these people will often question the very need for it. This question is not just based on an ecological consciousness, but also because of perceived personal benefits. These consumers wonder, "Is this product me?" (Marchand & Walker, 2008; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2003; Belk, 2010). This suggests that the socially responsible dimensions of a product’s identity are particularly attractive to consumers motivated to define, enhance, and distinguish their sense of self from others, through identification with the product (Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016).

2.2 Self-image

Markus and Kitayama (1991) introduced how our decision making is highly influenced on our self-construal, which differs between cultures. Our actions are affected by the constellation of thoughts, feelings, and actions concerning the relationship of the self to others and the self as distinct from others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Do we define ourselves as individual entities or do we see ourselves through the eyes of others? Until recently, social psychological theories of the self focused on the individuated self-concept - the person's sense of unique identity differentiated from others. Cross-cultural perspectives, however, have brought a renewed interest in the social aspects of the self and the extent to which individuals define themselves in terms of their relationships to others and to social groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988).

Social consumption motivation is concerned with the images of brands and the images of other people who buy/use the brand (Fitzmaurice & Comegys, 2006). Thus, it is associated with social status and
social identity (Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis & Zhao, 2015). The basic assumption behind such self-image congruence, is that consumers use products to express their self-image. Such is the value of the product. Self-congruity refers to the match between consumers ideal and social perception of the self, and the value which products might express in its attributes. Research has shown that the idea of self-image, how our product express us in social settings, is related to consumer attitudes and intentions towards certain products (Kressmann et. al., 2006). Such social settings involve per example the attitudes of friends, family and other groups deemed important to a consumer (Childers & Rao, 1992).

In general, Brazil is a collectivistic culture, where decisions are judged as how it influences our strongest tied relationships with others (Hofstede, 1980, in Bochner, 1994). Individuals seek to define themselves in terms of their immersion in relationships with others and with larger collectives and derive much of their self-evaluation from such social identities (Breckler & Greenwald, 1986; Greenwald & Breckler, 1985 in Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Individuals who identify with their social groups are more likely to engage in sustainable consumption (Lee, Levy & Yap, 2015). It has also been proposed that concerns about environmental quality may primarily embody status group concerns (Buttel & Flinn, 1978). Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni and Antune (2014) noted that the value of acting responsibly is important for the Brazilians to make known for the public, evidently so when discussing per example how corporations choose to display such practices on their websites.

2.3 Welfare development

The previously presented notions are rooted as finding value in a self-defining experience or as an self-expressive such. A third notion talks about the searched value as internalized beyond the self (Minton, Lee, Orth, Kim & Kahle, 2012). Kim and Johnson (2013) found that many consumers in their research support cause-related marketing campaigns for reasons other than personal benefit and realized that it was connected in many ways to cultural context and how we view our responsibilities (Kim & Johnson, 2013). Not only are consumers making more or less modest changes to their way of life and how they choose to consume, but they are doing so out of choice as opposed to coercion of others. These changes are related to reducing environmental impacts and leading a trend towards a popular mainstream existence (Bond, 2005).

When the value of socially responsible products are extended beyond the self, it becomes more about societal values rather than merely individual ones. These people search for long-term values rather than short-term gains and social gambles (Lorek & Fuchs, 2013). The importance of philanthropy, to act for something other than the self, has in Brazilian society been noticeable for a long time. It is considered to have derived from the social inequalities that have historically characterized the country. People with the financial ability, are concerned to donate to foundations and nonprofit organizations designated to improve common welfare (Scharf, 2009 in Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antunes, 2014).

However, the majority of studies show that consumers are reluctant to consume more responsible, even when they are aware of environmental problems and concerned about them. The majority are not willing to dramatically change their consumption behaviour to help resolve these problems or even to modify it (Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis & Zhao, 2015). Research conducted in western and eastern countries have shown that if the perception of how responsible a product is exceeds the strength of the attributes focused on satisfying selfish needs, consumption can actually transcend into
something bigger than the self (Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016). Dermody et al. (2015) argues that further research is needed for other cultures.

Below the authors have chosen to conclude the theory of the self in relation how it has been discussed in terms of individualism as well as ego-focused or societal values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The self</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The self</td>
<td>Self-image</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The others</td>
<td>Welfare Development</td>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 0. A summary on the meaning of the self.

2.4 Age

Previous studies have had a great emphasis on knowledge as an important factor when discussing socio-environmental attitudes. These studies have concluded that there is no significant relationship between age and the knowledge of social responsibility (Arcury, Scollay & Johnson, 1987). When collecting previous research, out of 33 studies gathered on the linkage between knowledge and age, only two have proven to show a significant result that younger members of the population exhibit higher levels of knowledge (Diamantopoulos, Schlegelmilch, Sinkovics & Bohlen, 2003).

Previous research have shown that no matter the age, people tend to have a somewhat knowledge of what socially responsible consumption is about, but when regarding attitudes it was a different discussion (Diamantopoulos et al., 2003). In a survey conducted in the UK (Diamantopoulos et al., 2003), the results proved that age was a variable affecting attitudes on socially responsible consumption, more so in a negative manner. One common explanation for such is that solutions presented to act against social and environmental effect, usually threatens to disrupt existing social order. In many ways, accepting responsible behaviour can seem intrusive of one's identity, possibly requiring substantial changes in traditional values, habitual behaviours, and existing institutions. It is logical to expect youth to support environmental reform and be more acceptive of pro-environmental ideologies more readily than their elders (van Liere & Dunlap, 1980). Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H1: There exists a negative correlation between age and the searched value on identity**

However, this only regards attitude. Younger people seem to lack the necessary resources to transform their positive attitude into behaviour, where older people display a higher level of responsible consumption (van Liere & Dunlap, 1980; Diamantopoulos, Schlegelmilch, Sinkovics & Bohlen, 2003). Schahn (1990) discusses the reason of such being that younger people are living in an era where such consumption is more of a discussed topic, encouraged in both social and academic contexts which makes it a part of forming an adult identity, adjusting to sustainable limitations (Schahn, 1990).
Younger people are likely to state that they will commit more of their resources to protecting the social and biological environment in the future (Zeidner & Shechter, 1988; Jackson, 1983). Regarding older people, the process of developing environmental conscientiousness requires time and a change in both attitudes and habits (Lin & Huang, 2012). With time, people search for more responsible lifestyles not only because they might be socio-environmentally conscious and understand the role they play in the environment but also because they expect personal benefits from society in how society perceives them (Marchand & Walker, 2008). Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H2: There exists a positive correlation between age and the searched value on self-image**

From the lack of theory regarding how age correlates with welfare development, the authors propose the following null hypotheses:

**H0.1: There exists no statistically significant influence between age and the searched value for welfare development.**

2.5 Gender

Gender has proven to be an interesting variable in many researches conducted on consumer attitude and social responsibility. Many studies that have been investigating the linkage between gender and environmental concern have found a significant relationship between the two variables. The majority of such studies have concluded that males have a higher tendency to be more educated regarding socio-environmental issues than women (Davidson & Freudenburg, 1996 in Diamantopoulos et. al., 2003). However, such theory was proven non-significant in their own research. Research has also stated that due to gaps in wages, men statistically may seem more socially responsible, when only looking at purchasing patterns (Arcury, Scollay & Johnson, 2004).

When regarding attitudes and behaviour in particular, females have been found to be a lot more concerned about such related issues which was proven coherent in Diamantopoulos (2003) own studies. Generally, women are finding value in taking both a sustainable stance at home, recycling and conserving energy, as well as working in the political field (Davidson & Freudenburg, 1996 in Diamantopoulos et. al., 2003). Women see morality as a requirement to contribute to other’s needs (Flanagan & Jackson, 1987). When there exists necessary fundings, women tend to implement socially responsible practices quite appropriately (Setó-Pamies, 2015). Per example, in a poll, it was found that the most "responsible" group of people were older and educated women with a liberal orientation (Levin, 1990 in Schrum, McCarty & Lowrey, 1995). Females and males respond to the idealized gender representations provided by society. Across cultures, researchers emphasize that women are more helpful, empathetic, expressive, and nurturing, whereas men are more competitive and self-determining (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Zelezny, Chua & Aldrich, 2000). Eagly (2013) in Dagher, Itani and Kassar (2015) identified that women are more likely to be concerned about others’ welfare as compared to men. Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H3: Women are more concerned on welfare development than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products**

Miniard and Cohen (1983) tell us that young men in particular are not drawn to socially responsible products unless it already matches the extrinsic values of the self; the need to show an acquiring of profit in some way. They also argue that young men often feel pressured to prove themselves in a
materialistic manner in order to strengthen the sense of identity and social acceptance in their social context. Zelezny et al. (2000) argue that the behaviour of individuals is conditioned by socialization, which shapes them through the gender expectations of that particular cultural context (Zelezny, Chua & Aldrich, 2000). Flanagan and Jackson (1987) also argued that men conceive morality as an attempt to ensure impartiality and fairness in the group (Flanagan & Jackson, 1987). If it is not perceived as an appreciated behaviour by the group, men are not inclined to purchase socially responsible products (Miniard & Cohen, 1983). Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H4: Men are more concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products**

However, a large number of studies have also found little or no relationship between gender and environmental attitudes and behaviours. Other researches argue that differences found are not universal and are dependant on other variables such as socio-cultural context and gender roles (Schrum, McCarty & Lowrey, 1995; Davidson & Freudenberg, 1996; Diamantopoulos et al, 2003; Chekima, Chekima, Wafa, Igau & Sondoh, 2016). Many demographical variables are interrelated with gender. It should be valued in terms of finance and status in a cultural context instead of just as a biological definition (Dagher, Itani & Kassar, 2015).

The social role of women is becoming more similar to that of men in modern society. Women are now more likely to be independent and competitive. Due to the changing roles of men and women in the workplace and also at home, there is more need to examine the gender effects on environmental attitude and behaviours (Mobley & Kilbourne, 2013). Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H5: Women are more concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products**

From the lack of theory regarding how gender correlates identity, the authors propose the follow null hypotheses:

**H0.2: There exists no statistically significant influence between gender and the searched value on identity**

### 2.6 Income

Previous research suggests that socially responsible purchasing intentions is strongly influenced by the consumers income (Cstura & Mozner, 2014; Chekima, Chekima, Waga, Igau & Sondoh, 2016). Despite there being extreme inequality and poverty in Brazil, the country's growing economy includes a huge developing middle class, which represents about 100 million of people, more than the population of the most European or Latin America countries. This middle class has been generating a large-scale environmental change in the country, making up around have of the entire population.

However, even if there persists a tangible inequality of income distribution, economic growth has proven to help the new middle class and given them power to live by a more socially responsible purchasing behaviour (Ariztía et al., 2014).

