

Is Ethical Consumption Intuitive? A Comparative Study on Food, Cosmetic and Clothes Markets

Stéphanie Montmasson, Sandrine Hollet-Haudebert and Brigitte Muller

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

July 8, 2021

Is Ethical Consumption Intuitive? A Comparative Study on Food, Cosmetic and Clothes Markets

Montmasson Stéphanie *, Université de Toulon, Toulon, France, stephaniemontmasson@etud.univ-tln.fr Hollet-Haudebert Sandrine, Université de Toulon, Toulon, France, sandrine.hollethaudebert@univ-tln.fr Muller Brigitte, Université de Toulon, Toulon, France, brigitte.muller@univ-tln.fr

ABSTRACT

For decades, marketing research in ethical consumption has been facing the gap between attitude and behavior of the ethical consumer. This topic has been explored mainly through a rational and cognitive approach. We intend to develop a new approach with the socio-intuitionist psychological model on three different markets: food, cosmetics and clothes. These three markets are interesting from a sociological and marketing view. Based on an online panel composed of 1080 consumers, structural equation modeling is used to analyze intuitive judgments and ethical concerns. Our results indicate that inferential intuition significantly predicts the ethical reasoning, which in turn significantly influence the purchase and the attention paid to the ecological and social commitments of the chosen products of ethical consumption behavior. The effects are however different according the three markets we analyzed, suggesting that marketing managers should focus on non-rational influences such as inferential and emotional intuition to effectively promote ethical consumption.

Keywords: Ethical consumption ; Moral intuitions and reasoning; Food; Cosmetics; Clothes

INTRODUCTION

If European consumers were considered in 2019 as actors of "better consuming", French consumers are even more demanding in terms of "less consuming" and "doing things differently". Indeed, 57% of French consumers believe that we need to "completely review our economic system and get out of the myth of infinite growth".¹ They are aware that the consumption of sustainable products is no longer enough, but that they should rather eliminate superfluous items and reduce their consumption in general. This phenomenon is already emerging in their purchasing habits: for example, in the cosmetic and hygiene products sector, more than two thirds of consumers say they are buying fewer products. In the clothing sector, 44% of French people declared they would voluntarily buy less clothing in 2018². Finally, in the food sector, reducing food waste is a major priority for 2020³. At the same time, the French are increasingly turning to local and socially responsible offerings. The COVID-19 pandemic has confirmed this tendency, almost half of the consumers have stated that they prefer choosing brands committee to reduce their impact on the environment and inclined to help local communities⁴. These elements correspond to the definition of ethical consumption proposed

 $^{^1\,}Etude\ Greenflex\ 2019,\ https://www.greenflex.com/communique-de-presse/barometre-consommation-responsable-2019-sortons-mythe-croissance-infinie/$

 $^{^2}$ IFM 2018, https://www.modeintextile.fr/marche-francais-textile-habillement-se-transforme-linfluence-consommateurs/

³ https://www.agro-media.fr/analyse/tendances-alimentaires-2020-lannee-de-tous-les-possibles-pour-lagroalimentaire-38134.html

⁴ https://comarketing-news.fr/consommation-le-mythe-dun-monde-dapres/

by Low and Davenport (2007, p:341) as "human, animal and environmental concerns" which is not so easy to implement in the daily life.

The traditionally rationalist and cognitive literature is confronted with this gap between the attitudes of ethical consumers and their actual consumption intention and behavior, leaving many questions unsolved. Marketing researches are becoming aware that the predominant rational view of ethical decision-making does not take into account sufficiently cognitive elements such as values, virtues, ethical ideology and beliefs (Vitell 2015) that underlie the ethical identity and intuitive response of the consumer (John and Caldwell James 2013). A part of the literature on ethical consumption has turned to intuitionist perspectives and in particular to the socio-intuitionist model (Haidt and Graham 2007), thus recognizing the co-existence of two psychological systems (Epstein 1999) and the importance of moral intuition in ethical consumption behavior.

