

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

16 January 2020

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Carrington, M. and Chatzidakis, A. and Goworek, H. and Shaw, D. (2020) 'Consumption ethics: A Review and Analysis of Future Directions for Interdisciplinary Research.', *Journal of business ethics.*, 168 (2). pp. 215-238.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04473-w>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in *Journal of Business Ethics*. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04425-4>

Additional information:

A correction to this article was published on 13 March 2020: In the published article the Acknowledgment section is missing. The following text should have been included: Acknowledgement The authors were supported by ESRC Seminar Series funding under award ES/M002446/1 in a series entitled 'Ethics in Consumption: Interdisciplinary Perspectives'. The original version can be found at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04425-4>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Consumption Ethics: A Review and Analysis of Future Directions for Interdisciplinary Research

INTRODUCTION

We are witnessing the continued growth of consumption ethics (Olson, 2013; Newholm, Newholm, & Shaw, 2015), alongside a significant shift in the breadth and scope of consumers' ethical concerns since the 1990s (Harrison, Newholm, & Shaw, 2005). Far from a homogeneous collective, however, what is 'ethical' encapsulates different expressions, concerns and issues across individuals, groups and socio-spatial contexts (Carrington, Neville, & Canniford, 2015; Chatzidakis, MacLaran, & Bradshaw, 2012). These issues are often complex and consider both the environmental and societal impacts of consumption.

Interest in consumption ethics is not limited to those seeking to practise it and businesses seeking to appeal to or avoid the gaze of the ethical consumer. The multi-faceted ethical consumer is increasingly attracting academic interest across disciplinary fields, as well as drawing the attention of activist organisations, government bodies, journalists, media, celebrities, primary industry, manufacturing sectors, and retailers. Differing academic disciplinary lenses, however, tend to be contained in separate streams of research literature that are developing in parallel and in relative isolation, as the current review demonstrates. Developing separate bodies of knowledge within bounded disciplinary silos has resulted in a multiplicity of terminology and varied tacit meanings of consumption ethics. We contend that this plurality and isolation of labels and meanings is working to further strengthen the barriers between disciplines. Indeed, the absence of a common language to enable communication across the disciplines and to develop common and meaningful understandings of consumption ethics hampers the very efforts of these scholars to develop a more equitable

and sustainable world. Thus, the purpose of this Journal of Business Ethics Thematic Symposium is to advance consumer ethics scholarship and practice through showcasing interdisciplinary approaches and theoretical frameworks that encapsulate the complexity and contextual nature of consumption ethics.

In this introductory paper, we first systematically interrogate and review perspectives, terminology and language employed to explore consumer ethics across disciplines by asking: what is ethics in consumption; who is the ethical consumer; and what do ethical consumers do? We achieve this through a review of work within the core disciplines of business, management and accounting, arts and humanities, economics, econometrics and finance, psychology and social sciences, examining the sub-disciplines within these core schools of thought (see Methodology). Second, employing content and thematic analysis, we critically examine the multiplicity of language and meanings used to portray consumption ethics identifying key areas of convergence and contradiction. Third, we introduce the four thematic symposium papers, illustrating how they support the interdisciplinary understanding of consumption ethics advanced. Fourth, to enrich our contribution, we develop an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that encapsulates the complexity and contextual nature of consumption ethics. In doing so, we advance a common platform of meanings and language, to facilitate an improved contextualisation of interdisciplinary research in our field. Finally, we highlight the issues and implications arising from our review and symposium papers for future interdisciplinary research.

METHODOLOGY

We conducted a systematic review of the following disciplines: philosophy, religious studies, history, social science, geography, political science, gender studies, anthropology, sociology,

cultural studies, economics, econometrics, finance, psychology, management, marketing and business. We took a three-step approach to obtain a comprehensive overview of the consumer ethics articles published across and within each of these business-related and humanities disciplines (Schlegelmilch, & Öberseder, 2010), and to rigorously analyse this body of literature. First, we identified the journals to be included in our review. Second, we selected appropriate search terms to mine these journals for relevant journal articles. Third, we systematically analysed the selected journal articles.