When regarding how such purchase affects the self, Diamantopoulos et al. (2003) found in their research that besides the variable of age and gender, attitudes on sustainable consumption was also affected by social class and level of income (Diamantopoulos et al., 2003). Young (2015) talks about how gender should not alone be studied as variable for socially responsible behaviour. When looking
at the issue from an socio-economic perspective, people who generally perceive themselves as being benefitted economically find themselves being benefitted socially, through following ideals that are more socio-environmentally concerned (Young, 2015).

**H6: There exists a positive correlation between income and the searched value on self-image**

Lee, Levy and Yap (2015) have found connections to the purpose of identity for such. People who have the finance and can afford to live in a community which they are comfortable in, tend to develop a stronger identity with their residential suburb - developing a certain place identity with their social context. These individuals are more positive toward responsible consumption, which can arguably be of reasons to preserve something that represents a part of who they are, their identity, more than for the sake of the environment (Lee, Levy & Yap, 2015).

Ritter, Borchardt, Vaccaro, Pereira and Almeida (2014) took upon themselves to identify the antecedents of socio-environmental product consumption among Brazilian product consumers. What they concluded in their research was, among other findings, that knowledge of what responsible is and what socio-economic context the consumer is defined within, is relevant when discussing attitude towards socio-environmental consumption (Ceglia, Lima & Leocádio, 2015). This tells us that social context such as quality of life, through income, is connected to our attitude on consuming socially responsible products. For individual concerns of consumption, such as discussed by Ceglia et. al. (2015), the fulfilment of the self is connected to individual needs of identity for people with a higher level of income. Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H7: There exists a positive correlation between income and the searched value on identity**

People of higher income have a higher tendency to spend on responsible products when their experienced welfare is at a well-maintained level, allowing a continued access of money (Chekima, Chekima, Wafa, Igau & Sondoh, 2016). However, for people who deem their income as low or unstable, the self is connected to the commitment to ideas that transcend personal satisfaction of material goods (Jacob, Jovic & Brinkerhoff, 2009). People who generally are of lower income suffer a higher tendency to be at risk from environmental nuisances, such as air pollution, contamination of water supplies, or the detrimental impacts of new infrastructure. These individuals, are more likely to be knowledgeable and feel strongly about such issues, and consequently, more likely to campaign against their effects for the sake of the community (Carson & Moulden, 1991). Such theory provides the following hypothesis:

**H8: People of lower income are more concerned about welfare development than other notions**
3.0 Methodology

The following chapter will discuss how previous theory will be handled in relation to the collection of new data. The chapter will present how the data will be collected both in terms of how the hypotheses will be used in a survey and also to what channel the research will be conducted for the respondents. There will also be a presentation of what context the research is made in, who to ask and in what way. Finally, some criticism is acknowledged to the choice of method and potential biases in data and methodology.

3.1 The research process

The purpose of conducting this research was to find knowledge in a certain context which the authors have identified to have been unexplored. The purpose has found theoretical background giving evidence that the following research has scientific relevance (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis & Zhao, 2015; Ritter, Borchardt, Vaccaro, Pereira & Almeida 2014; Dagher, Itani & Kassar, 2015).

Consideration has been given to the established guidelines of conducting scientific research - to generate new and applicable knowledge (Jacobsen, 2002). Scientific research also involves improving creative thinking, critical thinking and stimulating curiosity and interest to ask questions and look for their answers in a systematic way (Oliver, 2012). The research problem underpins the whole research process, which may be seen as consisting of four elements; idea, support, implication and contribution (Svensson, 2009).

3.1.1 Idea

The idea of the main research question, "What aspects of the self are certain consumers mostly interested in satisfying through consuming socially responsible products?", was born through observations of culture while working at two different companies in Blumenau, located in the southern regions of Brazil.

The authors quickly discovered cultural differences between Brazil and their country of origin, Sweden. Such differences in social life raised the question to ask how consumers perceive meaningful products in the Brazilian culture. The research question itself initially began when discussing plastic surgery and the impact such had on identity and self-image but due to the lack of theory and difficulties in methodology another direction was chosen. The second time around, the research question would be changed to fit the area of Corporate Social Responsibility and how businesses and consumers perceive responsible distribution and consumption. Due to the vast amount of empirical studies needed for relevancy and with a desire for the authors to look more closely at consumer behaviour, the research question finally was altered to what is now the final guideline of this research.
3.1.2 Support

Theoretical support was discovered in many different areas of the world, with research being conducted as far back as the year of 1978 up until 2016. However, the theoretical findings only seemed to support the research area to some extent. The authors noted a research gap for a cultural context and the purpose of purchase within. Not much research could tell us why consumers are acquiring socially responsible products, especially in relation to the self and in Brazil. The theoretical findings gave birth to the notions of identity, self-image and welfare development. These created many hypotheses to either accept or reject. These hypotheses guided the questions used in the survey, where theory argues that at least one or several research questions are supposed to contribute to the fulfilment of the research objective (Svensson, 2009). The research gap helped form the null hypotheses to empirically study from scratch (see section 1.6).

There are multiple sources to support that the following research would be needed and also relevant in its context (Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Luna & Gupta, 2001; Gleim, Smith, Andrews & Cronin, 2013; Cotte and Trudel, 2009). This research will gather empirical information regarding the issue, through a quantitative research in the form of a survey. This survey will be further explained in the following sections (3.2 and forward).

3.1.3 Implications and contributions

The latter two elements, implication and contribution, handle the results of the research and will be presented in chapter 6 (conclusions). Like Svensson (2009) articulated, implications are formed, theoretical and/or managerial from the empirical findings. Such will be the results of the research. Finally, the contribution of the research process is outlined. Conclusions are drawn and suggestions for further research are usually provided. The research process re-connects to where it all started, thereby completing the circle (Svensson, 2009).

3.2 Inductive or deductive?

The first division of methodology is to decide which method to use when connecting theory with empirical research. One direction is to first gather an idea of what the world looks like, in other words finding out what theories exist before testing such empirically. This method is described as the deductive method and is often used in areas where theory is plenty. If one on the other hand chooses to enter the field without any prejudices about reality and gather information, is to act accordingly to the inductive method. This is a method often used when there exists little information regarding the research area or when one might be interested in asking for answers to questions that might not initially have thought to ask (Jacobsen, 2002; Hyde, 2000).

The main strategy of this research is based on a deductive approach. Theory regarding the notions, identity, self-image and welfare development, have been found for some variables of age, gender and income. A theory is an explanation for a set of observations, which have usually been obtained from other research (Hayes, 2000). These theories have formed research questions and will be used as a basis for the empirical research.

However, there exists multiple inductive elements in this research. Previous research has not concluded answers to some variables and their connection to the notions, which the authors aim to also find. Therefore this research has concluded various null hypotheses based on the lack of data which will
be inductively approached. Also, a number of academic disciplines have challenged the primacy of logical deductive thinking. In psychology and cognitive science, researchers have concluded that deductive logic often provides an inadequate explanation of the way that people think (Jacobsen, 2002; Ormerod, 2010). Such theory also gives evidence to why some inductive research might be necessary to improve the reliability of this work. Like Ochieng and Meetoo (2015) argues; mixed-method approaches is likely to address any potential drawbacks of individual methods by exploiting the strengths of each at the various stages of research. In this case an inductive method was used to find variables - variables that was not altogether concluded in any previous research and then applied it as theory for a deductive method of empirical research.

Klaus Solberg Søilen argued during one of his courses at Halmstad University that "all deductive reasoning begins with something inductive" (personal communication, 12 december, 2016). Such reasoning can be noted in this research since the process both requires comparing theory to reality with the hypotheses, as well as in an inductive way test certain null hypotheses to form a theory, more inductively so.

3.3 Qualitative or quantitative?

The second division of methodology is to decide how the empirical data will be gathered practically. Qualitative methodology, studies the meaning and context of what is said, done or intended by people, concentrating on the interpretation of facts and their meaning (Lock & Seele, 2015). Such a method is most suitable when the variables are unknown and/or if there lacks a solid base of previous theories on the issue (Jacobsen, 2002). One of the reasons behind this research choosing a quantitative method, is mainly due to its need of a small sample-size and time-consuming in-depth discussions with the respondents (Lock & Seele, 2015). When conducting a quantitative method, one is more interested in the relationships of different known variables - to be measured and tested statistically (Jacobsen, 2002). The purpose of this research is to through a relatively large sample-size, generalize the attitudes of the population in Blumenau, therefore choosing a quantitative approach.

However, it should be noted that a quantitative method mainly applies to the empirical research and how the formation of a survey took place. It was based on theory and then used to collect data to be measured. In regards to the collection of theory, there exists elements of a qualitative approach. The notions for this research was found through a large exploratory research by the authors. The purpose was to find patterns in theory that conclusively had similar statements regarding the self but did not necessarily put it into clear notions. The pattern that was found regarding motives of acquiring value was explained as intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic, in terms of the view of the self and the way one might wish the self to be viewed as by others and extrinsic, as how one might distance oneself from personal gains (see section 1.5).

When researching ethics, Lock and Seele (2015) propose a process that discusses quantitative content analysis as a method for ethics, including an ethical research objective, and concluding with ethical reasoning and interpretation of the quantitative results. This is the direction which the following empirical data has been collected and later on analyzed. As the quantitative method mainly analyzes variables from secondary data, hence variables that have not been collected for the current purpose, quantitative content analysis reduces the respondent's bias. It is considered an unobtrusive method in comparison to long interviews and contrived focus groups (Krippendorff, 2013). The authors also deemed the difficulties in language and limitations of resources to be factors guiding this research to work more quantitatively in the method of collecting data.
3.4 Collection of data

This section will focus on the methodology that alone is related to the collection of secondary and primary data. Secondary data is mainly be found in the first two chapters of this research and primary data is presented in chapter 4. Such is data that is not found in theory but has in a systematically and scientifically reliable way been physically gathered by the authors of this research.

3.4.1 Secondary data

According to Jacobsen (2002), secondary data is based on enlightenments that have been collected by other researchers than the ones aimed for the current research. Such data therefore has an initial purpose to answer other research objectives than this one. One must act in a critical way when choosing secondary data to question where the information comes from and how reliable the information is.

Such ideas have led the authors to use sources that they deem to be scientifically approved and therefore holds a higher degree of reliability. The main sources used when gathering secondary data are the databases of Web of Science as well as some sources from Scopus. The main scientific data has been collected through articles with some exceptions regarding litterature. The secondary data is mostly connected to the first two chapters of this research with an aim to present the research area, its gap as well as finding reliable sources to display previous theory.

The process of finding secondary data was initiated through certain keywords to find information on perceptions of socially responsible purchasing. Some of these words were; *socially responsible consumption, intrinsic motives, extrinsic motives, environmental behaviour, the self and demographics in green consumption*.