We therefore chose to investigate the role of intuitions in ethical consumer behavior in order to determine what role they can play in ethical consumer decision-making. We intend to determine whether they have the same influence on the food, cosmetics and ready-to-wear markets. We conducted a quantitative study on a representative sample of 1080 French consumers question on three different market (food, cosmetics and ready-to-wear). Our results highlight the role of intuitions and in particular the influence of affective intuitions, which do not play the same role in each of the markets, thus we continue the research of Zollo et al. (2018). We propose innovative recommendations for marketing managers.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Ethics and Consumption

From the philosophical point of view, ethics can be defined as an element of foundation of the human person, in its roots, which allows the good living, the good doing for the well-being of others. In the academic literature, the concept of ethics encompasses the notions of sustainability and responsibility. The notion of relationship to others in a present and future temporal vision is fundamental for each of the three concepts. Ethical consumption serves as a means of ethical and moral action based on subjective moral judgments applied to individual products and brands throughout the cycle of production, consumption and disposal (Brunk 2012). However, what is ethical summarizes different expressions, concerns and issues for each person. Cooper-Martin et al (1993) define the ethics of consumer behavior as "decision making, purchasing and other consumer experiences that are affected by the ethical concerns of the consumer". In contrast to typical consumer decision making, which focuses on maximizing immediate benefits to the individual, sustainable choices involve long-term benefits to others and nature (White et al. 2019).

The Ethical Decision-Making Process and the Attitude-Behavior Gap

Researchers traditionally use rational cognitive models in which ethical decision-making is fully conscious, intentional and individually controlled (Rest1986). Research on ethical consumption has highlighted the prevalent presence of dissonant or inconsistent behaviors (Mc Eachern 2010). Consumers claim that their behavior is influenced by values and attitudes that do not necessarily translate into actual behavior. This is called the attitude-behavior gap (Chatzidakis et al. 2007). Consumers are not always willing to disclose their true attitudes towards ethical products. Indeed, attitude measurements are self-reported and lead to socially

desirable responses (Pelsmacker et al. 2005). White et al. (2019) put forward five categories of factors influencing sustainable behavior, including feelings and cognition, which are addressed jointly, as consumers generally take one of two options: affect or cognition (Fedorikhin 1999). This approach is consistent with the theories suggesting that an intuitive and affective or more deliberative and cognitive pathway may dominate decision making. However, the authors recognize that rationalist approaches that identify, encourage and evaluate sustainable behaviors do not provide a complete psychological framework (White et al. 2019). Thus, we believe that research on the role of intuition in ethical consumer behavior may be relevant to investigate the antecedents of moral consciousness and the psychological micro-mechanisms that lead to ethically acting decisions.

In the Moral Field, the Socio-Intuitionist Approach is a Necessary Complement

In philosophy, intuitionism refers to the idea that moral truths exist. When people grasp these truths, they do so not through a process of ratification and reflection but rather through a process closer to perception, in which one "simply sees, without argument, that they [truths] are and must be true" (Harrison 1967, p: 72). Jung (1933) described intuition as a primary mode of perception that works unconsciously. Intuitive people prefer to react by imagining possibilities and patterns of detection, which contrasts with the other types of perception that prefer concrete details. The debate between rationalism and intuitionism is old (Haidt 2001). Both currents agree that individuals have emotions and intuitions, engage in reasoning. Both intuitions and reasoning are influenced by each other. It is therefore a question of clarifying how these processes are articulated. Rationalist models focus on reasoning and then discuss other processes such as emotions, environments and social interactions in terms of their effects on reasoning. The central claim of the socio-intuitionist model (see Figure 1) is that moral judgment is caused by rapid moral intuition (system 1) and is followed (if necessary) by slow, post facto moral reasoning (system 2). System 1 is automatic, impulsive, unconscious, fast, instinctive and reflexive, innately programmed in human cognition (Haidt 2001). According to Epstein (2010), the intuitive system is resistant to change and remains context-specific. System 2 is slow, controlled, logical, deliberative, reflective and conscious, thinking is hypothetical (Kahneman 2003). Associated with the intuitionist model, the system model reveals that moral intuition is the a priori cognitive process embedded in system 1; moral reasoning is the post hoc rational cognitive process within system 2 (Zollo et al. 2017).

Figure 1: Social-Intuitionist Model in Ethical Decision Making(Zollo et al. 2017)



Socio-Intuitionism, a new Light on Ethical Consumer Behavior

In the ethical consumption context, implicit moral attitudes are introspective evaluations that suddenly appear unconsciously (Marquardt and Hoeger 2009), influencing ethical decision-making at a subconscious level, just like moral intuition forms intuitive moral judgments (Haidt 2001, Haidt and Graham 2007). Marketing theorists are becoming aware that the rational view of ethical decision-making does not take into account cognitive elements such as values, virtues, ethical ideology and beliefs (Vitell 2015) that underlie the ethical identity and intuitive response of the consumer (John and Caldwell James 2013). Consequently, a few studies (Tenbrunsel et al. 2008) referred to the socio-intuitionist model recognize "the importance of moral intuition, without any awareness of having gone through a process of research, evaluation of evidence or conclusion" (Haidt 2001, p:818). Thus, intuitive and unconscious processing of information provides a priori answers to ethical dilemmas, while moral reasoning plays a deliberative and post hoc justification role. Explicit moral attitudes combine individual considerations, evaluations, and concerns about particular sustainable, environmental, or ethical behaviors, thus recalling the moral awareness, judgment, and intent inherent in moral reasoning (Carlson et al. 2009).

