Determinants and Outcomes of Consumer Green Attitude; Moderating Role of Degree of Greenness

Malik Muhammad Faisal[*], Muhammad Razzaq Athar[†], Rauf.i.Azam[‡], Ali Raza[§] and Zia ur Rehman[**]

Abstract

Consumers are more price-sensitive in the case of food products and services. Hence it is one of the motivations of customers purchasing green food. Green consumerism has appeared to answer to the requirement of green consumers who are worried about the environment. Numerous may affect the responsiveness of an eco-friendly customer towards a product or service. By analyzing this phenomenon using theory of planned behavior and price promotions literature, customer purchase intentions is affected differently by different and kinds of price promotions. This process also varies the degree of greenness and responsible purchasing among customers. Data collected from a sample of 400 consumers while, structured questionnaires were used to gather primary data from consumers. For hypothesis testing process macro was used. CFA was run by using AMOS. There have been discussed results alongwith recommendations and future directions at the end.

Keywords: Consumer Product Knowledge, Perceived Quality, Perceived Saving, Consumer Green Attitude, Green Purchase Intention, Consumer Degree of Greenness.

Introduction

In the modern times, environmental consciousness among consumers is increasing. They are more inclined towards environmental friendly products and responsible purchasing. They analyze the effects of products and services on the planet while making purchase decisions.

[*] Malik Muhammad Faisal, PhD Scholar, University Institute of Management Sciences, PirMehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan. Email: faisal@uaar.edu.pk

[†] Dr. Muhammad Razzaq Athar, Associate Professor, University Institute of Management Sciences, PirMehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.

[‡] Prof Dr. Rauf.i.Azam, Vice Chancellor, University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan.

[§] Dr. Ali Raza, Assistant Professor,QAU, Islamabad.

[**] Zia ur Rehman, PhD Scholar Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Apart from this, consumers are also becoming price-conscious at the same time as different tools of price promotions affect their behavior differently. As a result, such factors are encouraging consumers to prefer green food over other options (Yin, Wu, Du, and Chen, 2010). The need for green food has been increased significantly in the current times due to increasing public health hazards and ecological problems. (Sheng, Shen, Qiao, Yu, & Fan, 2009) write that organic food industry can be considered as one of the most rapidly growing agricultural industries of the world.

Products which are not harmful for environment are known as environment friendly or green products. In the modern world, products are perceived to be depleting world resources but green products actually prevent this by providing alternative and environment friendly solutions to humans (Shamdasani, Chon-Lin, & Richmond, 1993). In the current world of depleted resources, consumers are focused on environment friendly products and services.In the current context, it has become imperative for the firms to know the pace to which green consumers are entering the mainstream markets. As per literature, it is evident that consumers respond differently to different kinds of environment friendly offerings. It is also important to define the concept of degree of greenness here. Degree of greenness refers to the degree to which consumers might prefer an environment friendly product over a less green product keeping all other things equal (Ginsberg and Bloom, 2004). It is interesting to note that consumers are becoming environment-conscious but they are likely to buy an environment friendly product merely on their environment consciousness. Their buying intentions vary differently due to several factors (Ginsberg and Bloom, 2004).

The above discussion suggests that is a significant gap between buying intentions and attitude of consumers towards environment friendly products (Ha and Janda, 2012; Kilbourne and Pickett, 2008). It is evident from the above discussion that environment friendly customers may not intend to buy an environment friendly products and services. Several factors involved that may affect the responsiveness of an environment friendly customer towards a product or service. Such factors can be: trust, price, relatedness, brand, and quality that may impact the purchase decision making process of environment friendly consumers (Carrigan and De Pelsmacker, 2009). Price is one of such factors that may prevent a green consumer to buy an eco-friendly product (Bonini and Oppenheim, 2008. (Tanner and Wölfing Kast, 2003) also confirms this relationship between buying intentions of consumers and price of green products. They even claimed that price was the major determinant to shape the buying intentions of Swiss consumers while purchasing

green products and services. In retails, price offers and discounts are the most significant factors to positively shaping the buying behavior of consumers (Krishna, Briesch, Lehmann, & Yuan, 2002).