When regarding how closely to the primary source the secondary data was gathered, most information was collected as a second hand source. Jacobsen (2002) describes such, as information from someone who wasn’t present at a certain event but has gathered that information from someone else. When the authors came across an article that cited something from another article, the aim was to continue further to the original source, to increase the reliability of the information and decrease the risk of misinterpretations. In certain cases there was difficulties in locating the original source due to it being outdated for online publishing, or a lack of accessibility for the authors regarding certain databases. The sources used in this case are according to Jacobsen (2002) described as third hand sources and can be recognized in their citation, per example “according to A in B”.

A few references that describes a conclusion of some sort, can be defined as a first hand source. This is information that has been collected by someone who was present in the actual research (Jacobsen, 2002). These sources can be distinguished in this research where citation has been used as information gathered in surveys, polls or other articles’ conclusions.
3.4.2 Primary data

According to Jacobsen (2002), primary data is defined as information collected by the researcher for the first time and from the main source. One of the main reasons to advocate primary data is that it has been collected for the purpose of the actual research (Jacobsen, 2002). As mentioned previously in section 3.2 and 3.3 the main methodology was performed in a quantitative and deductive manner in terms of the empirical research. A survey was formed with the guidance of quantitative theory (see section 3.5) with questions related to the hypotheses and null hypotheses concluded in section 1.6.

The survey itself has been handed out through two different channels. One approach was for the authors to physically hand out the survey to people in Blumenau, Brazil. The second approach was to through the use of Facebook and the mailings of Universidade regional de Blumenau send the survey in electronic form. Wärneryd (1990) and Jacobsen (2002) discuss the benefits as well as the restrictions of both methods. To conduct a physical meeting with the respondents is more flexible making it easier for the authors to explain the questions and control the situation of the respondents. This falls under the possibility to advocate a higher degree of answers as well as making sure each respondent views the survey individually (Wärneryd, 1990; Jacobsen, 2002). Jacobsen (2002) argues that it is important to not restrict oneself to posting the survey on a website, since it does not include the people who are not regularly visiting the website. The authors deemed Facebook to be a website that many often visit but are being critical to such a statement, therefore additionally asking through personal mailings as well.

When it comes to sending out the survey electronically, it is easier to avoid potential biases caused by the authors in terms of attitude, nonverbal communication and subjectivity in the choice of respondents. Theory also advocates the setting to be more stable when responding on behaviour, since it raises the feel for the respondents to be anonymous as well as not having the pressure of answering on the spot. Online-surveys also increases the accessibility of the targeted respondents (Wärneryd, 1990).

Finding theoretical evidence for collecting primary data, the authors found the chosen method most suitable due to difficulties in communication and a lack of time and resources. In the culture of Brazil, the language is mainly restricted to portuguese which made a large qualitative research potentially difficult and therefore not preferable. Since the research involved time consuming pre-studies in the area and non-sufficient fundings, the following method was regarded to be efficient, resulting in a solid degree of answering respondents and more reliable answers in general.

3.4.2.1 Translation

Research has shown that when words are presented with their dominant translation, the recognition process was faster than when words were presented with their non-dominant translation. However, when put in a context and given certain meaning, the process of understanding the term was both faster and more accurately translated for the respondent (Laxén & Lavaur, 2010; Boada et. al., 2012). Boada et. al. (2012) however found that such process is mostly connected to people who are bilingual. Such theory assumes general knowledge about the language that is to be translated. The authors of this research possessed little knowledge regarding portuguese, the native language of Brazil and what the survey was being translated into. Being critical to what the authors would have as their dominant choice of words when translating, since such semantic knowledge is based on an english and swedish perspective, further aid was sought in order to form the questions accurately.
Langlet and Wärneryd (1990) describes two types of faults that might occur in language. The respondents can either think they understand the question and answer with a different mind or one doesn't understand at all and skips the question or answers it with no thought. Together with the help of the personnel at Universidade regional de Blumenau, the survey was translated from English to Brazilian based Portuguese and later on tested to see how the survey was received by a group of respondents (see section 3.8).

3.5 Structure of survey

The survey begins with an introduction to explain the purpose of the research as well as to define certain notions that might be misinterpreted by the respondents. The authors believe that the introduction serves the purpose of gaining both attention and trust for what the survey is used for. Jacobsen (2002) argues that people often have difficulties remembering the attitude towards something that happened too far back in time. People often only remember the general attitude towards a certain event and this survey is purposed on finding more in depth information. To avoid biases in the answers the respondents have been informed to both regard previous purchases of socially responsible products as well as potential purchases in the future. The research aims to look at the general attitude of acting socially responsible more as to just the attitude of a previous purchase (exemplified in chapter 8.1). The survey consists of 13 questions which have been asked in a short and exploratory manner. Asking questions that are short but rich reduces the risk of the respondent being overwhelmed with information and understanding the question wrong. Asking too many questions might lead to the respondent becoming bored with the survey and answering it inaccurately or not at all (Wärneryd, 1990). The more questions that are asked in the survey, the lesser frequency of answers are given (Jacobsen, 2002). The authors therefore chose the survey to be handled in a manner of asking only the important questions in relation to the research objective - limiting the survey to 13 questions.

Langlet and Wärneryd (1990) and Friberg and Wärneryd (1990) discuss how it is important to test the survey and how certain words or sentences are interpreted by the respondents. Therefore, the survey was also tested beforehand which gave notice to some adjustments (see section 3.8). Any terms which the authors deemed to be difficult to grasp or which might be foreign to the respondents is explained in the survey. Like Wikman (1990) argues; many answers might be answered inaccurate due to a lack of understanding the questions. To specify potentially difficult notions will help prevent any potential misinterpretations. A solid structure is needed in order to make the information standardized and comparable. When measuring attitudes and psychological phenomenons one should avoid using questions that are answered with either Yes or No. Many people have a tendency to simply agree if the question sounds legit. It takes more effort for a respondent to answer why one has chosen to respond No in comparison to Yes (Davidsson & Wärneryd, 1990). To avoid such bias, this survey had a different structure of answers. The structure of the questions to use for measurement were be based on a rating scale which is commonly used when the aim is to measure attitudes (Davidsson & Wärneryd, 1990). The rating scale was scaled between 1 and 6. Wärneryd (1990) argues that people rarely are able to differentiate their opinions on more than 5 categories but in order to avoid the respondents choosing an indifferent option of 3 the authors have chosen to add one more category. This approach will give answers that are inclined in one direction, and the authors believe this to make the respondents take a stand as to how they really feel, if only for the slightest of an opinion. The notions were measured according to the rating scale with the purpose of estimating the level of value, whereas the variables of age, gender and income were measured in either categorization or as an open answered question.
3.5.1 Formation of questions
The following section will present how the questions in the survey were formed and the motives behind the present formation.

3.5.1.1 The variables

Questions 1 and 2: Gender and Age

The authors of this research chose to put gender into two comparable categories: man or woman. The aim for such was to examine if gender is an influencing factor in relation to the notions. The variable of age was questioned with an open answer. Open answers give the possibility for the respondent to not be constrained by a limited choice of answers (Arnell-Gustafsson & Wärneryd, 1990). The purpose of using the variable age, was to find out if there exists any correlation between such and the notions. The authors aimed to conclude as many statistical measurements as possible when performing the statistical tests in chapter 4. Such is the reason for not constraining the variable into intervals.

Question 13: Income

The aim of examining income was to see if such is an influencing factor in relation to the notions. Davidsson and Wärneryd (1990) argue that asking a person of his or her income is often problematic. People are often reluctant to share such information or might not fully remember the details of their income. One way of encouraging people to answer the question and give a somewhat accurate answer, is to estimate the income into intervals instead of asking for exact numbers. Often such intervals are enough in order to compare certain levels of income with each other (Davidsson & Wärneryd, 1990).

The authors of this research agrees with such a statement, since the aim was to compare categorization of middle-, low- and above average incomers, where specific numbers were unnecessary. Therefor, the alternative of answers are specified into four intervals representing the lack of income, below middle-income, middle-income and above middle-income. The secondary data of such was gathered from two different websites in order to estimate the middle-income in Blumenau, Brazil. The first thing the authors concluded was the minimal income of Brazil (Globo, 2016; Economia uol, 2016) and the numerical factor to describe Blumenau’s relation to this minimal income. When calculated, the middle-income proved to be estimated at 2.400 RS. This number was checked by looking at the middle-income of Brazil and Blumenau at the year 2010, comparing their relation (Furb, 2016).
3.5.1.2 The notions

**Question 3**

To measure the notion of identity, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that before and after purchasing, people ask themselves if the product relates to their personality and who they are (Marchand & Walker, 2008; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2003; Belk, 2010).

"I buy socially responsible products because...  
... it is a part of my personality"  
Disagree... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Agree

**Question 4**

To measure the notion of self-image, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that individuals define themselves in terms of their culture and relationships to others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988).

"I buy socially responsible products because...  
... it is a part of my culture"  
Disagree... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Agree

**Question 5**

To measure the notion of self-image, the authors proposed a question based on the theory of how other people perceive the value of socially responsible products, and the norms of society reflects how individuals value such products (Fitzmaurice & Comegys, 2006; Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis & Zhao, 2015). The question also connects to the notion of welfare, were some people purchase products without the influence of others (Bond, 2005).

"I buy socially responsible products because...  
... it is expected by society"  
Disagree... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Agree

**Question 6**

To measure the notion of identity, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that socially responsible products can either seem intrusive or act as empowering of one’s identity (van Liere & Dunlap, 1980; Van Der Werff, Steg & Keizer, 2013).

"When buying socially responsible products...  
... it must match my lifestyle"  
Disagree... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Agree
Question 7

To measure the notion of self-image, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that for Brazilians, it is important to share the act of being responsible to the public. This is important since it confirms one’s social identity (Breckler & Greenwald, 1986; Greenwald & Breckler, 1985 in Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antune, 2014)

"When buying socially responsible products...
... I share my purchase on social media"

Rarely... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Often

Question 8

To measure the notion of self-image, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that the social setting, in particular the attitudes of friends and family, is deemed important for the consumer when viewing socially responsible products (Childers & Rao, 1992; Kressmann et al., 2006).

"When buying socially responsible products...
... I share my purchase with family and friends"

Rarely... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Often

Question 9

To measure the notion of welfare development, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that values can be extended from the self in socially responsible products, whereas individuals act philanthropically to improve society. This has been concluded to be noticeable in Brazil per example (Lorek & Fuchs, 2013; Scharf, 2009 in Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antunes, 2014; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016).

"When buying socially responsible products...
... I value personal welfare rather than communal welfare"

Disagree... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... Agree

Question 10

To measure the notion of identity, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that people buy socially responsible products to feel pride and express their inner identity. They even donate time to confirm one's ego with their purchase (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Aaker & Williams, 1998; Arnett, German & Hunt, 2003).

Regard the following statement:

"To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel good about yourself?"

Low... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... High
**Question 11**

To measure the notion of identity, the authors proposed a question based on the theory that people who have a strong independency use socially responsible products, to feel unique and distinct from others (Markus & Kitayama 1991; Lee, Aaker & Gardner, 2000).

