

# The Haskayne Report



## The Consumer: A Driving Force for Ethical Business Practice

by Arjie Arcos, Jack Mladen, and Josiah Soliman

What was once rooted in religion has now become an epicentre of concern for morally ambiguous institutions. Ethics, as the core principles of our humanity, drive what we think, say, and do. It is the theory of morality that attempts to systematize moral judgements (Sroka & Lorinczy, 2015). A pervasive thought exists in which ethics remains adjunct from business, dating back to the free market ideology (Cragg, 1997). In the 1960s, the counterculture movement, fuelled by socio-political unrest, cast a shadow of controversy across the ethical landscape (George, 1987). Now, in our modern interconnected environment, the impact of ethics in commerce is increasing. Consumerism enables individuals to be the

proponents of society's moral shift. Purchasing decisions – once a function of necessity – are now extensions of individual identity. This paradigm shift acts as the catalyst for the Ethical Consumerism movement (Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008). Ethical Consumerism suggests that consumers can, and should, act upon a set of moral values whilst allocating their discretionary funds.

### *Two Steps Forward, One Step Back*

Free market ideology proposes that ethics implies a level of cooperation incompatible with the forces present in business (Cragg, 1997). Globalization, in fostering

collaboration amongst businesses, makes this notion less applicable. Not only did it expand purchasing selection but also proliferated the flow of information. Consumers are left with a greater avenue to exercise ethical decision making. The influx of available information exposed major companies like Nike, who were criticized for poor labour practices such as the “slave” labour of young Asian women (DeTienne & Lewis, 2005). In contrast, certain companies leverage the dissemination of information as a competitive advantage by exemplifying ethical practices. TOMS Shoes, an early adopter of philanthropic practices, aims to synthesize shared value with its one-for-one policy (Bachnik & Szumniak-Samolej, 2013). This initiative matches every purchase of a TOMS product with an equivalent donation in shoes. While TOMS’ philanthropic initiative aligns both financial gains and the maximization of societal welfare, the most ethical decision seldom coincides with the most favorable for consumers. There is often a cost associated with ethical decision making (Hiller & Woodall, 2019). The tradeoff between Ethical Consumerism and increased prices compels consumers to purchase products that are incongruent with their moral predisposition as a counterbalance to the economic onus. The persistence of ethical purchasing highlights the subtlety and nuance present in consumer decision making.

### *Minding the Gap*

The consumer buying process originates at a schism between the actual and ideal self (Mandel, et al., 2017). Should a discrepancy exist, a need is recognized to achieve the ideal state. Thus, the expression of the desired self is materialized through purchasing. To make purchasing decisions, individuals first research information and evaluate alternatives (Kotler et al., 2017).

The buying decision process then considers personal factors – one’s personal identity, psychological factors – one’s cognitive processes and functioning, and situational factors – one’s reactionary perception of their current surroundings (Brown, 2006). Within the psychological factors, ethics introduces the “intention-behavior gap” (Carrington, et al., 2014). The intention-behavior gap is a dichotomy between an individual’s desire for an ethical decision and the actualization of this decision. The degree to which this gap is palpable is a function of prior planning, control over the buying experience and aspects of the buying environment (Carrington, et al., 2014). The variety in individuals’ unique set of beliefs amplifies the complexity of Ethical Consumerism. The degree to which an individual incorporates ethical choices in their daily lives is organized into primary issues of importance – where they are consistent and planned – and secondary issues of importance – they are not consistently followed nor planned (Carrington, et al., 2014).

### *From Laissez-Faire to Ethically Aware*

Inability to adapt to ethically inclined consumer segments may carry reputational and economic consequences. Organizations can mitigate these risks by entrenching ethics as a foundation of corporate strategy. The push for ethical production and sourcing compels companies to re-evaluate their market position and integrate corporate social responsibility (CSR) plans. Although pursuing ethical decisions could introduce additional costs, financial performance can improve overall (Brik, et al., 2011). Financial gains may be further realized through the retention of loyal customers in alignment with the brand’s principles (Singh et al., 2012).

Businesses develop impressions of personal relationships with their customers, through marketing initiatives (Bendixen & Abratt, 2007). The aggregate of these relationships constitutes a company's brand reputation, as an expression of corporate values and a point of differentiation from competitors. Product differentiation, in accordance with CSR, enables value creation where the price premium is justifiable and profitable. One such instance of this is the case of Patagonia, in which its environmental-friendly products sell at about 50% or more than competitors such as LL Bean and Eddie Bauer (Husted & Allen, 2007).