It is interesting to know that consumers from developed nations are more eco-friendly relative to other consumers (Cherian and Jacob, 2012). Research conducted in the 2000s such as the studies of (Han, Hsu, & Lee 2009), Rahbar & Abdul Wahid, 2011), and D'Souza, Taghian, & Lamb, 2006) found that certain customers can even pay the premium prices for environment friendly offers. Contrary to this, such findings are limited to developed nations only while there is a clear research gap in literature regarding this consumer behavior in developing nations such as India (Bhattacharya, 2011).

The current study will analyze the determinants of consumer behavior towards green or environment friendly food products and services. It will also investigate the association between consumers' green attitude and green buying intentions of environment friendly consumers. As per prospect theory by (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979) and literature studies discussed above, it is evident that price can actually impact the buying behavior of consumers. By analyzing the relationship among varying degrees of greenness and responsiveness to price, this study will not only fill a gap in literature but also help the industry to craft effective marketing strategies particularly regarding pricing plans.

Significance of the Study

This study may help the academicians to understand the relationship between degree of greenness, green buying intentions among consumers, and different factors such as price, product information, perceived quality, and perceived savings influencing green buying decision making process. In the current world, markets are becoming more mature due to intense price wars among companies and rational buying behavior of consumers.

Rationale

This study takes theory of planned behavior as underpinning theory. With this backgroung it further studies the moderating role of degree of greenness which makes the current study distinct from others. This type of research, mainly from the perspective of green dairy products have not been studied so far. Therefore, this study was carried out to augment the literature.

Problem Statement

Due to worsening climate and environmental conditions, consumers are becoming more responsible and sophisticated regarding environmental sustainability by preferring green products over normal products (Bhattacharya, 2011). As a result, buying environment friendly products and services is considered as a tool to protect the environment by consumers (Kilbourne and Pickett, 2008). While they buy environment friendly products and services, their motive is to contribute to environmental preservation and sustainability (Han, Hsu, & Lee, 2009).

Apart from increasing evidence that eco-friendliness is increasing in consumers, there is still a research gap regarding the association of green attitude and green purchase intention (GPI) of responsible consumers. As discussed earlier, degree of greenness varies depending upon different factors such as price that may impact the purchase decision making of consumers. This gap is further increased in case of developing nations when there is not enough evidence that consumers in developing nations like Pakistan is sensitive to eco-friendly products or services.

Research Questions

1. Does the consumer product knowledge affect consumer green attitude?
2. Does the relationship of perceived quality affect consumer green attitude?
3. Does the relationship of perceived saving effect consumer green attitude?
4. Does the consumer green attitude mediate the relationship of determinants of consumer green attitude and GPI?
5. Does Consumer degree of greenness moderate the relationship of consumer green attitude and consumer GPI?

Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

- To examine the relationship of consumer product knowledge with consumer green Attitude.
  - To investigate the consumer product knowledge on consumer green attitude.
  - To investigate the consumer product knowledge on consumer's GPI
- To examine the relationship of perceived quality with green purchase attitude.
  - To investigate the perceived quality on consumer green attitude
  - To investigate the perceived quality on consumer's GPI

- To examine the relationship of perceived saving with consumer green attitude.
  - To investigate the perceived saving on consumer green attitude
  - To investigate the perceived saving on GPI
- To examine the moderating role of consumer degree of greenness on consumer green attitudeand GPI.

Review of Literature

Environmental attitudes can be described as certain beliefs, perceptions, and intentions held by a consumer regarding environment friendly activities (Hughner, McDonagh, Prothero, Shultz, & Stanton, 2007). It is also considered as a psychological tendency based on beliefs and perceptions held by a person regarding natural environment that may encourage/discourage him/her to some degree about engagement in ecological activities (Milfont and Sibley, 2012). In the study of (Laroche, Bergeron, & Barbaro-Forleo, 2001), it is found that some influencing parts of environmental attitude are, sometimes, inconvenient to environment friendly behavior of individuals.