*Regard the following statement:*

"To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel different from your friends and family?"

Low... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... High

**Question 12**

To measure the notion of the self or the others, the authors proposed a question based on the previously explained theory that people either act from ego-focused values, or are more distanced from such, acting towards the better of others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Aaker & Williams, 1998; Arnett, German & Hunt, 2003; Lorek & Fuchs, 2013; Scharf, 2009 in Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antunes, 2014; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016).

*In general, when buying socially responsible products, your purchase decision is based on...*

1. what the product can do for You
2. what the product can do for your Community
3.5.2 Context of questions

The following section will present why the questions are asked in the present order.

In regards to the question of gender and age, the authors of this research chose to introduce it early in the survey. Davidsson and Wärneryd (1990) suggest to ask the easiest questions with less emotional ties first, since it is a way of "warming up the respondent" and to position the more sensitive questions near the end. Why such questions should arguably be positioned at the end of the survey, will be discussed below question 13 regarding income. The authors deemed the question of gender and age to be non-sensitive questions to answer and therefore chose to ask such early in the survey.

Davidsson and Wärneryd (1990) also argue that many researchers choose to regard income at the end of the survey, to avoid the risk of such a sensitive question to affect the responses in the rest of the survey. This research has chosen to take such theory in consideration and has therefore chosen to end the survey with what might be viewed as the most sensitive type of questions. To measure more complex notions one must use more questions to find solid answers, something that is different from asking of something simple like age or gender (Jacobsen, 2002). Due to the various elements within the notions of identity, self-image and welfare development, the authors chose to ask more than one question per notion if possible, in order to measure all included levels within each notion. Per example, to ask regarding identity there exists both the question of how consumption matches one’s personality as well as how consumption regards lifestyle.

Jacobsen (2002) proposes numerous ways of answering a question. As previously discussed in section 3.5, this research is based on three types of answers; categorization, open answer or rating scaled questions. In regards to rating scales, which the majority of the questions consist of, Jacobsen (2002) argues that there exists certain biases. What does it really mean when comparing the relation between answering per example 3 or 5 for a certain notion? To comprehend some sort of pattern for each notion, the authors have chosen to ask multiple questions of each notion. Wärneryd (1990) argues the difficulties when regarding attitudes - one might find it difficult to scale one’s attitude and therefore the authors have chosen to include as many elements as possible.

Another way of responding to a question is through categorization. This type of answering puts the respondent in a position of having a clear distinction of choices, choosing one or the other. This is something used when measuring attitudes of being either for or against a certain answer. The measurement does not include any kind of intensity in the answers, in comparison to the questions with rating scales (Wärneryd, 1990; Jacobsen, 2002). One aim for the authors when regarding the formation of the questions, was to present them in a short manner - to ask questions with a focus of only one notion at a time above having complex questions. Jacobsen (2002) discusses flaws in memory which can be minimized by having simple and short questions.

Question 12 differs from the majority of the survey since it is the only notion that is measured through categorization. The authors chose to include such a question based on the theory of Wärneryd (1990) that it is difficult to measure attitudes. The authors wanted to see if one might answer the questions differently even they had a purpose of measuring the same notion. The authors believe such to raise the level of reliability by including such a test variable in the survey.
3.6 The respondents

One reason for choosing a quantitative approach to research is because the purpose is to gain a general view of a certain population (Jacobsen, 2002). Out of practical reasons, it is impossible to question all members of the population, in this case the people of Blumenau. Because of this one must make a selection, but a selection that is representative enough to be used to describe something general. This falls under the fact that everyone in the population has the same possibility of being chosen for the sample. Such an approach is described as a 'random selection' (Jacobsen, 2002). However, due to the limitations of this research in terms of time, finance and other resources, the selection was made in the form of a 'convenience sample'. This is described as selecting the people who are the easiest to reach and are most willing to respond to the survey - as long as they fall under the requirements of living in Blumenau, Brazil and are consumers of socially responsible products.

The sample-size of the current research was calculated with a 95% confidence level and a 5% confidence interval. The interval tells us that the answers given in the sample-size is representative with a possible difference of 5% more or less in comparison to the population (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012). The confidence interval is based on the assumption that each respondent is chosen in a random manner (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012). With Blumenau having a total population of 344,540 (Furb, 2016), the explained premises gave a sample of 385 respondents. To make sure that the respondents are relevant, which assumes a consumption or will, regarding socially responsible consumption, the survey began with clarifying this issue in order to discard of irrelevant respondents.

Jacobsen (2002) suggests that in quantitative research, the sample-size should consist of around 400 to 600 people. Ochieng and Meetoo (2015) argues that mixing methods is the best approach in most cases since the flaws of one method is compensated by the benefit of another. In regard to this, the authors chose to gather answers from 200 respondents electronically and 200 in physical form by handing out the survey in the field.

3.7 Loss of data

A total of 442 respondents were gathered in the survey and from such the authors concluded around 1 percent to be answered incorrectly. Therefore some data was not viable for analysis for the specific variables missing. However, since the percentage is deemed to be low by the authors, the data was chosen to still be analysed for the remaining variables, since it does not statistically affect the results to a greater level.

3.8 Testing the survey

When conducting a quantitative survey the importance is focused at the time of planning the survey, in order to grasp the aspects on the phenomenon up for research (Friberg & Wärneryd, 1990; Jacobsen, 2001). The only way of really knowing if a survey works as it is intended to, is by testing the survey beforehand. Testing the questions on four to six respondents can be of most importance and save the annoyance of later getting answers in the main research, that are not usable. Some questions might have been skipped or answered without the questions being fully understood (Jacobsen, 2002). Friberg and Wärneryd (1990) suggests the method of testing the survey on what the authors deemed as knowledgeable or interesting people. With that in mind the authors chose to test the survey in a qualitative manner, talking to five english and portuguese speaking respondents after having them
answer the survey. The purpose was to ponder in what way they understood the questions, potential flaws in translation as well as how they felt regarding the context of the questions. Changes were made for some questions, making the formation of the survey more applicable to the Portuguese language and also removing one of the headlines. The results can be seen in section 8.1, the final survey which was used in the collection of primary data. The authors and the tested respondents found the new version to improve clarity in what the question was asking and it made the general answering process run more smoothly.

3.9 How to analyze primary data

The raw data that has been gathered needs to be analyzed in order to generate meaning. Data can be explained as the product of research or the raw material of information. A single piece of data has no meaning unless the context is understood and therefore it needs to be transformed into a flow of message (Klimesova, 2009). When regarding the choice of making a quantitative analysis, the authors found it according to Jacobsen (2002) to be most suitable to transform each response into a numerical value. This was done if a numerical value was not present, and then statistically evaluate the data in a statistical software programme (Jacobsen, 2002).

The variables of gender, age and income as well as question 12 were handled in a different manner than the remaining part of the survey, which already were responded with a numerical value on the rating scale. Gender was numerically coded into 1 and 2, where "man" was valued as 1 and "woman" with 2. As previously mentioned in section 3.5.1.1, "age" was not categorized and therefore not valued in the same manner as gender. Instead each answer was manually transferred individually as age was answered as an open answered question, varying on each respondent. In terms of "income", each category was valued similar to gender, with 0 representing “no income”, 1 as “below average income”, 2 as having an “average income” and 3 being “above average income”. Question 12 was valued with 1 for option 1 and valued with 2 for option 2.

The authors discussed early on in the research how the data would need to look like in order to create a satisfactory analysis, naturally needing an organized way of structuring the survey. The creation of such was made in the online service of Google Forms. The reason for choosing such was that the authors found it convenient to access the survey anywhere and to keep an overview of the data. It was also found to be easy to structure the survey as well as statistically present the information in different charts. The statistical analysis was made through the use of SPSS in order to calculate the values of the material in terms of significance, mean and mode per example. The data collected through the survey was first calculated as a mean per notion on each respondent. This value was manually transferred into SPSS under identity, self-image and welfare development. The authors also included question 12 as a test variable in order to compare if it correlated with the answers to question 9. The purpose of such was to see if some questions might have been misunderstood or responded in an untrue manner. Each question was also manually transferred into SPSS in order to analyze the score of each notion and as to why it was valued that way. In other words, the purpose was to see any connections between certain questions and why one notion might have been given a higher score in comparison to another.

When performing the descriptive analysis, the authors calculated the mean, the mode, the standard deviation and the standard error of each question. This was done before doing any extensive analysis of the material, in order to get a clear view of the data (see table 14). Körner & Wahlgren (2012) describes these measurements in a short but exploratory manner and since the literature has been well studied by the authors, it was deemed as a reliable source for defining the measurements used.
3.9.1 Statistical measurements

3.9.1.1 Comparing means

When regarding what notion was valued the highest by the respondents in general, the authors calculated the mean of each notion before comparing their values. In order to raise the reliability of the values, the authors chose to calculate the mean of each question to aid in finding out the differences of each question per notion. These values are presented in table 14 along with the mode, the standard deviation and the standard error of each question. The mode can be described as the value that occurs most times of all the values between 1 and 6. The standard deviation is the average deviation from the total average of a certain question. A low standard deviation tells us that the values are close to the mean and a high standard deviation tells us the opposite - that the values are very diverse from the mean. The standard error tells us the error which needs to be taken into consideration when constructing a confidence interval. This is the error that emerges when one is trying to say something about the population through a sample. The authors calculated a one-sample t-test in order to find out the lower and upper values of such interval, based on a level of 95% certainty (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012).

The method of comparing means was also used when answering the hypotheses which required a comparison of means. The average, or the mean, has been calculated in an arithmetic manner. All the responded values of each question has been added up per question and divided by the number of respondents, giving the average value answered per notion (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012). The results were useful both in finding out which notion was generally most popular as well as to compare each mean with the variables when answering the hypotheses. Such is illustrated in table 21.

3.9.1.2 Pearson correlation test

To answer any hypotheses or null hypotheses, regarding any potential significance between any variables, the authors chose to perform a Pearson correlation test. This test was also used in order to see how reliable the questions asked where and if they equally measured the same thing. Such a test is useful when there is a need to find out if two or more variables have connection where an independent variable can predictively change a dependent variable. The value which tells us if there exists a correlation between any variables, should be either close to negative 1 or positive 1 (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012).