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK AND DEFINITION OF HYPOTHESES

In line with recent literature (Zollo et al. 2018), we propose an integrated framework that considers both moral intuition and moral reasoning as important cognitive processes in ethical decision-making. More specifically, we wish to empirically verify whether moral intuition a priori affects moral reasoning and then influences the ethical consumption behavior of food, cosmetic and apparel products. Studying these three different markets is interesting for several reasons. First, they all three occupy a strategic place in the French economy. Secondly, from a sociological point of view, the food, clothes and cosmetics markets offer consumers numerous opportunities to express their personality, to assert themselves and to distinguish themselves as autonomous individuals free to make their own choices given their great diversity. Thirdly, from a marketing point of view, these three mature markets are marked by decrease of consumption, return to natural and "less is more" trends. They are experiencing significant growth on the organic and local or fair-trade product segments which are important in food, less important in cosmetics and still marginal in clothing.

Our research question is: What role do intuitions play in ethical consumer decision making in the food, cosmetics and clothes market and how do they interrelate?

First, we wish to determine the influence of the three types of intuitions: affective, inferential and holistic. Holistic intuitions have been distinguished into "big picture" holistic intuitions, which emphasize global rather than detailed perspectives, and "abstract" holistic intuitions, which tend to privilege theoretical knowledge over concrete facts. Zollo et al.'s (2018) research has demonstrated only the influence of inferential intuitions on moral reasoning and on general ethical consumption. In this research, we wish to investigate the links that might exist between different types of intuition, especially affective intuitions and their influence on moral reasoning on defined markets.

H1: Moral intuition is positively correlated to moral reasoning (EMCB) of the (i) Food, (ii) Cosmetic and (iii) Clothes market

H1a: Emotional Intuition (INTEMO) is a positive antecedent of Holistic Big Picture Intuition (INTHI)

H1b: Holistic Big Picture Intuition (INTHI) is a positive antecedent of Holistic Abstract Intuition (INTHA)

H1c: Holistic Abstract Intuition (INTHA) is a positive antecedent of Inferential Intuition (INTINF)

H1d: Inferential Intuition (INTINF) is a positive antecedent of moral reasoning (EMCB)

In order to measure moral reasoning, we consider that the EMCB scale (Ethically Minded Consumer Behavior) (Sudbury-Riley and Kohlbacher 2016) reflects moral reasoning (Haidt 2001) and that it reveals explicit values of moral attitudes (Marquardt and Hoeger 2009) by identifying specific, ethically conscious moral attitudes towards the beliefs and values that precede ethical behavior (Roberts and Bacon 1997). Based on the ethical marketing literature, we measure ethical consumption behavior in the food, cosmetic and fashion markets through a dozen ethical consumption behavior topics which are common to the three markets. First the purchase itself: buying locally manufactured products or organic or labeled products. Second the propensity to pay more for ecologically and socially responsible products and a seeking information on the brand's commitments. These topics remain fairly general in order to make as objective comparisons as possible between the three markets.

H2: Moral reasoning (EMCB) influences positively the (i) Food, (ii) Cosmetic and (iii) Clothes Ethical consumption

H2a: EMCB influences positively pro-environmental and pro-social (i) Food, (ii) Cosmetic and (iii) Fashion product attention (ATT)

H2b: EMCB influences positively pro-environmental and pro-social (i) Food, (ii) Cosmetic and (iii) Fashion product purchase (RESP).

Based on the review of the literature and the hypotheses developed, the social-intuitionist framework is conceptualized in FIGURE 2.



Figure 2: Hypothesized Model

(i): Food market, (ii): Cosmetic market, (iii): Cloth market

METHODOLOGY

Sample and Measurements

This study was administered via the Internet in January 2020 to a representative sample of the French population of 1080 people in terms of gender (male: 49.7%, female: 50.3%) and age (mean: 41.9, standard deviation: 13.53). In order to avoid a phenomenon of fatigue caused by the length of the questionnaire, respondents were randomly questioned only for two of the three markets, thus obtaining: 720 respondents for food products, 720 for cosmetic products and 720 for clothing.