It is important to note that knowledge and information drives behavior. Ecological responsiveness of a person depends upon his/her knowledge and awareness of sustainability issues (Young, Hwang, McDonald, & Oates, 2010). As per literature and studies, there is a positive association between knowledge and behavior (Hoch & Deighton, 1989; Park, Mothersbaugh, & Feick, 1994). It is interesting to note that some studies like (Martin and Simintiras, 1995) find this relationship to be inconsistent in case of environmental and socially responsible behaviors.

Knowledge of the consumers impact their environmental behavior in different ways. First of all, knowledge is taken as a personal resource by individuals while making environmental and personal responsibility decisions (Bhattacharya, 2011). Secondly, knowledge enables a person to apply behavioral control resulting in ability and motivation to act in a certain situation to execute environment friendly behavior (Carrigan and De Pelsmacker, 2009). From the above discussion, it can be argued that knowledge about environmental problems motivates a person to adopt a responsible behavior.

In today's world, environment conscious consumer segments can be easily differentiated from others. As a result, such segments can be targeted to offer environment friendly products and services even at premium prices (Krishna, Briesch, Lehmann, & Yuan, 2002). There are several factors that may impact the purchase intentions of green consumers such as price, quality, perceived savings, and willing to

purchase responsible products (Milfont and Sibley, 2012). As discussed earlier, degree of greenness refers to the degree to which consumers will prefer an environment friendly product over others. (Ginsberg and Bloom, 2004) identified five segments of consumers with respect to their degree of greenness.Additional gain offerings made by a promotional message can positively shape the purchase intentions of a consumer because it enhances the perceived savings for the consumers while making a purchase decision (Gamliel and Herstein, 2011; Xia, Monroe, and Cox, 2004).

Breaking down the primary determinants that impact of green buying and utilization, the principle variables incorporated into the reviews were inner: ecological concern (see Newton et al., 2015; Kanchanapibul et al., 2014), disposition and qualities (see Gilg et al., 2005; Chairy, 2012; Barber et al., 2014; Paço et al., 2013; Ramayah et al., 2010) are more particular to culture and behavioral brain science. Temporarily, different creators alluded to the distinct hypotheses, which incorporated inner, social and outer factors. Provisionally, in this paper the fundamental consideration was paid to outside variables, though the impacts of outer components, especially the primary boundaries, for example, cost, were less investigated, and additionally the connection between green buying and naturally amicable conduct.

Generally, it is perceived by a large consumer group that green products have a poor quality. This group of consumers may not be willing to pay premium prices due to their price sensitivity and perceived quality (Milfont and Sibley, 2012). Contrary to this, consumers who are highly responsible to environment may associate ‘greenness’ of the product with quality. As a result, they may compromise the performance for greenness by considering greenness as a quality indicator. This highlights the role of perceived quality to affect the purchase intentions and behaviors of consumers (Yin, Wu, Du, & Chen, 2010).

Hypotheses

H_{11}: Consumer product knowledge (CPK) has positive and significant effect on consumer green attitude (CGA).
H_{12}: CGA has positive and significant effect on GPI.
H_{13}: Perceived quality (PQ) has positive and significant effect on CGA.
H_{14}: Perceived saving (PS) has positive and significant effect on CGA.
H_{15}: Consumer degree of Greenness (CDoG) will moderate the relationship of CGA and GPI.
H_{16}: CGA will mediate the relationship of CPK and GPI.
H_{17}: CGA will mediate the relationship of PQ and GPI.
H_{18}: CGA will mediate the relationship of PS and GPI

Material and Methods

The aim of this study is to study the impact of product knowledge, perceived quality, and perceived savings on the purchase intentions and behavior of green consumers. For this purpose, focus was on testing the listed hypotheses.

This study has followed a pragmatic approach by combining both quantitative and quantitative research methods. The quantitative tool that I have used for gathering primary data was questionnaire survey that are considered as one of the most effective quantitative social research methods (Cooper and Schindler, 2006).