Sampling Strategy

First, the top ten journals for each discipline and sub-discipline were identified based on the Scopus SCImago journal ranking system. This journal ranking indicator draws upon the Scopus database – currently the largest scientific database that also best represents global literature coverage, and provides a meaningful journal ranking within disciplines, based upon up-weighting within-discipline citations as an indication of subject area expertise (Guerrero-Bole & Moya-Anegón, 2012). The top ten journals were separately identified for each discipline to ensure equitable disciplinary representation and to minimize disciplinary bias due to disparities in citation rates and conventions between research fields (Guerrero-Bole & Moya-Anegón, 2012), such as, some disciplines citing more heavily than others. We additionally identified the Journal of Business Ethics given the dominance of this journal to the consumer ethics literature within business disciplines. This resulted in the identification of 26 journals from across 12 academic disciplines to form the basis of the review. Second, each journal's database was systematically researched using a consistent list of search terms, which included: consum* ethics; ethical consum*; green consum*; pro-environmental consum*; consumer citizen*; anti-consum*; responsible consum*; conscious consum*; political consum*; pro-social consum*; radical consum*; sustainable consum*; consumer

resistance; consumer activism; consumer social responsibility. This list of search terms was commonly employed across all the journals sourced for the review and was systematically expanded across all of the journals to capture new and emerging terminologies and meanings. No date restriction was applied. A minimum of 100 citations as at June 2019 was applied to the Journal of Business Ethics articles to ensure that the review included contributions that have been influential. This resulted in 155 relevant articles found in social science, geography, political science, gender studies, philosophy, religious studies, history, business and management, marketing, economics, econometrics, finance and psychology.

Analysis Approach

Third, the review moved into the analysis phase by systematically employing content and thematic (e.g., Braun, & Clarke, 2006) analysis techniques to identify, categorise, analyse, synthesise, and contrast the multiplicity of consumption ethics terminology, meanings and assumptions. The initial phase of analysis focused on three key lines of inquiry: what is ethics in consumption; who is the ethical consumer; and, what do ethical consumers do? To ensure the validity of our review and analysis, we employed methods to improve inter-coder and intra-coder reliability, such as, the use of multiple researchers to code and classify the text, and the use of a consistent coding frame (Neuendorf, 2002). Subsequently, we produced a series of tables that included key themes and language from each of the identified articles across the main identified lines of inquiry. Both independently and jointly we developed higher-order emerging themes that summarised the prevalence of each disciplinary understanding. The final stage included going back to the original articles of each discipline to ensure the prevalence and validity of our main insights and observations. We also triangulated these against key books published on consumption ethics or closely related areas (see Table 1).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Upon completing our review and introducing the four thematic symposium papers, to address questions of interdisciplinarity, we draw on the Circuit of Culture (Johnson, 1986; Hall, 1973) as an enabling theoretical platform that further abstracts our findings and helps us develop an interdisciplinary theorisation of consumer ethics that captures both the distinct and complementary contributions of each of our disciplines.

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY UNDERSTANDING OF THE ETHICAL CONSUMER

“Consumer ethics”, “consumer citizenship”, “anti-consumption”, “responsible”, “conscious”, “ethical”, “political”, “pro-social”, “radical”, “green” and “sustainable” consumption are terms that are often used in an interchangeable fashion and yet they vary in terms of popularity and definitional clarity across and within disciplines. Within geography, for instance, the term ethical consumption is used more commonly than the broader term consumer ethics (see Barnett et al., 2010). Likewise, green consumerism has typically been narrowly viewed as a sub-type of ethical consumption that encompasses pro-environmental motivations only (e.g., Connolly, & Shaw, 2006), although for social psychologists (e.g., de Groot, & Thøgersen, 2013) green consumerism incorporates both social and environmental concerns. Adding to the multiplicity of disciplinary lexicons, ethical consumption can be conceived as either directly impacting entities in the immediate supply chain, such as, rural farmers through consumption of fairly traded commodities; or, indirectly creating positive outcomes for entities outside of the immediate commodity chain, such as, the beneficiaries of cause-related marketing (Hawkins, 2011; Olson, McFerran, Morales, & Dahl, 2016).