We measured the four different kinds of intuitions: holistic-big picture, holistic-abstract, inferential, and affective using the 29 items of the TInTS (Types of Intuition Scale (Pretz et al. 2014). We treated the four subdimensions of intuition as separate constructs because "these scales measure distinct and independent types of intuition" (Pretz et al. 2014, p. 461). In order to measure moral reasoning, we used the 10 items of EMCB scale (Sudbury-Riley and al. 2016) that conceptualizes the variety of consumer choices related to environmental issues and corporate social responsibility. We also used 10 items in order to measure ethical consumption behavior on food, cosmetic and fashion market (Fletcher 2008). All measurement scales were rated on a five-point Likert scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree.)

Results

In order to check the reliability of our measurement scales, we undertook Explanatory Factor Analysis. Results are presented below in TABLE 1. In order to get a good reliability, we reduced number of items on TInTS scale (Pretz 2014). Regarding emotional intuitions, the final number of measured items was three: "I generally don't depend on my feelings to help me make decisions", "I prefer to follow my head rather than my heart", "It is foolish to base important decisions on feelings" leading to acceptable Cronbach-alpha (see TABLE 1). We kept three items (out of eight) regarding inferential intuitions: "When making a quick decision in my area of expertise, I can justify the decision logically", "If I have to, I can usually give reasons for my intuition", "When making a quick decision in my area of expertise, I can justify the decision logically". The new scale showed good reliability index. Holistic big picture intuitions could be measured by two items for which scale reliability is also good: "I try to keep in mind the big picture when working on a complex problem", "I am a "big picture" person". The holistic abstract intuition scale wasn't reliable, so we were not able to measure this kind of intuitions. The EMCB scale (Sudbury Riley et al. 2016) presented a good reliability with 8 items, for example: "When there is a choice, I always choose the product that contributes to the least amount of environmental damage", (FOOD, α =0.898, COSM, α =0.904, FASHION α =0.836). In order to measure the ethical consumption of the three markets we proposed questions that allowed us to compare ethical consumption behavior. We first measured the "RESPONSABILITY" with 4 items (FOOD, $\alpha = 0.834$, COSM, $\alpha = 0.757$, FASHION $\alpha = 0.757$), and "ATTENTION" with 3 items (FOOD, $\alpha = 0.734$, COSM, $\alpha = 0.858$, FASHION $\alpha = 0.894$) (see Appendix).

Table 1: Correlation Matrix Factors OnFood/Cosmetic/Fashion Market

| Food | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--|
| FACTOR | MEAN | SD | EMCB | FOODRESP | DRESP INT I | | INT EMO | | FOODAT | T INTHI | |
| | | | (a=0.898) | (a=0.898) | 98) (α=0.8 | | (α=0.898) | | (α=0.898) |) (α=0.898) | |
| EMCB | 27.16 | 6.43 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | |
| FOODRESP | 13.07 | 3.09 | 0.686 | 1.000 | 1.000 | | | | | | |
| INTINF | 11.3 | 1.89 | 0.156 | 0.247 | 1. | 000 | | | | | |
| INTEMO | 9.76 | 2.25 | 0.115 | 0.199 | 0.199 0.28 | | 1.00 | 0 | | | |
| FOODATT | 10.36 | 2.61 | 0.617 | 0.615 | 0.117 | | 0.03 | 33 | 1.000 | | |
| INTHI | 7.6 | 1.39 | 0.343 | 0.408 | 0. | 511 | 0.40 |)7 | 0.240 | 1.000 | |
| Cosmetics | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FACTOR | MEAN | SD | EMCB | COSMRI | COSMRESP | | INF | IN | Т ЕМО | COSMATT | |
| | | | (α=0.904) | (α=0.75 | (a=0.757) | | 746) | (α: | =0.898) | (α=0.858) | |
| EMCB | 27.30 | 6.04 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | |
| COSMRESP | 5.89 | 1.87 | 0.677 | 1.000 | | | | | | | |
| COSMINF | 11.41 | 1.78 | 0.200 | 0.166 | | 1.0 | 00 | | | | |
| INTEMO | 9.79 | 2.27 | 0.139 | 0.122 | | 0.2 | 0.270 | | 1.000 | | |
| COSMATT | 9.25 | 3.12 | 0.678 | 0.671 | | 0.1 | 0.165 | | 0.013 | 1.000 | |
| Clothes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FACTOR | MEAN | SD | EMCB | INTINF | F A | FASHRESP | | FASH | IATT | INTEMO | |
| | | | (α=0.894) |) (α=0.757 |) (| α=0.851) | | (a=0.836) | | (a=0.696) | |
| EMCB | 27.30 | 6.28 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | |
| INTINF | 11.33 | 1.86 | 0.201 | 1.000 | | | | | | | |
| FASHRESP | 5.92 | 1.64 | 0.440 | 0.092 | | 1.000 | | | | | |
| FASHATT | 8.56 | 2.91 | 0.692 | 0.146 | | 0.514 | | 1.0 | 00 | | |
| INTEMO | 8.27 | 2.200 | -0.132 | -0.292 | | -0.151 | | -0. | 53 | 1.000 | |