I have collected data from a sample of 400 general consumers while they were engaged in the study using questionnaire surveys. Structured questionnaires were used to gather primary data from consumers of Twin cities of Punjab (Pakistan). I have handed over the questionnaire that consumer filled it and returned the survey later. Data analysis was conducted by using Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS) and AMOS software. I used factor analysis for data validation and analysis. For data reliability, Chronbach's Alpha was utilized. For hypothesis testing, process macro was used and for CFA (confirmatory factor analysis) AMOS was used.

After data screening regression analysis was executed to determine how well determinants of consumer green purchase attitude predict consumer GPI. The final step of the data analysis in this research included the total hypothesized moderation and mediation. For this purpose process macro of Hayes (2013) was selected.

Reliability Analysis

Table 1:Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
CPK	0.812	5
PS	0.843	6
CDOG	0.833	7
CGA	0.856	7
GPI	0.908	11
PQ	0.852	5

The Cronbach's alpha values(0.812, 0.843, 0.833, 0.856, .908, and 0.852 for CPK, PS, CDOG, CGA, GPI and for PQ respectively) show the reliability of instrument used.

Correlation Analysis

Table 2:Correlations

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	CPK	CDOG	PS	PQ	CGA	GPI
CPK	2.300	0.777	(0.81)					
CDOG	2.482	0.775	.505**	(0.83)				
PS	2.591	0.917	.384**	.539**	(0.84)			
PQ	2.295	0.854	.552**	.639**	.569**	(0.85)		
CGA	2.256	0.786	.557**	.532**	.389**	.589**	(0.86)	
GPI	2.472	0.828	.560**	.673**	.573**	.699**	.567**	(0.91)

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Regression Analysis

Table 3:Impact of CPK on GPI with mediating role of CGA

Antecedent		Consequent							
		M (CGA)					Y (GPI)		
		B	SE	P			B	SE	p
X (CPK)	a1	0.5636	.04210	0.000	a2	c'	0.3778	0.9496	0.000
M (CGA)		---	---	---		b1	0.3893	0.0490	0.000
Constant	iM1	0.9601	0.1022	0.000	iM2	i2	0.7242	0.1106	0.000
		R^2 = 0.3104					R^2 = 0.4075		
		F(1,398) = 179.1048, p = .000					F(1,398) = 181.7179, p = .000		

	Effect	SE (Boot)	LLCI (95% CI)	ULCI (95% CI)
TE: CPK-->GPI	0.5972	0.442	0.5101	0.6843
DE: CPK-->GPI	0.3778	0.0496	0.2802	0.4754
CPK-->CGA-->GPI	0.2194	0.491	0.1253	0.3160

The results of mediation are provided in the table 3. Initially, the direct impact of CPK was tested on CGA was significant(b = 0.5636, p-value < 0.01). Overall model is also significant at F (1,398) = 179.1048, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 31.04% variation of CGA. In the second step, CPK and CGA were regressed on GPI. Regression coefficient of both CPK and CGA were significant at β = 0.3778, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.3893, p-value < 0.01 respectively. The overall modelfits very well(F (1,398) = 181.7179, p-value < 0.01) and explains 40.75% variation. There is an increment of 9.71% after the inclusion of CGA as mediator in the model. Total effect of CPK on GPI is also significant at b =.5972 with boot strapped values (0.5101 and 0.6843 excluding zeros) at 95% confidence interval. Direct and indirect effects are also significant at 95% confidence interval with effect value of 0.3778 and 0.2194, with bootstrap values of (0.2802 and 0.4754, 0.1253 and 0.3160 excluding zeros) respectively.