Such differences in nuance and the usage of terminologies and meanings are not surprising given the distinct historic and discursive influences – and often isolated literature

streams – within each discipline. Rather, they are telling of the broader social-historical-economic-political-cultural context in which the contemporary “ethical consumer” has emerged. The commonalities and contrasts, therefore, provide a starting point from which to reveal, synthesise and naturalise what ethics in consumption is, who is the ethical consumer and what do ethical consumers do within and across our distinct disciplines and domains.

We analysed the articles in our review along the above three lines of inquiry as these questions reveal commonalities and contrasts within and between disciplines. We synthesise these interdisciplinary themes and assumptions in Figure 1. We now present these themes and varying approaches in detail.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

What is Ethics in Consumption?

Our review reveals two key elements of divergence and commonality between the articles when we explore what constitutes ethics in consumption. We denote these elements as: (1) *the beneficiaries of ethical consumption*; and (2) *ethics stability*. It is interesting to note that these key elements and the associated orientations (other-self, stable-variable) are generally assumed and unstated in the articles reviewed, suggesting that researchers often bring these orientations to their research unconsciously, and/or it is not a disciplinary practice to overtly state these positions. Table 2 orients the approach taken and the underlying assumptions of relevant studies in our review to the nature of ethics in consumption.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

The Beneficiaries of Ethical Consumption: Self or Other Focused

A common thread that emerged across disciplines and journals were the beneficiaries of consumption—to whom the ethical considerations in consumption were directed. This

common orientation was *other-oriented* – in contrast to self-benefit oriented products and consumption (e.g., Pelozo, White, & Shang, 2013; White, & Simpson, 2013; Barnett et al., 2005). Thus, typically, ethical consumption choices are assumed to be self-transcendent: focused on the benefit of others rather than oneself, where ‘others’ may be human, non-human, singular and/or collective (Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008; Klein, Smith, & John, 2004; White, MacDonnell, & Ellard, 2012; Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015). For example, business scholars Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014:525) suggest that ethical consumption extends to practices that “contribute to the good of the community in which [the consumer] lives.” Political scientists Bolsen, Ferraro and Miranda (2014) focus on the actions of consumer-citizens to suggest that pro-social behaviours are those that positively contribute to public goods.

Consumer researcher Henry (2010) similarly suggests that the notions of the citizen and the consumer are intertwined when considering the exercising of moral logics in consumption choices; where consumer responsibilities are linked to ideals of good citizenship, in contrast to self-interested individualistic ways of being and consuming. The beneficiaries of good consumer citizenship are beyond the self: other consumers, society and the planet (e.g., Kronrod, Grinstein, & Wathieu, 2012). Further, Klein et al. (2004: 93) suggest that beyond ethical consumers acting “against selfish interests for the good of others”, the boycotting behaviours of ethical consumers are often accompanied by a self ‘sacrifice’. Thus, the benefit to others can come at a cost to self – a cost inherent to consuming ethically. This cost or sacrifice is often framed in terms of a ‘trade-off’ between consuming ethically and the cost of doing so – where these costs may come in the form of price, performance, status, identity enhancement, and so on (Olson, 2013).

There were exceptions, however, to this common other-orientation. In particular, these exceptions emerged in the economics and geography disciplinary streams. First, a

divergent meaning of ‘sustainable consumption’ was found within some of the economics literature reviewed, for instance, Fleurbaey (2009) and van der Ploeg (2011). In these studies, the term ‘sustainability’ refers to “sustainable levels of consumption” (van der Ploeg, 2011: 402) where consistent levels of consumption are maintained across future generations – to maintain a consistent standard of living and lifestyle. This economic perspective affords little consideration of the externalities of these sustained levels of consumption on individuals or the environment and society at large. Further, in some instances, what counts as ethical consumption additionally or dominantly includes benefits to self (e.g., Auger and Devinney, 2007; Devezer, Sprott, Spangenberg, & Czellar, 2014; White, & Simpson, 2013), illustrating a *self-orientation*.