We used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to empirically test the proposed hypotheses (see Figure 2) and to simultaneously assess the causal relationships among our manifest and latent variables (Bagozzi and Yi 1988; Bentler 1990). Results indicate a fairly good fit with the data for the three structural models, as inferred from the goodness of model fit indices (see TABLE 2 below)

Table 2: Model Fit

| <u>.</u> | CHI ² | DF | р | Cmin/DF | GFI | AGFI | TLI | CFI | RMSEA | SRMR |
|----------|------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| FOOD | 629.269 | 213 | p<0,001 | 2.954 | 0.927 | 0.906 | 0.941 | 0,95 | 0,052 | 0,048 |
| COSM | 647.666 | 217 | p<0,001 | 2,985 | 0,924 | 0,903 | 0,940 | 0,949 | 0,053 | 0,048 |
| FASHION | 515.562 | 181 | p<0,001 | 2,848 | 0,936 | 0,919 | 0,942 | 0,95 | 0,051 | 0,044 |

| Table 3: Confirmator | y Factor Anal | ysis Results |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|

| | FOOD | | COSM | ETICS | FASHION | | |
|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|
| | β | R ² | β | R ² | β | R ² | |
| TOTAL EFFECTS | | | | | | | |
| EMO 🗲 HI | 0.69*** | 0.23 | 0.39*** | 0.59 | -0,44***' | 0.19 | |
| HI 🇲 INF | 0.83*** | 0.48 | 0.77*** | 0.15 | 0,77*** | 0,6 | |
| INF 🗲 EMCB | 0.29*** | 0.08 | 0,33*** | 0.07 | 0,24*** | 0,06 | |
| EMCB 🗲 _ATT | 1.02*** | 1.03 | 0,95*** | 0.90 | 0,87*** | 0,75 | |
| EMCB →_RESP | 0.90*** | 0.81 | 0,78*** | 0.61 | 0,50*** | 0,25 | |
| INDIRECT EFFECT | S | | | | | | |
| EMO 🗲 _ATT | 0.12*** | | 0.08*** | | -0,05***' | | |
| EMO ➔_RESP | 0.10*** | | 0,06*** | | -0,1***' | | |
| INF 🗲 _ATT | 0.26*** | | 0,26*** | | 0,19*** | | |
| INF →_RESP | 0.29*** | | 0,21*** | | 0.36*** | | |
| HI ➔ _ATT | 0.24*** | | 0.26*** | | 0.14*** | | |
| HI ➔_RESP | 0.22*** | | 0.16*** | | 0.25*** | | |

The examination of the coefficients on the 3 markets validated the hypotheses formulated with the exception of H1b and H1c. The models did not allow to demonstrate the influence of emotional intuition on abstract holistic intuition and the influence of abstract holistic intuition on big picture holistic intuition on the ethical consumption of food, cosmetics and clothes. All other hypotheses were validated (see TABLE 3) and thus indicated that intuitions influence ethical consumption. In relation to the literature, we wanted to examine the existence of links between the types of intuition. Thus, we first confirm the direct link highlighted by Zollo et al. (2017) between inferential intuition and moral reasoning on ethical consumption in general, by using the EMCB on each of the 3 markets with slightly higher values (see Table 4) (β = 0.29, 0.33 and 0.24) than on the study of Zollo et al. (2017) (β = 0.16).

Our results highlight the links between emotional and holistic big picture intuitions and then inferential intuitions. The consumption of clothing stands out, on this point, from food and cosmetic consumption. Indeed, emotional intuitions have positive influences on holistic big picture intuition in the food and cosmetics market (β =0.69 and 0.39), but negative in the clothes market (β = -0.44). The influences of the different variables tested show positive effects on the three markets with relatively close coefficients, except for the clothing market, where the influence of moral reasoning on RESPONSABILITY shows lower coefficients than in the other two markets (β = 0.50 versus 0.90 for food and 0.78 for cosmetics). On ATTENTION the variables are significantly close (β = 1.02, 1.03 and 0.87).