The results of such does however only relate to the current sample. To statistically confirm that the results are applicable to the general population, one must look more closely at the significance level. The value of such should be somewhere under 0.05. The significance can be calculated by using a method appropriate to the type of data that is available for comparison. Each method, or test, is dependant on what type of variables we are comparing (Körner & Wahlgren, 2012). The significance could also be distinguished using a Pearson correlation test which was the reason why such a test was sufficient. If there were to be any correlation, the authors would choose to perform a regression test to see in what direction the connection was moving, but such was not the case.
3.10 Reliability and internal validity

Reliability refers to what degree the research can be trusted. A high reliability can be reached when the same research can be re-done using the same method and reaching the same results once again (Jacobsen, 2002). The authors deem the research to be well motivated in the methodology. All actions made to gather, comprehend and analyze data has been described to make each step from choosing the sample size, questioning the respondents and process the data, re-doable for other researchers. However, Christensen, Andersson, Engdahl and Haglund (2001) argue, that the world is in a constant change giving new premises in the world which the research is conducted within. The authors therefore notices the problems of conducting the same research and getting the same results, no matter how well described the methodology has been done. Even if time and context is an influencing factor, as noted previously researching psychological phenomenons often give varying results (Hayes, 2000; Christensen, Andersson, Engdahl & Haglund, 2001).

Validity can be divided into external and internal validity (Jacobsen, 2002; Ferguson, 2004). Internal validity refers to the confidence with which one can make statements about relationships between variables, based on the forms in which the variables were manipulated or measured. How the collection of data is designed can control for some of the threats to internal validity and give researchers greater confidence. This confidence refers to that the effects in the research were attributable to the experimental or treatment variable and not to any other plausible explanations for the observed effects (Cook & Campbell, 1979 in Ferguson, 2004). The authors deemed that the quantitative analysis itself was led under as little influence as possible by choosing two different methods for conducting the survey. The formation of the survey and its context was created under scientific guidance, to minimize the levels of interviewer effects, sensitive questions and concretization of the survey (see section 3.4.2). The questions in the survey was solemnly based on existing theory where one can only base the level of validity on the existing theory. However, researchers have realized difficulties in researching psychological phenomenons (Hayes, 2000; Christensen, Andersson, Engdahl & Haglund, 2001) leaving the author's critical to if the chosen variables where the most interesting to research. Further studies are needed which will be explained further in section 6.3.

3.11 Generalizability (external validity)

Jacobsen (2002) describes generalizability as a form of external validity. This notion questions as to what degree the results are transferrable from one context into another. In order to make such possible, the current research must be representative of a bigger context and tell us more about the population rather than only the sample size (Jacobsen, 2002). When the research is generalizable, it holds more scientific value as it can tell us more about specific phenomenons rather than only a single situation of research (Ferguson, 2004). Since the area of research is limited in previous theory the authors might consider the current research to be the only of its kind and in the specific cultural context. As previously noted in the level of reliability, there persists difficulties in explaining the general world since the world never remains the same. However, for the premises described in this research and for the data collected at that time, the authors would deem the research to be generalizable. The research objective has been limited to a smaller area, Blumenau, and also to a question of a specific type of consumption. The authors might dare to say that one might generalize a specific phenomenon to some extent, when one is not trying to expand such a statement too far beyond one’s reach.
3.12 Objectivity and subjectivity

In psychological usage, objectivity is nearly synonymous with reality, while subjectivity refers to ideas and beliefs that exist only in the mind. When philosophers speak of the objectivity of science, they generally mean its ability to know things as they really are (Porter, 1996). The authors argue that chapters 1 and 2 are solely based on theory, or in other words secondary data, that has been collected from scientifically verified sources. No statements of reality have been made under these chapters, therefore one might deem these sections to have a high level of objectivity. However, the authors also note that there to some level persists elements of subjectivity. The specific sources of information, previous theory as well as the research objective itself has been actively chosen by the minds of the authors. The effect of such is that the general aim and feel of the research might have certain elements of the authors reality.

Chapter 3 is to the majority deemed by the authors as a subjective chapter. Objective theory is included to aid in the arguments for the type of methodology chosen and also in order to explain certain notions. However, the authors deem this type of subjectivity necessary in order to increase the level of scientific value and to show other researchers and readers how certain conclusions have been made. Chapter 4 is deemed highly objective by the authors since it is only a presentation of collected data where no statements or analysis is made. Its level of subjectivity only relates to its connection to biases in the survey. The last two chapters of 5 and 6 are arguably the most subjective parts of this research. The purpose of these chapters, like Svensson (2009) argued in the research process, is to generate new knowledge of a certain area. It is within these two chapters that the final parts of the process is made, to implicate certain ideas and conclude with results based on what the authors have witnessed and processed in this research.

3.13 Criticism of methodology

As Jacobsen (2002) and Ormerod (2010) argued, there will always be a need for a mixed methodology and when describing psychological phenomena, a deductive approach is not enough to really understand the area of research. The authors of this research found this evident in the lack of theory which argued a need to use a mixed approach to doing research. However, since the field of socially responsible consumption and particularly that of self-congruence is still an unexplored area, one might argue further need to research the area without any presumptions of our reality. Therefore the authors suggest a more in-depth qualitative empirical research to further understand the phenomenon of the self rather than to only measure it.

In terms of how the empirical research was conducted, the collection of data was done through a quantitative measurement, which in regards to the objective arguably is a valid method to use. If the authors were interested in to further understand the phenomenon and underlying variables of attitudes, a qualitative method would have been preferable. However, the research was based on specific variables noted in theory as relevant, and the level of validity is based on such theory. To question the variables would mean a different approach to research and a different type of research objective as well. The purpose was to create a statistical overview and not a psychological re-evaluation. The authors have however kept the level of objectivity as an important guideline when inductive and qualitative methods have occurred. As in the section of theory, making sure that the coloration of the authors is excluded as much as possible and not guided in any direction of an opinion.
Regarding the survey, as previously discussed, there might be problems when researching psychological issues since it often involves asking sensitive questions. The authors however stand on the effort to minimize such issues by structuring the context of the questions according to Wärneryds (1990) arguments. He argued the benefit of placing such questions at the end of the survey to avoid its potential influence. The questions were also handled in a way where only one thing was asked at a time to avoid confusion or an overload of information (Wärneryd, 1990). The authors have taken precautions to such a statement by testing the survey to further increase reliability.

As previously mentioned, to ask regarding a person's income can often be viewed as a sensitive subject (Davidsson & Wärneryd, 1990). The purpose of positioning such sensitive questions in the end of the survey has been to minimize the risk of it affecting the rest of the survey, however it might still be known as a variable that has been answered incorrectly, saying that one has more or less income than what actually is. The respondent could also have been confused regarding one’s income position, currently working between jobs or having an irregular level of monthly income. With that in mind, the variable of income could need further research and validation beyond the comparison of what is statistically known for the general population. When regarding the respondents and how they have been selected for questioning, there persists some flaws in the method used. To select the respondents from a convenience sample could mean that people are maybe unfocused or uninterested when answering the survey. The people who have answered are in major part people who have been most accessible for the researchers (Jacobsen, 2002). If the respondents had a negative experience when taking the survey, such would mean that the answers are not be fully reliable or representative of the population. Since a majority of the collected data has been done through meeting the respondents in their regular schedule, one might feel that the authors were intrusive or too time-consuming, resulting in potential biases in many answers.

The authors also remain critical to the difficulties in language regarding conducting the survey. One might have been able to conduct a fully physical survey where the questions could have been explained and uncertainties regarding the purpose even more clarified. However, even with the necessity of having to be more fluent in portuguese such a research could have more risks of interviewer effects, guiding the respondents in some direction. In the end, for the context of which the research was made as well as its purpose of being quantitative, the authors deem the chosen methodology for such to be the most suitable for the situation.
3.14 Criticism of references

All of the used references in this research have been collected from what the authors deem to be scientifically reliable and valid sources of information. The sources used for quotation, information and groundwork for analysis are the webpages Web of science and Scopus. However, as mentioned some sources are not directly connected to these websites and are therefore not a secondary source of information. To remind us what was previously argued in section 3.4.1, "When the authors came across an article that cited something from another article, the aim was to continue further to the original source to increase the reliability of the information and decrease the risk of misinterpretations". The authors have aimed to remain closely related to the primary source and when such was not available the argument has been to return to the web pages that are deemed scientifically reliable and use such as reference. These third hand source are however used with caution, striving to use data that has been verified more closely.

Some references have been found in literature, to find guidance for relevant methodology. Many of these books include finding definitions to certain measurements and terms rather than subjective arguments and situational research. The authors therefore deem such to not have a significant influence on the reliability of this research. However, since it has been argued both in previous theory as well as by the authors themselves that there persists a lack of knowledge regarding the research objective, one must question the theory in chapter 2. Since such theory only base the hypotheses which are tested and concluded, it does not immediately mean that the results falter. However, since such theory lay ground for the variables in each hypothesis, further research is needed to verify if these variables are the most relevant ones to study.
4.0 Empirical research

The following chapter will present the results from the empirical research. In total the survey was responded by 442 people with some deviations resulting in non-usable data. Each question displays the distribution and total of answers given. The first sections of 4.1 to 4.4 will present the given answers in a frequency table for each question. Section 4.5 will statistically present the measurements calculated through the software SPSS. All tables are constructed by the authors.

4.1 The variables

Question 1: Gender

Regarding the first question, the respondents were asked to specify their gender. The majority of the respondents were female (61.1%).

Table 1. In the table above the results from question 1 are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Distribution of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38,90% 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61,10% 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: Age

Regarding the second question, the respondents were asked to specify their age. The majority (82.8%) of the respondents were between the ages of 17-27 with 19 being the most reoccurring age answered in the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Distribution of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.20% 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.70% 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.05% 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.10% 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.40% 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.20% 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.60% 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.40% 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.60% 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.30% 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.30% 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.50% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.40% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.50% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.50% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.50% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.50% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.50% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.50% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.50% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.40% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.50% 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. In the table above the results from question 2 are presented.

**Question 13: Income**

Regarding the thirteenth question, the respondents were asked to specify their income. The majority of the respondents were below average income with the second most answered choice being above average income.
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Table 3. In the table above the results from question 13 are presented.

**4.2 Identity**

*Question 3: “I buy socially responsible products because...

... it is a part of my personality”*

The majority (30.8%) of the respondents agreed to the statement at a level of 5 on a 6 graded scale.
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Table 4. In the table above the results from question 3 are presented.
Question 6: "When buying socially responsible products...
... it must match my lifestyle"

The majority (71.1%) of the respondents agreed to the statement at a level between 3 and 5 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. In the table above the results from question 6 are presented.

Question 10: "To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel good about yourself?"

The majority (58.4%) of the respondents felt that the statement was coherent with themselves to a degree of 5 or 6 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. In the table above the results from question 10 are presented.

4.2.4 Question 11: "To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel different from your friends and family?"

The majority (29%) of the respondents felt that the statement was coherent with themselves to a degree of 4, with the second most responded answer being 5 (21.3%) on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. In the table above the results from question 11 are presented.
4.3 Self-image

Question 4: "I buy socially responsible products because...
... it is a part of my culture"

The majority (65.6%) of the respondents agreed to the statement at a level between 3 and 5 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6                | 13.60%            | Total 442

Table 8. In the table above the results from question 4 are presented.

Question 5: “I buy socially responsible products because...
... it is expected by society”

The majority (50.6%) of the respondents agreed to the statement at a level between 3 and 4 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6                | 19.50%            | Total 442

Table 9. In the table above the results from question 5 are presented.