Table 4: Impact of PS on GPI with mediating role of CGA

Antecedent		Consequent							
		M (CGA)					Y (GPI)		
		B	SE	P			B	SE	P
X (PS)	a1	0.3334	0.3960	0.000	a2	c'	0.3753	0.3590	0.000
M (CGA)		---	---	---		b1	0.4269	0.0419	0.000
Constant	iM1	1.3926	0.1087	0.000	iM2	i2	0.5358	0.1081	0.000
		R^2 = 0.1514					R^2 = 0.4674		
		F(1,398) = 70.9982, p = .000					F(2,397) = 174.2127, p = .000		

	Effect	SE (Boot)	LLCI	ULCI
			(95% CI)	
TE: PS-->GPI	0.5176	0.0371	0.4446	0.5905
DE: PS-->GPI	0.3753	0.0359	0.3047	0.4459
CPK-->CGA-->GPI	0.1423	0.0296	0.0921	0.2086

Results of mediation with perceived savings as independent variable are given in the table 4. Impact ofPS on CGA was significant(β = 0.3334, p-value < 0.01). The model fits well(F (1,398) = 70.9982, p-value < 0.01) and explains 15.14 % variation. In the second step, perceived saving and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI. Regression coefficient of both consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI were significant at β = 0.3753, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.4269, p-value < 0.01 respectively. Overall model is also significant at F (2,397) = 181.7179, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 46.74 % variation of consumer green purchase attitude. There is an increment of 31 % after the inclusion of consumer green purchase attitude as mediator in the model. Total effect of PS on GPI is also significant at β =.5176 with boot strapped values (0.4446 and 0.5905 excluding zeros) at 95% confidence interval. Direct and indirect effects are also significant at 95% confidence interval with effect value of 0.3753 and 0.0359, with bootstrap values of (0.3047 and 0.4459, 0.0921 and 0.2086 excluding zeros) respectively.

Table 5:Impact of PQ on GPI with mediating role of CGA

Antecedent		Consequent							
		M (CGA)					Y (GPI)		
		B	SE	p			B	SE	P
X (PQ)	a1	0.5416	0.0373	0.000	a2	c'	0.5422	0.0415	0.000
M (CGA)		---	---	---		b1	0.2506	0.0451	0.000
Constant	iM1	1.0137	.0913	0.000	iM2	i2	0.6622	0.0940	0.000
		R^2 = 0.3464					R^2 = 0.5250		
		F(1,398) = 210.9363, p = .000					F(2,397) = 219.4343, p = .000		

	Effect	SE (Boot)	LLCI	ULCI
			(95% CI)	
TE: PS-->GPI	0.6779	0.0348	0.6095	0.7463
DE: PS-->GPI	0.5422	0.0415	0.4605	0.6238
CPK-->CGA-->GPI	0.1357	0.0403	0.0602	0.2179

Table 5 shows the results of mediated regression with perceived quality. Initially, the impact of perceived quality was tested on consumer green purchase attitude. Regression coefficient of perceived quality was significant at b = 0.5416, p-value < 0.01. Overall model is also significant at F (1,398) = 210.93, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 34.64 % variation of Consumer Green purchase attitude. In the second step, perceived quality and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI. Regression coefficient of both consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI were significant at β = 0.5422, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.2506, p-value < 0.01 respectively. Overall model is also significant at F (2,397) = 219.43, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 52.50 % variation of consumer green purchase attitude. There is an increment of 18 % after the inclusion of CGA as mediator in the model. Total effect of perceived quality on GPI is also significant at β =.6779 with boot strapped values (0.6095 and 0.7463 excluding zeros) at 95% confidence interval. Direct and indirect effects are also significant at 95% confidence interval with effect value of 0.5422 and 0.1357, with bootstrap values of (0.4605 and 0.6229, 0.0602 and 0.1357 excluding zeros) respectively.

Table 6: Impact of CPK on GPI, mediating role of CGA, moderating role of CDOG

Antecedent		Consequent M (CGA)					Y (GPI)		
		B	SE	P			β	SE	P
X (CPK)	a1	0.5636	0.0421	0.000	a2	c'	0.2124	0.0469	0.000
M (CGA)		---	---	---		b1	0.8627	0.1786	0.000
Q (CDOG)		---	---	---		b2	0.6463	0.1053	0.000
QxX(CGAxCDOG)		---	---	---		b3	-.0648	0.0379	0.088
Constant	iM1	0.9601	0.1022	0.000	iM2	i2	-1.1596	0.4069	0.004
		R^2 = 0.3104 F(1,398) = 179.10, p = 0.0000					R^2 = 0.5626 F(6,393) = 90.3016, p = .0000		