To test whether the effects of intuitions on ethical consumption were mediated by moral reasoning (EMCB), bootstrapping in AMOS 22.0 was conducted. The bootstrapping approach enabled the examination of confidence intervals for indirect effects that Emotional, Inferential and Holistic Big Picture intuitions might have on purchase and attention on the three markets. The indirect effect of the three kinds of intuitions was significant on the three markets (see TABLE 3). These results confirmed that intuitions influence ethical consumption indirectly through reasoning and directly also, in a less important way (p-value > 0.001, coefficients are lower, see TABLE 3).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

To study the antecedents of ethical consumption, we relied on the socio-intuitionist model (Haidt 2001). As Zollo et al. (2017), we hypothesized that moral intuition influences moral reasoning. More specifically, we confirm that the only significant antecedent of consumers' positive attitudes towards ethical food, cosmetic and clothes consumption is inferential intuition, based on analytical and logical information from previous decision-making experiences (Pretz and Folse 2011; Pretz et al. 2014) and consumption experiences also. Inferential intuition is influenced by holistic big picture intuition that emphasizes global rather than detailed perspectives. Emotional intuition which is derived from feelings and emotional reactions (Pretz and Totz, 2007; Pretz et al. 2014) is an antecedent of holistic big picture intuition. Consistent with the marketing literature (John and Caldwell James 2013; Sekerka and Bagozzi 2007), we argue that consumers use both unconscious and conscious criteria to guide their pro-environmental pro-social decisions and actions. Researchers argue that consumers' ethical values, beliefs, and identities shape their intuitive and impulsive ethical behavior (Cherry and Caldwell 2013; Sekerka et al. Bagozzi 2007; Sekerka and Bagozzi 2014). We find that consumers behave ethically according to the automatic inferential information processing of system 1 (Kahneman 2003; Stanovich and Ouest 2000) which is itself influenced by

affective intuitions and holistic big picture intuitions. These findings are consistent with previous research (Sekerka and Bagozzi 2007; Sekerka et al. 2014) that showed emotional reactions were considered as antecedents of ethical decision-making.

Our results also show that emotional intuitions do not have the same influence depending on the studied market. Indeed, emotional intuitions have a positive influence on the holistic big picture intuitions on the food ($\beta = 0.69$) and cosmetic markets ($\beta = 0.39$) but negative on the clothes market ($\beta = -0.47$). This confirms the role of affect as a determinant of ethical consumption in the three markets studied. As with other green consumption decisions, the decision to engage in responsible clothing consumption behaviors requires trade-offs between conflicting goals (e.g. style vs. ethics) and can be more difficult depending on personality traits and personal values (Niinimäki 2010; Moisander 2007). This complexity can be attributed to the unique nature of clothing, which goes beyond a utilitarian role satisfying an individual's need for identity formation, social acceptance and distinction (Joy et al. 2012). Our study thus highlights the negative influence of emotional intuitions on other types of moral intuition (inferential and holistic big picture), moral reasoning and ethical consumption. Our study shows that people who have already experienced moral intuition derived from repeated and repetitive behavior is the most likely antecedent of ethical behavior as shown by the link between inferential intuitions and moral reasoning (Food: $\beta = 0.29$, Cosmetics: $\beta = 0.33$, Fashion $\beta = 0.24$), which implies that ethical attitudes are instinctively predetermined (Zollo et al., 2017). Instead, effects-based intuitions (Pretz and Totz 2007; Pretz et al. 2014) may be temporary, transitory, and do not predict future ethical decisions. Hence, values, traits and virtues can generate unconscious and cognitive first-order ethical desires "stimulating actions" (Sekerka & Bagozzi 2007) and "automatic self-regulation" in the processing of inferential information (Sekerka et al. 2014, p. 16). Extending this argument, we demonstrate empirically that unconsciousness influences post hoc rational decisions to behave ethically according to one's moral intuition (Pretz et al. 2014).

In undertaking this study, we intended to apply the intuitionist model (Haidt 2001) to the ethical consumption literature to show how non-rational elements such as intuition may influence consumers when they form ethical attitudes and make ethical decisions regarding proenvironmental and pro-social consumption behavior on food, cosmetic and fashion market. Analysis of the data indicated that inferential intuition was a significant antecedent motivating moral reasoning, which, in turn, highly influenced pro-environmental and pro-social dimensions of the food, cosmetics and clothes consumer. But the inferential intuitions are influenced first by emotional intuitions and second by holistic big picture intuitions.