Question 7: "When buying socially responsible products...
... i share my purchase on social media"

The majority (65.2%) of the respondents disagreed to the statement at a level of 1 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6                | 2.70%             | Total 442

Table 10. In the table above the results from question 7 are presented.
Question 8: "When buying socially responsible products... 
... I share my purchase with family and friends"

The distribution of answers were evenly responded between rarely (1) and often (6), however the majority of the answers were given between the level of 4 and 5 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18,60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. In the table above the results from question 8 are presented.

4.4 Welfare development

Question 9: "When buying socially responsible products... 
... I value personal welfare rather than communal welfare"

The majority (57%) of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed vastly with the statement, answering either 3 or 4 on a 6 graded scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. In the table above the results from question 9 are presented.

Question 12: “In general, when buying socially responsible products, your purchase decision is based on…”

The distribution of answers were evenly distributed between the choices available, however there were a small inclination towards buying socially responsible products based on what the product would do for the consumer more than the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer selection</th>
<th>Choice of answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What the product can do for You</td>
<td>55,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the product can do for your Community</td>
<td>44,30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. In the table above the results from question 12 are presented.
### 4.5 Statistical measurements from SPSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.963</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>24.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;I buy socially responsible products because... it is a part of my personality&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;I buy socially responsible products because... it is a part of my culture&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &quot;I buy socially responsible products because... it is expected by society&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. &quot;When buying socially responsible products... it must match my lifestyle&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. &quot;When buying socially responsible products... I share my purchase on social media&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. &quot;When buying socially responsible products... I share my purchase with family and friends&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. &quot;When buying socially responsible products... I value personal welfare rather than communal welfare&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.358</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. &quot;To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel good about yourself?&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. &quot;To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel different from your friends and family?&quot;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In general, when buying socially responsible products, your purchase decision is based on...</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Income</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14.** In the table above the results from the one sample t-test are presented.
Table 15. In the table above the results from the correlation test of the questions regarding identity are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. I buy socially responsible products because... it is a part of my personality</th>
<th>6. When buying socially responsible products... it must match my lifestyle</th>
<th>10. To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel good about yourself?</th>
<th>11. To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel different from your friends and family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I buy socially responsible products because... it is a part of my personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When buying socially responsible products... it must match my lifestyle</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel good about yourself?</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To which degree does buying socially responsible products make you feel different from your friends and family?</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 16. In the table above the results from the correlation test of the questions regarding self-image are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. I buy socially responsible products because... it is a part of my culture</th>
<th>5. I buy socially responsible products because... it is expected by society</th>
<th>7. When buying socially responsible products... I share my purchase on social media</th>
<th>8. When buying socially responsible products... I share my purchase with family and friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I buy socially responsible products because... it is a part of my culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I buy socially responsible products because... it is expected by society</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When buying socially responsible products... I share my purchase on social media</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When buying socially responsible products... I share my purchase with family and friends</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 17. In the table above the results from the correlation test of the questions regarding welfare development are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9. When buying socially responsible products... I value personal welfare rather than communal welfare</th>
<th>12. In general, when buying socially responsible products, your purchase decision is based on...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. When buying socially responsible products... I value personal welfare rather than communal welfare</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: 1, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.000, N: 442</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: -2.87, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.000, N: 442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 18. In the table above the results from the correlation test of age and identity are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: 1.177, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.000, N: 442</td>
<td>1.177, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.000, N: 440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 19. In the table above the results from the correlation test of age and self-image are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Self_Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: 1, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.002, N: 440</td>
<td>1.966, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.966, N: 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self_Image</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: 0.002, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.966, N: 440</td>
<td>1.966, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.966, N: 442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. In the table above the results from the correlation test of age and welfare development are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>-1.188***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 21. In the table above the results from the comparing of means between the notions are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Self_Image</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,1667</td>
<td>3,3879</td>
<td>3,4598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,09298</td>
<td>.94177</td>
<td>1,21460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,3433</td>
<td>3,2985</td>
<td>2,9403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,04875</td>
<td>89917</td>
<td>1,41029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,2738</td>
<td>3,3337</td>
<td>3,1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,06865</td>
<td>91616</td>
<td>1,35922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. In the table above the results from the correlation test of gender and identity are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23. In the table above the results from the correlation test of income and identity are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Self_Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No income</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2,8696</td>
<td>4,0543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,24023</td>
<td>1,96884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3,2213</td>
<td>4,2131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,40845</td>
<td>1,11420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3,2400</td>
<td>4,3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,25454</td>
<td>.93678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3,0000</td>
<td>4,5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,31809</td>
<td>.99367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3,1364</td>
<td>4,2830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,35651</td>
<td>1,06229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. In the table above the results from the one sample t-test of income and the notions are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Self_Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. In the table above the results from the correlation test of income and self-image are presented.
Table 26. In the table above the results from the correlation test of income and welfare development are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Analysis

5.1 Analysis of the notions

The following section will discuss the notions alone without any particular categorization of the consumer. The aim of the analysis is to find out any patterns regarding what aspect of the self is most important to people in general, when consuming socially responsible products (see section 2.1-2.3).

5.1.1 Identity

When looking at the total mean of the responses given to the notion of identity, it was valued at 4,27 on a scale between 1 and 6 (see table 21). This was deemed by the authors to be relatively high since the value exists on the upper level of the rating scale. This gives the incentive that people in general thought of identity as an important notion to satisfy when regarding socially responsible products.

These results can be compared by the idea that Brazil would according to Hofstede, de Hilal, Malvezzi, Tanure and Vinken (2010) have been a collectivistic culture but as described by Lenartowicz and Roth (2001) the south of Brazil would be more individualistic. The notion of identity touches an individualistic area, and since self-image was valued at 3,33 and welfare development at 3,14 it follows the theory of Lenartowicz and Roth (2001) giving incentives that such theory was proved right.

The mean of identity may have been 4,27, however, looking more closely at each question under the notion of identity, there were some differences to be noted. Question 3 regarding the importance of consumption and its fit to one's personality was generally rated at a mean of 4,40 with a mode of 5 (see table 14). This tells us that people in general responded quite high on the rating scale and also that the majority of respondents answered 5 for question 3. The standard deviation was calculated at 1,31 which means that the general answer was somewhere between 3 and 6. The standard error was calculated at 0,062 which gives us a confidence interval between 4,28 - 4,52. Since the mean was 4,4 it exists within the interval and gives the possibility to say that with a 95% certainty that the answer is generalizable to the general population (see table 14).

With the responses to the question regarding personality being on the upper part of the scale, the authors deem it to be important for the general respondent and is therefore consistent with the theory of Marchand and Walker (2008) and Sen, Du & Bhattacharya (2003). This theory notes that when consuming a product, the person at hand questions oneself how fitting the product is to one's personality - with the main objective of purchase being to gain personal benefits (Marchand & Walker, 2008; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya).

Looking at question 6, which regards how important it is for the consumer that the product matches one's lifestyle, it was valued at a mean of 4,14 and a mode of 3,00 and 5,00 (see table 14). The authors notes that the mode was equally distributed towards the lower as to the upper part of the scale. This tells us that the majority of the respondents answered question 6 both with a negative as well as a positive attitude. The standard deviation was calculated at 1,33 which means that the general answer was somewhere between 3 and 5. This means that the distribution of answers were more consistent for question 6 in comparison to question 3 but the results are more difficult to interpret since there exists an inclination for both directions of the scale. The standard error was calculated at 0,063 which gives is a confidence interval between 4,01 - 4,26. Since the mean was 4,14 it exists within the interval and gives the possibility to say that with a 95% certainty that the answer is generalizable to the general population (see table 14).
The respondents were generally indifferent at a value of 3 with equals the amount being rated to 5. The distribution of answers was less concentrated in relation to question 3, with 24% answering 3, 23.10% answering 4 and 24% answering 5. This means that the mode calculated through SPSS gives a misleading value and the authors therefore prompts the reader to look at table 5 for a more accurate presentation.

The consumers answering 3 on question 6 might be uncertain when it regards how their personality are consistent or not with their actions. Are they really applying their socially responsible personality to their lifestyle? With that in mind, the authors choose to look more critically at the theory by van Liere and Dunlap (1980), van Der Werff and Steg, and Keizer, 2013) saying that people consuming responsible products does so since it matches their actions. However, since equally the amount had responded 5 on question 6, it gives more incentives to analyze the differences in these two types of respondents lifestyles. The authors discuss the reason for these differences being that people either don’t feel a match between their lifestyle and their actions, that these people are not in control of their lifestyle, per example still living at home or simply that one has difficulty in categorizing one's lifestyle.

Question 10 talks about how socially responsible products makes one feel good about him or herself. The mean of the question was valued at 4.62 with the mode being valued at 6. Generally the majority of the respondents answered above 4 (see table 6) which gives the authors the idea that people feel good about themselves when consuming these products. This proves consistent with the theory of Markus and Kitayama (1991), Aaker & Williams, (1998) and Arnett, German and Hunt (2003) that people go through ego-focused emotions such as pride when regarding socially responsible products.

With a standard deviation valued at 1.26 most answers were somewhere in between 3 and 6 on the rating scale. With a standard error of 0.06 and a confidence interval between 4.50 - 4.74 we can say that with a 95% certainty that the results are generalizable to the general population (see table 14).

The last question regarding identity, question 11, asked the respondents on how socially responsible products differentiate themselves from their friends and family. The mean of the question was valued at 3.87 with a mode of 4 being the most chosen answer. Generally people feel somewhat different through their consumption since the majority of answers where on the upper part of the rating scale. This gives the authors an inclination towards the theory of people having strong independency and therefore using socially responsible products to feel unique and distinct from others (Markus & Kitayama 1991; Lee, Aaker & Gardner, 2000). With a standard deviation of 1.42 the majority of answers were somewhere in between 2 and 5. However, when looking at table 7 one can notice that the inclination towards agreeing with the statement was not distinct enough for the authors to fully say that the survey corresponds with theory and suggest further research to see how the question was interpreted. With a standard error of 0.067 and a confidence interval between 3.74 - 4.00 we can say that with a 95% certainty that the results are generalizable to the general population (see table 14).

Since existing theory proposed the questions used in this survey, with a statement that it generally measures the idea of identity, the authors chose to perform a correlation test between the questions to see if they were answered in a similar manner (see table 15). Many of the questions had a correlation between 0.45 and 0.52 which measures as a poor correlation since the desired value should be more close to 1. However, question 3 and 6 had the highest correlation of 0.70 which gives the authors an inclination that the notion of personality and lifestyle are relevant to use together in similar studies.
5.1.2 Self-image

The mean calculated for the total responses given to the notion of self-image was valued at 3,33 on a scale between 1 and 6 (see table 21). This value is one the lower part of the scale which is deemed by the authors to be relatively unimportant for the consumer to satisfy one's self-image through socially responsible consumption.

