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Abstract

- We argue that the effects of ethical violations on purchase likelihood depend jointly on the nature of the violation and on the recipient type.
- Our findings suggest that luxury brands' ethical violations reduce purchase likelihood of gifts for close others, and this effect attenuates when buying for oneself; furthermore, environmental violations were the most egregious, even reducing "self-gifting" purchase likelihood.

Background

Ethical consumption:

- Definition: Conscious purchasing or boycotting due to an environmental, social responsibility, or human rights issue (Sudbury-Riley & Kohlbacher, 2015)
- Motivations: Distinction, pleasure, love and appreciation (Szmigin & Carrigan, 2005)
- Hindrances: Lack of information, limited option availability and higher purchase price (Bray et al., 2011; Joy et al., 2013)
- Arises less frequently in the context of luxury-goods purchases than when buying commodities (Davies et al., 2012)

Gift-giving:

- Convey the giver’s characteristics as well as the giver’s perception of the recipient (Wolfinbarger, 1990)
- Motivations could be experiential/positive, obligated or practical (Wolfinbarger & Yale, 1993)
- The benefits sought by the gift-giver may vary depending on the recipient, who could be the giver’s superior, colleague/acquaintance, relative or friend (Parsons, 2002).

Self-gifts vs. interpersonal gifts:

- Demonstrate self-dialogue instead of symbolic messages, indulgences rather than social obligations, and internalized rather than mutual meaning (Heath et al., 2012).
- May occur to reward oneself or celebrate an achievement (Heath et al., 2012).

Study 1

- Testing the effects of recipient type and ethical violation on purchase intentions for luxury goods
- 233 MTurk participants (122 females; median age 35-49yrs.)
- In a 2 (recipient: self vs. other) x 2 (violation: present vs. absent) between-subjects design, participants considered purchasing a luxury Rolex watch
- Half of the participants considered buying the watch for themselves, while the other half considered buying the watch as a gift for someone close to them
- Half of the participants read a fictitious news article about Rolex’s use of cheap labor, while the other half saw no violation.

Participants rated their purchase likelihood (1=Extremely unlikely, 5=Extremely likely) for the watch

- Significantly less likely to buy the watch for someone else when there was a violation (F=14.64, p<.001)
- No effect of violation when buying for oneself (F<1, p>.3).

Study 2

- Testing the effects of recipient closeness and violation type on purchase intentions for luxury goods
- 299 MTurk participants (160 females; median age 25-34yrs.)
- A 4 (violation: none vs. cheap labor vs. child labor vs. environmental violations) x 3 (participant type: self vs. other vs. extremely-close other) between subject design

Purchase likelihood was significantly lower for an extremely-close other, when any violation was present (p<.001). Environmental violations also reduced purchase likelihood when buying for oneself (p=.037) or for a more-distant other (p=.07). No other violation effects were significant.

Discussion

Future research could investigate the impact of diverse dimensions of giver-receiver relationships and gift-giving motivations on ethical consumption, for more comprehensive predictive theories.
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