These results are important from a managerial point of view. Indeed, ethical communication must be based on inferential elements: the whole consumer experience (purchase, use and disposal) must be solicited and improved in order to create new consumer habits in the food, cosmetics and clothes markets. Holistic big picture intuitions have an important influence on inferential intuitions. Thus, there is a need to broaden the consequences of product choices more widely than the consumption of the products itself. Showing its impact on the environment, human kind and animals is a key point. Finally, if food and cosmetic brands can rely on affect and emotions as shown by our results, they appear to play a negative role in the ethical consumption of clothing, it is therefore a question of proposing a less emotional communication but more based on concrete and rational elements regarding fashion.

Some limits and avenues for further research have to be underlined. The TInTS measurement scale (Pretz 2014) doesn't seem to be very suitable in a French context. Indeed, we had to delete several items in order to improve scale reliability, reducing the initial scale to 8 items (instead of 29). Second, our research was conducted in three specific markets, analyzing moral intuitions and moral reasoning. Although this approach is highly original, the questionnaire was very long and didn't allow us to get precise details on the overall consumption of these markets. Focusing on one dedicated market should allow researchers to inquire more deeply about intuitions and consumer personal values regarding ethical consumption in its entirety.

References

Brunk, K. H. (2012). Un/ethical Company and Brand Perceptions: Conceptualizing and Operationalizing Consumer Meanings. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(4), 551–565.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Wadsworth, L. L. (2009). The Impact of Moral Intensity Dimensions on Ethical Decision-making: Assessing the Relevance of Orientation 1, *XX* (4), 534–551.

Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S., & Smith, A. P. (2007). Why People Don't Take their Concerns about Fair Trade to the Supermarket: The Role of Neutralization, 89–100.

Epstein, S. (2010). Demystifying intuition: What it is, what it does, and how it does it. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(4), 295–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2010.523875

Etude Greenflex 2019, https://www.greenflex.com/communique-de-presse/barometre-consommation-responsable-2019-sortons-mythe-croissance-infinie/

Haidt, J. (2001). The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment. *Psychological Review*, *108*(4), 814–834. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research*, 20(1), 98–116.

Harrison, J. (1967). Ethical objectivism. In P. Edwards (Ed.), The encyclopedia of philosophy (Vols. 3-4, pp. 71-75). New York: Macmillan.

Holian R. (2006) "Management Decision Making, Ethical Issues and 'Emotional' Intelligence." Management Decision 44.8: 1122–1138.

Hunt, S. and S. Vitell: 1986, 'A General Theory of Marketing Ethics', Journal of Macromarketing 6, 5–16.

Joy, A., Sherry, Jr., J.F., Venkatesh, A., Wang, J., Chan, R. (2012). Fast fashion, sustainability, and the ethical appeal of luxury brands. Fashion Theory 16 (3), 273–295.

Jung, C. G. (1933). (First published in 1921.) Psychological Types. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. Kaempf, G. L., Klein, G., Thordsen, M. L., & Wolf, S. 1996 Kahneman, D. (2003). A perspective on judgment and choice. American Psychologist, 58.

Low W., Davenport E. (2007). To boldly go...exploring ethical spaces to re-politicize ethical consumption and fair trade. Journal of Consumer Behavior, 6:336-348.

Marquardt, N., & Hoeger, R. (2009). The Effect of Implicit Moral Attitudes on Managerial Decision-Making: An Implicit Social Cognition Approach, 157–171.

Pelsmacker, P. D. E., Driesen, L., & Rayp, G. (2005). Do Consumers Care about Ethics? Willingness to Pay for Fair-Trade Coffee, *39*(2), 363–385.

Pretz, J. E., Brookings, J. B., Carlson, L. A., Humbert, T. K., Roy, M., Jones, M., & Memmert, D. (2014). Development and Validation of a New Measure of Intuition: The Types of Intuition Scale †, *467*(May), 454–467. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1820

Preuit, R., Yan, R.-N. (2017). Fashion and sustainability: Increasing knowledge about slow fashion through an educational module. International Journal of Environmental Science of. Education. 12 (5), 1139–1154

Roberts, J. A., & Bacon, D. R. (1997). Exploring the Subtle Relationships between Environmental Concern and Ecologically Conscious Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 40(1), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(96)00280-9

Sekerka, L. E., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2014). Self-Regulation: The Moral Muscle in Online Ethical Consumerism Self-Regulation : The Moral Muscle in Online Ethical Consumerism Menlo College Deborah Brown McCabe Menlo College, 8(January), 9–20.