This goes against previous theory of how Brazil would be a collectivistic culture where decisions are judged on how it influences their relationships and immersions in social groups. Purchase is a status group concern where it would be important for the Brazilians to share such with the public (Hofstede, 1980, in Bochner, 1994; Breckler & Greenwald, 1986; Greenwald & Breckler, 1985 in Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Buttel & Flinn, 1978; Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antune, 2014).

In order to clarify if this mean of the total notion is reliable, the authors have also for the notion of self-image chosen to look at each question more closely. Question 4 regarding the purchase of socially responsible products being made by cultural reasons was rated at a mean of 3,78 and a mode of 3,00 (see table 14). This tells us that the majority of respondents were somewhat indifferent to the question but the distribution of answers where still even for the response of 4 and 5. This means that people were also equally positive towards the question and believe that culture is an influencing factor behind their attitude towards these products. The standard deviation was calculated at 1,41 which confirms that the answers where between 2 and 5. The standard error was calculated at 0,067, giving a confidence interval between 3,65 - 3,91. With the mean being inside the interval we can statistically say to 95% degree that the answers are generalizable to the general population (see table 14).

Theory would say that people define themselves in terms of their culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988) which tells us that culture in this case might be an important factor. However, as the notion of identity also was valued as important, it is difficult to confirm if one can generalize Brazil as an individualistic or collectivistic culture (Hofstede, 1980, in Bochner, 1994). The distribution of answers to question 4 gives the authors the idea that there exists more facets of culture making it difficult to say if it is important or not.

Question 5 regarded how the purchase is made since it is expected by society to do so. The question was generally valued at a mean of 4.10 with a mode of 4,00 (see table 14). These values tell us that generally people were somewhat positive towards the question, agreeing that they feel a somewhat pressure from society to consume socially responsible products.

In table 9 we can see that 26,20 % had responded 4 whereas 24,40 % responded 3. This is interpreted by the authors that people were either indifferent or had some agreement with the question. It might be so that the respondents think of society in different ways. If the idea of socially responsible products have yet not been normatively internalised in society, such as theory would suggest would prompt socially responsible behaviour (Fitzmaurice & Comegys, 2006; Dermody, Hannmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis & Zhao, 2015) it might be the reason for many answers being rated at 3. However, theory also says that these products are a growing field of consumption, where these respondents are finding themselves in social groups where these norms are more prominent.

The standard deviation was calculated at 1,35 which confirms that the majority of answers where in between 3 and 5. The standard error valued at 0,064 giving a confidence interval between 3,97 - 4,22.
With the mean being inside the interval it is possible to say with a 95% certainty that the results are generalizable to the general population (see table 14).

When looking at question 7, which talks about how important it is to share your purchase on social media, the mean was valued at 1.71 with a mode of 1.00 (see table 14). 65.28% responded 1 on a scale of 1 to 6 which means that people do not find it being important to share socially responsible products online. Question 7 gives further incentives that it would be interesting to look at each question rather than the general mean of self-image. The authors would propose that another question could be more suitable to measure self-image in a way where all answers are more consistently measured. The answers from the survey goes against the theory that Brazilians think that is important to share the act of being responsible to the public and confirm one's social identity (Breckler & Greenwald, 1986; Greenwald & Breckler, 1985 in Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Galego-Alvarez, Formigoni & Antune, 2014).

The standard deviation was calculated at 1.22 which gives the general answers being between 1 and 3. The standard error was calculated at 0.058 giving a confidence interval between 1.60 - 1.83. This tells us that the results are generalizable to the population with a 95% certainty (see table 14).

Question 8 regards how socially responsible consumption is shared with family and friends. The mean was valued at 3.63 with a mode of 4.00. When looking at table 11 one can see that the distribution of answers are highly even from 1 to 6. The authors suggest that the question was interpreted differently since there is no inclination in any direction. One of the ways question 8 could have been read differently is the many facets behind the word “sharing” and if it is read in the physical term or as a mean of sharing on social media. The theory of how socially responsible products are deemed important based on the attitudes of family and friends (Childers & Rao, 1992; Kressman et. al., 2006) can neither be discouraged or approved since the data shows no specific correlation.

The standard deviation was calculated at 1.58 which confirms the answers being very evenly distributed between 2 and 5. A standard error of 0.075 gives the confidence interval of 3.48 - 3.78. With the mean being inside the interval we can to a 95% degree say that the results are generalizable to the general population (see table 14).

Since the authors noted great differences between the mean of each question for self-image, a correlation test was suggested. The majority of questions had a correlation close to 0. The numbers tell us that the highest correlation of any question was found at 0.49 between question 4 and 5. Therefore one might question if previous theory was confirmed enough by other researchers to have measured the same thing, that is the notion of self-image (see table 16).
5.1.3 Welfare development

For the notion of welfare development, which consisted of question 9, had a mean of 3.18 and a mode of 3.00. This question regarded to what degree personal welfare was preferred over communal welfare. The values tell us that the majority of answers were given quite indifferently with 30.80% at 3 and 26.20% valued at 4. The results were interpreted by the authors that many people were either valuing communal welfare when purchasing socially responsible products or had a some inclination to one's own welfare first and foremost (see table 12). The theory that people extend their purpose of purchase beyond the values of the self and that such was noticed in the case of Brazil, is deemed difficult to confirm from such statistics (Lorek & Fuchs, 2013; Scharf, 2009 in Galego-Álvarez, Formigoni & Antunes, 2014; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya, 2016). The authors would have preferred a number more close to the lower part of the rating scale in order to fully say that people act beyond the self.

With a standard deviation of 1.36 it tells us that the answers where distributed between 2 and 4. With a standard error calculated at 0.065 we reach a confidence interval between 3.05 - 3.31 which means that the results can with a 95% certainty be generalized to the general population (see table 14).

To further see if the questions was asked properly, interpreted and answered in a manner that measured the notion of welfare development the authors included a test variable. The results proved that many respondents answered inconsistently between the two questions (see table 17) with the correlation being valued at -0.29. This gives evidence to the authors that the notion was either difficult to measure in terms of it being a sensitive question, or that it was semantically read differently by different respondents.

5.2 Analysis of the variables and the notions

The following chapter aims to define certain consumers and their relation to the notions. The hypotheses are based on the variables of age, gender and income. Statistical tests have been made to find if they have any significance with the notions. The results of the statistics is compared to the hypotheses formed from the theory regarding age, gender and income (see section 2.4 - 2.6).

5.2.1 Age

Hypothesis H1 regarded if there existed a negative correlation between age and identity. The results of this research are shown in table 18 where the correlation is valued at 0.177. The authors deemed this value to be far away from 1 which would signify a correlation between the variables of age and identity. The authors therefore concluded the results to be non consistent with the theory of Diamantopoulos et. al. (2003) saying that age would have been an influencing factor on attitudes for socially responsible consumption, more so in a negative manner. The reason for such was that social responsibility can seem intrusive of one’s identity, which therefore would expect the youth to identify more with such consumption (van Liere & Dunlap, 1980). With a low correlation in this research hypothesis H1 is therefore rejected.

H1: There exists no correlation between age and the searched value on identity

Further illustrated in table 15 there exists a weak or no correlation between the questions asked under the notion of identity. The authors therefore remain open to the idea that there might be a correlation if other questions had been asked. Identity measured in the UK by Diamantopoulos et. al. (2003) showed
a significant influence, but it was made in another cultural context with a different collection of questions to measure with.

Hypothesis H2 regarded if there existed a positive correlation between age and self-image. The results of this research is shown in table 19 where the correlation was valued at 0.002. The authors deemed this value to be far away from 1 which would signify a correlation between the variables of age and self-image. The authors therefore concluded the results to be non consistent with the theory of Lin and Huang (2012) who argued that environmental conscientiousness takes time to be internalised into attitudes and habits, and as Marchand and Walker (2008) found that if so actions are done for the personal benefits of how society will perceive you. With no correlation, the hypothesis H2 is rejected.

\[
H2: \text{There exists no positive correlation between age and the searched value on self-image}
\]

Table 16 shows that there exists no correlation between the questions asked under the notion of self-image. Similarly to identity, the authors remain open to the idea that the questions chosen from theory might not be applicable to the current cultural context, also that other results could have been achieved with other questions regarding self-image. The theory that older people would pursue the gains of a positive attitude from their surroundings through their purchase might be true but there could be other areas more important for such than confirmation through social media (as asked in question 4).

Null hypothesis H0.1 regarded through the lack of theory that there would assumed to not be any significance between the variable of age and welfare development. The results shown in table 20 show a correlation value of -0.188 . The authors deem this value to be far away from a significant value of negative 1 or 1 which indicates no significant influence between age and the searched value in welfare development.

These conclusions are amplified in table 17 where there was no correlation between the question regarding welfare development or the test variable. The respondents seemed to answer contradictory to the idea of valuing one’s own benefit equally as the benefit of society. This means that the null-hypothesis is accepted.

\[
H0.1: \text{There exists no statistically significant influence between age and the searched value for welfare development}
\]

5.2.2 Gender

Hypothesis H3 regarded if women had a higher level of care for welfare development than other notions, compared to men. The results of this research are shown in table 21 which valued women at a total mean of 2.94 with men valued at 3.45. Since the question regarded to what level personal welfare was more important than communal, men were more concerned on personal gains since the value is higher than for women. The authors therefore concluded the results to be consistent with the theory saying that women would be more likely to be concerned about other’s welfare compared to men (Eagly, 2013 in Dagher, Itani and Kassar, 2015). Women would see it as a morality to contribute to other’s needs (Flanagan & Jackson, 1987). Hypothesis H3 is therefore accepted.

\[
H3: \text{Women are more concerned on welfare development than other notions when purchasing socially responsible products}
\]
Hypothesis H2 regarded if there existed a positive correlation between age and self-image. The results of this research is shown in table 19 where the correlation was valued at 0.002. The authors deemed this value to be far away from 1 which would signify a correlation between the variables of age and self-image. The authors therefore concluded the results to be non consistent with the theory of Lin and Huang (2012) who argued that environmental conscientiousness takes time to be internalised into attitudes and habits, and as Marchand and Walker (2008) found that if so actions are done for the personal benefits of how society will perceive you. With no correlation, the hypothesis H2 is rejected.

Hypothesis H4 and H5 regarded if men and women were more concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products. The results of this research is shown in table 21 which valued women at a mean of 3.30 and men at 3.39. The results were slight but still coherent to the theory by Miniard and Cohen (1983) who argued that men are drawn to socially responsible products if it shows an acquiring of profit to the outside world. Men strengthen their need of proving oneself in social acceptance through their consumption. If it is not perceived as an appreciated behaviour by the group, men are not inclined to purchase these products. Hypothesis H4 is therefore accepted whereas H5 is rejected.