Table 6 shows the results of moderated mediation regression. Initially, the impact of CPK was tested on consumer green purchase attitude. Regression coefficient of CPK was significant at β= 0.5636, p-value < 0.01. Overall model is also significant at F(1,398) = 179.10, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 31.04 % variation of consumer green purchase attitude. In the second step, CPK and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI in the presence of CDOG. Regression coefficient of both CPK and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI were significant at β = 0.2124, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.8627, p-value < 0.01 respectively. Regression coefficient

of CDOG was significant β = 0.6463, p-value < 0.01 respectively. Interaction term between CGA and CDOG is marginally significant β = -0.0648, p-value < 0.10. Overall model is also significant at F (6,393) = 90.3016, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 57.96% variation of GPI.

Table 7: Impact of PQ on GPI, mediating role of CGA, moderating role of CDOG

Antecedent		Consequent M (CGA) B	SE	P			Y (GPI) B	SE	P
X (PQ)	a1	0.5416	0.0373	0.0000	a2	c'	0.3619	0.0432	0.0000
M (CGA)		---	---	---		b1	0.8601	0.1642	0.0000
Q (CDOG)		---	---	---		b2	0.6145	0.0957	0.0000
QxX (CGAxCDOG)		---	---	---		b3	-0.1007	0.0344	0.0037
Constant	iM1	1.0137	0.0913	0.0000	iM2	i2	-1.1848	0.3825	0.0021
		R^2 = 0.3464 F(1,398) = 210.9363, p = 0.0000					R^2 = 0.6096 F(6,393) = 102.2644, p = .0000		

Table 7 shows the results of moderated mediation regression. Initially, the impact of perceived quality was tested on consumer green purchase attitude. Regression coefficient of perceived quality was significant at β= 0.5416, p-value < 0.01. Overall model is also significant at F(1,398) = 210.9363, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 34.64 % variation of consumer green purchase attitude. In the second step, perceived quality and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI in the presence of perceived quality and consumer degree of greenness and moderator. Regression coefficient of both perceived quality and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI were significant at β = 0.3619, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.8601, p-value < 0.01 respectively. Regression coefficient of both perceived quality and consumer degree of greenness was also significant with β = 0.2585, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.6541, p-value < 0.01 respectively. First interaction term between consumer green purchase attitude and perceived quality was significant and β = -0.1216, p-value < 0.0 and second interaction term between consumer green purchase attitude and consumer degree of greenness is marginally significant β = -0.1007, p-value < 0.10. Overall model is also significant at F (6,393) = 102.2644, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 60.96% variation of GPI.

Table 8: Impact of PS on GPI, mediating role of CGA, moderating role of CDOG

Antecedent		Consequent M (CGA)					Y (GPI)		
		B	SE	P			B	SE	P
X (PS)	a1	0.3334	0.0396	0.0000	a2	c'	0.2510	0.0352	0.0000
M (CGA)		---	---	---		b1	1.1371	0.1655	0.0000
Q (CDOG)		---	---	---		b2	0.7606	0.0948	0.0000
QxX (CGAxCDOG)		---	---	---		b3	-0.1429	0.0354	0.0037
Constant	iM1	1.3926	0.1087	0.0000	iM2	i2	-1.7020	0.3944	0.0000
		R^2 = 0.1514 F(1,398) = 70.9982, p = 0.0000					R^2 = 0.5925 F(6,393) = 95.2301, p = .0000		