Sudbury-Riley, L., & Kohlbacher, F. (2016). Ethically minded consumer behavior: Scale review, development, and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2697–2710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.11.005

Tenbrunsel A. E., Smith-Crowe K. (2008): 13 Ethical Decision Making: Where We've Been and Where We're Going. *ANNALS*, 2, 545–607, <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211677</u>

Vitell, S. J. (2015). A Case for Consumer Social Responsibility (CnSR): Including a Selected Review of Consumer Ethics / Social Responsibility, 767–774.

White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(3), 22–49.

Zollo, L., Yoon, S., Rialti, R., & Ciappei, C. (2018). Ethical consumption and consumers' decision making: the role of moral intuition. *Management Decision*, *56*(3), 692–710.

Appendix: CFA Results

| | FOOD | | | COSMETICS | | | FASHION | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| | γ | CR | AVE | γ | CR | AVE | γ | CR | AVE |
| REASONING (EMCB) | 0.746 | 0.885 | 0.492 | 0.720 | 0.796 | 0.520 | 0.720 | 0.892 | 0.713 |
| contributes to the least amount of environmental damage | 0.746 | | | 0.738 | | | 0.738 | | |
| I have switched products for environmental reasons | 0.752 | | | 0.768 | | | 0.741 | | |
| I do not buy household products that harm the environment | 0.671 | | | 0.716 | | | 0.724 | | |
| If I understand the potential damage to the environment that some products can cause, I do not purchase those products | 0.620 | | | 0.671 | | | 0.631 | | |
| I do not buy products from companies that I know use sweatshop labor, child labor, or other poor working | 0.610 | | | 0.643 | | | 0.664 | | |
| conditions | 0.815 | | | 0.793 | | | 0.793 | | |
| I do not buy products from companies that I know use sweatshop labor, child labor, or other poor working conditions | 0.704 | | | 0.705 | | | 0.674 | | |
| I have paid more for environmentally friendly products when there is a cheaper alternative | 0.669 | | | 0.726 | | | 0.720 | | |
| I have paid more for socially responsible products when there is a cheaper alternative | | | | | | | | | |
| EMOTIONAL INTUITIONS | | 0.721 | 0.464 | | 0.725 | 0.468 | | | |
| I generally don't depend on my feelings to help me make decisions (R) | 0.646 | | | | | | | | |
| I prefer to follow my head rather than my heart (R) | 0.716 | | | | | | | | |
| It is foolish to base important decisions on feelings (R) | 0.805 | | | | | | | | |
| INFERENTAL INTUITION | | 0.787 | 0.554 | | 0.749 | 0.500 | | 0.760 | 0.516 |
| When making a quick decision in my area of expertise, I can justify the decision logically | 0.776 | | | 0.651 | | | 0.648 | | |
| If I have to, I can usually give reasons for my intuition | 0.791 | | | 0.700 | | | 0.707 | | |
| When making a quick decision in my area of expertise, I can justify the decision logically | | | | 0.759 | | | 0.792 | | |
| HOLLISTIC BIG PICTURE INTUITION | | 0.72 | 0.563 | | 0.667 | 0.500 | | 0.667 | 0.502 |
| I try to keep in mind the big picture when working on a complex problem | 0.737 | | | 0.730 | | | 0.763 | | |
| I am a "big picture" person | | | | 0.884 | | | 0.650 | | |
| RESPONSABILITY | | 0.825 | 0.445 | | 0.868 | 0.621 | | 0.852 | 0.742 |
| I buy organic food /cosmetic/ apparel products | 0.767 | | | 0.813 | | | | | |
| I buy food /cosmetic/ apparel products with labels | 0.671 | | | 0.771 | | | 0.834 | | |
| I buy locally made food /cosmetic/ apparel products | | | | 0.728 | | | 0.888 | | |
| I buy fair-trade food /cosmetic/ apparel products | | | | 0.837 | | | | | |
| ATTENTION | | 0.805 | 0.580 | | 0.821 | 0.605 | | 0.813 | 0.593 |
| I find out about the ethical commitments of the food/ cosmetic/apparel brand I buy. | 0.745 | | | 0.771 | | | 0.709 | | |
| I am willing to pay more for food/cosmetics/apparel products that contribute less to environmental damage. | | | | 0.806 | | | 0.837 | | |
| I am willing to pay more for cosmetic/apparel food products that pay for the work of the producers in a decent way. | 0.721 | | | 0.756 | | | 0.759 | | |