Demands for ethical production pressure companies to rethink their operations and supply chain. As a result, supply chain transparency has become more prominent and encourages active pursuit of ethical decisions not only to satisfy regulations but to also appeal to consumers (Shafiq et al., 2020). Socially Responsible Supply Chain Management advances corporate philanthropy as it extends to a proactive approach of eliminating unethical social issues within the workplace beyond charitable giving (Hoejmose et al., 2013). Furthermore, these ethical decisions promote innovative and sustainable practices that provide long-term operational and financial benefits (Nidulomu et al, 2009).

### *Moral Is The New Normal*

Ethical Consumerism reframes how businesses market to consumers. In a dynamic market, with ever-changing tastes and preferences, companies must compete beyond the value of a product's utility but further, in its means of production. Consumers must recognize that the trade-off for ethically produced and sourced products comes at an additional cost. Businesses should consider generating

economic value by incorporating ethical practices. Brands that align with a consumers' ethical predisposition create opportunities for strong and lasting consumer relationships. However, a risk emerges when organizations feign engagement in ethical practices with selfish underlying intentions. Ingenuine ethics can ultimately defeat the main purpose behind the movement of Ethical Consumerism. Ethical Consumerism is about changing behaviour, not perception. It is not enough for businesses to merely preach what they will do, rather companies must do what they preach.

# References

- Bachnik, K., & Szumniak-Samolej, J. (2013). Shared value in practice: TOMS Business Model. *Chinese Business Review*, 12(09). doi: 10.17265/1537-1506/2013.09.005
- Bendixen M., & Abratt, R. (2007). Corporate identity, ethics and reputation in supplier-buyer relationships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76(1), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9273-4>
- Brik A.N., Rettab B., & Mellahi, K. (2011). Market orientation, corporate social responsibility, and business performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(3), 307–324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0658-z>
- Brown, A. Chapter 6 Class Notes. Available at <http://www.udel.edu/alex/chapt6.html> [quoted 2006- 07-05].
- Carrington, M.J., Neville, B.A., & Whitwell, G.J. (2014). Lost in translation: Exploring the ethical consumer intention–behavior gap. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2759–2767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.09.022>
- Cragg, W. (1997). Teaching Business Ethics: The Role of Ethics in Business and in Business Education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(3), 231–245. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017974908203>
- DeTienne, K., & Lewis, L. (2005). The pragmatic and ethical barriers to corporate social responsibility disclosure: The Nike case. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, 60(4), 359–376. doi: 10.1007/s10551-005-0869-x
- Freestone, O.M., & McGoldrick, P.J. (2008). Motivations of the ethical consumer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(4), 445–467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9409-1>
- George, R.T. (1987). The status of business ethics: Past and future., 6(3), 201–211. doi:10.1007/bf00382865
- Hiller, A., & Woodall, T. (2019). Everything flows: A pragmatist perspective of trade-offs and value in ethical consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(4), 893–912. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3956-5>
- Hoejmose, S., Brammer, S., & Millington, A. (2013). An empirical examination of the relationship between business strategy and socially responsible supply chain management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 33(5), 589–621. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443571311322733>
- Husted, B.W., & Allen, D.B. (2007). Strategic corporate social responsibility and value creation among large firms: lessons from the Spanish experience. *Long Range Planning*, 40(6), 594.
- Kotler, P. (2017). *Principles of marketing*. Pearson Education. Seventh European Edition.
- Mandel, N., Rucker, D.D., Levav, J., & Galinsky, A.D. (2017). The Compensatory Consumer Behavior Model: How self-discrepancies drive consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 27(1), 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2016.05.003>
- Nidumolu, R., Prahalad, C.K.; Rangaswami, M.R. Why sustainability is now the key driver of innovation. *Harvard Business Review*. 2009, 87, 56–64.
- Shafiq, A., Ahmed, M.U., & Mahmoodi, F. (2020). Impact of supply chain analytics and customer pressure for ethical conduct on socially responsible practices and performance: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 225, 107571.
- Singh, J.J., Iglesias, O., & Batista-Foguet, J.M. (2012). Does having an ethical brand matter? The influence of consumer perceived ethicality on trust, affect and loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(4), 541–549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1216-7>
- Sroka, W., & Lorinczy, M. (2015). The perception of ethics in business: Analysis of research results. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 34, 541–549. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)01614-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01614-7)