Table 8 shows the results of moderated mediation regression. Initially, the impact of perceived saving was tested on consumer green purchase attitude. Regression coefficient of perceived saving was significant at β= 0.3334, p-value < 0.01. Overall model is also significant at F(1,398) = 70.9982, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 15.14 % variation of consumer green purchase attitude. In the second step, perceived saving and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI in the presence of perceived saving and consumer degree of greenness and moderator. Regression coefficient of both perceived saving and consumer green purchase attitude were regressed on GPI were significant at β = 0.2510, p-value < 0.01 and β = 01.1371, p-value < 0.01 respectively. Regression coefficient of both perceived saving and consumer degree of greenness was also significant with β = 0.2876, p-value < 0.01 and β = 0.7606, p-value < 0.01 respectively. First interaction term between consumer green purchase attitude and perceived saving was significant and β = -0.1402, p-value < 0.0 and second interaction term between consumer green purchase attitude and consumer degree of greenness is marginally significant β = -0.1429, p-value < 0.10. Overall model is also significant at F (6,393) = 95.2301, p-value < 0.01 and this model explains 592.5% variation of GPI.

Conclusion

The basic aim to conduct this study is to have better consideration among marketers and consumers to distinguish at different point including those who buy no green food. Many investigations showed that one main consideration that considered being the boundary to green nourishment utilization is its cost, yet given the expansive scope of conceivable components that impacts green sustenance basic leadership, there are others that may considered as boundaries to green sustenance utilization among purchasers. For example, customer item learning on green

nourishment and also move made by the advertiser either to advice or to advance, has not achieved the ideal level in empowering manageable utilization with green sustenance. In any case, despite the fact that shoppers has the item learning what added to manageability of condition because of believe of comfort of their present utilization example won't change their recognition towards green sustenance item however great it is.

The survey of the literature proposes that ecologically mindful respondents have a tendency to be guided by estimations of correspondence, supportiveness and compassion for condition. A person's conduct affects nature. While consumers have inspirational conducts towards obtaining items which ar ecological benevolent. Assist environmental knowledge and level of greenness has turned out to be filled in buy choices of numerous people attributable to more noteworthy ecological cordial items mindfulness and uplifting disposition.

Green buy expectation for ecological cordial items is administered by level of greenness for the results of the buy on the environment. Organizations showcasing methodologies underline on the negative effect of items on the earth. Along these lines, firms must put resources into their situating techniques and market correspondence methodologies to change over this antagonism into an open door. It can be inferred that green buy disposition positively affects green buy goal and subsequently green buy conduct. Positive green buy disposition towards ecological neighborly items impact shopper's buy goal to pay the cost for earth benevolent items and at last the buy aim to purchase natural items likewise increments. The more positive buyer saw nature of the green item, and the higher the purchaser green buy state of mind towards natural items, the more positive the ecological inviting buy conduct will be.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The confinement of this examination is that the specimen was limited to a solitary geographic territory of Pothowar. Since shopper's recognition towards green sustenance item has a solid connection with the buy aim of natural nourishment, along these lines it is ideal to additionally examine the points of interest of how the accessibility of natural nourishment may affect the buy goal. Ideally this may help advertisers with better offering moment that elevating these items to the general population on the loose. Thus, it is particularly critical if such correspondence message or instructive exercises can be started at the before organize before the utilization conduct moves toward becoming propensity. Occasions, for example, green nourishment fairs and shows ought to be held and

appeared among youthful purchasers at their initial age before they achieve the phase of deciding their future character and self-esteems.

Future examinations must concentrate on the effect of psychographic properties including the disposition and esteem structure that energizes green utilization conduct. Green buy goal for natural agreeable items is represented by level of greenness for the outcomes of the buy on the biological community. Organizations advertising methodologies underline on the negative effect of items on the earth. Consequently, firms must put resources into their situating methodologies and market correspondence techniques to change over this antagonism into an open door. It can be inferred that green buy state of mind positively affects green buy aim and therefore green buy conduct. Positive green buy mentality towards ecological cordial items impact buyer's buy expectation to pay the cost for earth well-disposed items and at last the buy aim to purchase natural items likewise increments. The more positive purchaser saw nature of the green item, and the higher the shopper green buy disposition towards natural items, the more positive the ecological amicable buy conduct will be.

References

Bhattacharya, S. (2011). Consumer attitude towards green marketing in India. *IUP Journal of Marketing Management*, *10*(4), 62.