**H4: Men are more concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products**

**H5: Women are less concerned on self-image than other notions, when purchasing socially responsible products**

Null hypothesis H0.2 was formed to see if there were differences within the responses of each gender. In the case of this research, it was shown that men and women in total valued differently between the notion.. To test such, the authors performed a Pearson correlation test from the primary data and the results are presented in table 22. With the correlation being valued at 0.081 the authors argue that for this research there was no significant correlation between gender and the searched value on identity. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted.

**H0.2: There exists no statistically significant influence between gender and the searched value on identity**

### 5.2.3 Income

Hypothesis H6 regarded if there existed a positive correlation between income and self-image. The results of this research are shown in table 25 with a correlation of 0.027. The authors deemed this value to be distant from a value of 1 meaning that there would be no significant correlation between the level of income and the searched value on self-image. This means that the theory by Young (2015) is questioned by the authors. People may generally not experience themselves as socially benefitted through having a high income, but more so it could be not thought of as a norm by the high incomers social group to act socially responsible. Therefore hypothesis H6 is rejected.

**H6: There exists no correlation between income and the searched value on self-image**
Hypothesis H7 regarded if there existed a positive correlation between income and identity. The results of this research are shown in table 23 with a correlation of 0.145. The authors deemed this value to be distant from a value of 1 meaning that there would be no significant correlation between the level of income and the searched value on identity. This means that the theory by Lee, Levy and Yap (2015) is questioned by the authors. They concluded in theory that people of higher income are more protective of their identity because their existence of place is related to their sense of self. It was argued that people want to preserve something that represents a part of who they are more than for the sake of the environment. Ceglia, Lima and Leocâdio (2015) discuss the fulfilment of the self to be connected to individual needs of identity for people with a higher level of income. Since there seemed to be no correlation in this research, hypothesis H7 is rejected.

**H7: There exists no correlation between income and the searched value on identity**

Hypothesis H8 regarded if people of lower income are more concerned about welfare development than other notions. The results of this research are shown in table 24 where “no incomers” valued welfare development at 2.87 in comparison to identity valued at 4.05 and self-image at 3.45. As previously described, a lower value on welfare development would indicate a higher concern for the community more than individual needs. This proved consistent with theory that people who are of low income would transcend the act of purchasing socially responsible products beyond personal satisfaction of material goods (Jacob, Jovic & Brinkerhoff, 2009). People of a lower income are at a higher risk of per example pollution and contamination and therefore acts against these effects for the sake of their community (Carson & Moulden, 1991).

However, regarding the respondents of below average income, the value of welfare development was 3.22 in comparison to 4.21 for identity and 3.28 for self-image. In this case the difference between the values of welfare development and self-image was noticeably slight. The authors therefore remain critical to accept the hypothesis for at least the below average incomers. Generally one might still assume that people value welfare development more if they are closer to having no income. Hypothesis H8 is accepted.

**H8: People of lower income are more concerned about welfare development than other notions**
6.0 Conclusions

The following chapter will conclude the findings of this research and how it applies to the initial research objective. The authors will present potential biases that one might need to adhere to when analyzing and drawing conclusions of this research. The end section will discuss what the authors find could be further looked upon in future research.

6.1 Conclusion of this research

In the first step of analysis, the authors chose to look more closely at the notions and how they relate to the general consumer. The purpose of this analysis finds ground in the research question when trying to generalize what aspect of the self consumers are generally trying to satisfy through consuming socially responsible products. Generally, the highest valued notion through the calculations of the collected primary data was identity but in order to see if each question based on theory actually measured the same thing, the authors performed tests to see if the questions correlated. The results gave rise to many questions as if the assumption of the notions would differ between cultures and if it would need a re-definition for it’s particular context. This applied not only to the notion of identity, but also for the remaining notions of self-image and welfare development.

When looking at the facets within the notion of identity, the authors found that for the context of Blumenau, the idea of a consumer’s personality and how it relates to one’s lifestyle was most significant to actually measure identity. These thoughts are based on theory saying that these aspects would be interesting to generally measure when talking about identity, but this research found that many of the questions did not apply to the context of Brazil due to its low significance. However, looking closely at how the respondents felt about their consumptions fit with their lifestyle, the attitude seem to be equally as indifferent as positive. This gives arise to the idea that these people actually have different lifestyles and it would be interesting to research these individuals in the future and how personality connects to changing lifestyles.

The idea of consuming socially responsible products making an individual feel better about themselves was generally valued the highest of each question within identity. This gives inclination for marketers to make use of these feelings of self-worth in their marketing. More so, one might see the benefits of clarifying to the consumer the difference of not choosing to purchase such a product and how it may evoke feelings of guilt.

To examine a certain consumer’s attitude, the authors chose three variables of age, gender and income to categorize them. The results showed that there was no significant correlation between these and the notions. No matter the age, gender or income, people could have different attitudes towards the questions in this research. However, the research proved that women in general had a higher care for welfare development whereas men found it most important to satisfy their self-image through consumption. Since there was no correlation, it gives arise to the question as to what unknown variables influence these people to have these types of attitudes. Gender was not an influencing variable which was confirmed through the null hypothesis and tells us that even if women scored higher on identity and men on self-image, we cannot make any predictions on what a random woman or man would think regarding a notion. The same conclusion can be made with income. Even if the respondents who were below income seemed most concerned in general about welfare development, we cannot statistically predict that a person below income who is randomly selected would be so.
For people working with marketing socially responsible products, it might be interesting to say that in the case of this research, a certain categorization of the consumer was not possible. The variables of age, gender and income proved to not be significant, but when talking about people of Blumenau in general, the pursuit of strengthening one’s identity might be of the bigger importance. To ways of measuring attitudes has proven not to be a universal language - we need to redefine what it means to value identity. Identity might be looked upon differently depending on the cultural context. This research found inclinations in it’s results, even if one might question the results based on what a fitting measurement of identity might be, especially in the case of Blumenau. The authors found that identity was significantly more important to the respondents than the other notions. To take this research back to it’s objective, we might not be able to say what the consumer actually looks like, but we can say that socially responsible products are bought from an ego-focused dependency. It may not be as important to the consumers how the world perceives them or how their actions might affect the world, but more so as to how they choose to look at themselves.

### 6.2 Potential biases

Through the primary data, the authors found suggestions that some questions might have been understood differently between the respondents. This falls in particular to question 8 since the distribution of answers was highly even between the choices available. The idea was that question 7 would relate to question 8 but in a more extensive manner and since these two questions often significantly differed it might be due to the case of misinterpreted semantics.

Another bias which has continuously been discussed in this research, is the fact that the questions chosen to measure the notions were picked from previous theory. Since this theory exists in another time of measurement as well as in another cultural context, more research would be needed to see if the differences in answers is true or something based on flaws in measurement. The authors found inclination to such a statement based on the fact that many questions had a low correlation.

Since the sample was made from a convenience choice, many of the respondents turned out to be of the younger age group. In order to make more generalizable conclusions it might have been desirable to reach a wider range of age in the respondents. In the methodology (see section 3.5) it is described that the respondents were reached both through physical handouts of the survey as well as online. The authors had more control in the physical handouts and were able to distribute the survey more evenly between age, but the online survey had a significantly greater number of younger people choosing to answer the survey. This can incline that the older generation would be less interested in socially responsible products and any type of analysis of this age group might not represent the attitude of the general population.
6.3 Suggestions for future research

For future purposes on researching how socially responsible products relate to one’s sense of self, this research has found that some theoretical facets might still be of interest to continue using, even if much has been defined as inapplicable to this cultural context. The authors suggest further research into how personality connects to lifestyle and how one variable might affect another when regarding socially responsible products. Since the variables chosen to measure the levels of each notion proved to be non-significant it might be of interest to try finding the right variables to categorize the consumer, if possible. This research has given ground of answering as to what extent this type of consumption relates to the self.

However, to truly specify one’s consumer might be of importance for businesses. When regarding marketing communication, one could benefit from finding the appropriate variables to define what our consumer looks like. The current research might give answers to what general focus the marketing message should have to the general population, but to reap the potential benefits of having a more focused message for each consumer, more research is needed.
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8.0 Complements

8.1 Quantitative survey

**Consumo socialmente responsável**

Olá!

Somos dois estudantes de intercâmbio da Suécia e no momento estamos estudando as atitudes sobre o consumo socialmente responsável em Blumenau.

Consumo socialmente responsável refere-se aos produtos que são desenvolvidos como amigáveis para o meio ambiente ou parte do valor que você gasta com eles retorna, de alguma forma, para a sociedade.

Gostaríamos de tomar 1 ou 2 minutos do seu tempo para algumas perguntas. Ao responder a pesquisa, lembre-se de um produto que você comprou recentemente ou quer comprar e era/é socialmente responsável.

Produtos socialmente responsáveis são produzidos por empresas que realizam ações para contribuir para o desenvolvimento da sociedade. Essas ações podem ser projetos que aumentam o bem-estar, que contribuam para a preservação do meio ambiente, que melhorem o ambiente de trabalho para os funcionários, e/ou investem em tecnologia para melhorar processos e produtos.

Obrigado!

*Obligatorisk

1. Qual é o seu gênero? *
   - Homem
   - Mulher

2. Qual sua idade? *

   Ditt svar

**Eu considero importante os produtos socialmente responsáveis porque ...**

3. É uma parte da minha personalidade *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Discordar
   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Concordar
4. É uma parte da minha cultura *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discordar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. É esperado pela sociedade *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discordar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Porque corresponde ao meu estilo de vida *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discordar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Eu compartilho a minha compra em mídias sociais *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raramente</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequentemente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Eu compartilho a minha compra com a família e amigos *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raramente</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequentemente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Eu valorizo bem-estar pessoal, em vez do bem-estar comunitário *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discordar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerar as seguintes declarações

10. Em que medida a compra de produtos socialmente responsáveis faz você se sentir bem? *

[1 2 3 4 5 6]

Pouco [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Muito

11. Em que medida a compra de produtos socialmente responsáveis faz você se sentir diferente em relação a seus amigos e familiares? *

[1 2 3 4 5 6]

Pouco [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Muito

12. Em geral, quando você compra produtos socialmente responsáveis, a sua decisão de compra é baseada em ... *

[ ] o que o produto pode fazer por você
[ ] o que o produto pode fazer para sua comunidade

13. Qual a sua renda mensal? *

[ ] Sem renda
[ ] Abaixo de R$ 2.200,00
[ ] Entre R$ 2.200,00 e R$ 2.600,00
[ ] Acima de R$ 2.600,00

Obrigado!
Ove Robin Granström, a student graduating in marketing and tourism science who finished his studies in Brazil. Completing and summarizing his learnings in writing, the current essay was made with a focal point on consumer behavior.

Julia Roos, a student graduating in marketing who finished her studies with an internship in Blumenau, Brazil. During her stay, she also wrote her final thesis with a focal point on consumer behavior.