Bonini, S., & Oppenheim, J. (2008). Cultivating the green consumer. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *6*(4), 56-61.

Carrigan, M., & De Pelsmacker, P. (2009). Will ethical consumers sustain their values in the global credit crunch?. *International Marketing Review*, *26*(6), 674-687.

Chen, Y. S., & Chang, C. H. (2012). Enhance green purchase intentions: The roles of green perceived value, green perceived risk, and green trust. *Management Decision*, *50*(3), 502-520.

Cherian, J., & Jacob, J. (2012). Green marketing: A study of consumers' attitude towards environment friendly products. *Asian social science*, *8*(12), 117.

D'Souza, C., Taghian, M., & Khosla, R. (2007). Examination of environmental beliefs and its impact on the influence of price, quality and demographic characteristics with respect to green purchase intention. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, *15*(2), 69-78.

Gilg, A., Barr, S., & Ford, N. (2005). Green consumption or sustainable lifestyles? Identifying the sustainable consumer. *Futures*, *37*(6), 481-504.

Ginsberg, J. M., & Bloom, P. N. (2004). Choosing the right green-marketing strategy. *MIT Sloan management review*, *46*(1), 79.

Ha, H. Y., &Janda, S. (2012). Predicting consumer intentions to purchase energy-efficient products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *29*(7), 461-469.

Han, H., Hsu, L. T. J., & Lee, J. S. (2009). Empirical investigation of the roles of attitudes toward green behaviors, overall image, gender, and age in hotel customers' eco-friendly decision-making process. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(4), 519-528.

Hughner, R. S., McDonagh, P., Prothero, A., Shultz, C. J., & Stanton, J. (2007). Who are organic food consumers? A compilation and review of why people purchase organic food. *Journal of consumer behaviour*, *6*(2-3), 94-110.

Kanchanapibul, M., Lacka, E., Wang, X., & Chan, H. K. (2014). An empirical investigation of green purchase behaviour among the young generation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *66*, 528-536.

Krishna, A., Briesch, R., Lehmann, D. R., & Yuan, H. (2002). A meta-analysis of the impact of price presentation on perceived savings. *Journal of Retailing*, *78*(2), 101-118.

Laroche, M., Bergeron, J., &Barbaro-Forleo, G. (2001). Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products. *Journal of consumer marketing*, *18*(6), 503-520.

Martin, B., &Simintiras, A. C. (1995). The impact of green product lines on the environment: does what they know affect how they feel? *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *13*(4), 16-23.

McCarthy, B., Liu, H. B., & Chen, T. (2014). Trends in organic food consumption in China: opportunities and challenges for regional Australian exporters. In: Proceedings of the Sustainable Economic Growth for Regional Australia. From: SEGRA 201.

Milfont, T. L., Sibley, C. G., &Duckitt, J. (2010). Testing the moderating role of the components of norm activation on the relationship between values and environmental behavior. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *41*(1), 124-131.

Rahbar, E., & Wahid, N. A. (2010). The Malaysian consumer and the environment: Purchase behavior. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, *2*(4), 323-336.

Robin A. Coulter, Linda L. Price, Lawrence Feick, Camelia Micu, "The Evolution of Consumer Knowledge and Sources of Information: Hungary in Transition."Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Volume: 33 issue: 4, page(s): 604-619.

Shamdasani, P., Chon-Lin, G. O., & Richmond, D. (1993). Exploring green consumers in an oriental culture: Role of personal and marketing mix factors. *ACR North American Advances*.

Sheng, J., Shen, L., Qiao, Y., Yu, M., & Fan, B. (2009). Market trends and accreditation systems for organic food in China. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, *20*(9), 396-401.

Tanner, C., &Wölfing Kast, S. (2003). Promoting sustainable consumption: Determinants of green purchases by Swiss consumers. *Psychology & Marketing*, *20*(10), 883-902.

Young, W., Hwang, K., McDonald, S., & Oates, C. J. (2010). Sustainable consumption: green consumer behaviour when purchasing products. *Sustainable development*, *18*(1), 20-31.