This self-orientation emerged as a common theme in a cluster of geography studies that take a critical perspective to their appraisal of ethical consumption. For example, Carrier (2010) critically contends that ethical consumption represents a “conjunction of capitalism and conservation” where market-mediated activities/transactions are problematically viewed as effective mechanisms to bring about social equity and environmental protection. Thus, ethical consumers unwittingly reinforce the capitalist market logic and in effect contradict their ethical concerns when attempting to consume ethically. From this perspective, the consequences of ethical consumption work to reinforce the self-serving nature of the market, rather than providing benefits for others.

Ethics Stability

The studies in our review took divergent perspectives on the stability and consistency of individuals’ ethics in consumption across domains. While some studies contend that ethics are *variable* and *contingent*, evolving and changing as consumers move through the domains of their life; other studies suggest that an individual’s ethics in consumption are relatively

stable and *consistent* across domains. For instance, management theorists Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014) and geographers Barnett et al. (2005: 23) contend that ethics in consumption are fluid and evolving – the “working up of moral selves”. Political scientist Baker (2005) takes this argument further to suggest that belief systems of individuals as citizens can differ from the belief systems of the same individuals when they are making decisions as consumers. From this perspective, the systems of morality (or amorality) are deemed to differ inside and outside of the market (Carrington, Zwick, & Neville, 2016). In contrast, however, political scientists Bolsen et al. (2004) find that an individual’s internal pro-social preferences are relatively stable across domains, while consumer researchers Crockett and Wallendorf (2004) note that the political ideologies of individuals are shaped by societal fields and are, thus, malleable, contextual and contingent on the domain in which they are being exercised. Indeed, the marketing and consumer research literature reviewed generally views consumer ethics—or at least the expression of such ethical positions—as variable across contexts and scenarios. This is not surprising given the focus in marketing on the manipulation and transformation of consumers and their behaviours, and the assumptions of marketing’s effectiveness in driving this variability.

Whether stable or variable, however, academics across disciplines suggest that individuals derive their ethics in consumption logics and belief systems from multiple ethical contexts and resources (e.g., Enderle, 2000; Baker 2005; Karababa & Ger, 2010). Along these lines, Enderle (2000) contends that ethical resources are complex and contingent as they originate from “many different kinds of ethics.”

Who is the Ethical Consumer?

The demographic and psychographic profiling of the ‘ethical consumer’ has been a key theme in disciplines such as psychology and marketing at least since the 1960s (e.g.,

Anderson & Cunningham, 1972; Webster, 1975; Roberts, 1996; Straughan & Roberts, 1999). Other disciplines have focused on their own set of questions, ranging from the ethical consumer's religiosity (Minton, Kahle, Juan, & Tambyah, 2016; Wenell, 2014) to his/her class in a socio-historic setting (Newholm, Newholm, & Shaw, 2015). We find in our interdisciplinary review, however, that research is moving away from profiling and creating typologies of concerned consumers. Rather, the field is moving towards framing the ethical consumer around questions of *responsibility* and *agency* that look *beyond the individual actor* (i.e., *collectivities*). Table 3 illustrates these differing positions by the studies in our review.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Responsibility

When considering the sense of responsibility underlying individuals' ethics in consumption, the studies within our review generally take one of two clear orientations to this responsibility that we denote as *internal-* and *outcome- focused* (Barnett et al., 2005; Garcia-Ruiz, & Rodriguez-Lluesma, 2014). In studies favouring the internal responsibility orientation, consumption choices 'reflect a person's conscience' (Irwin & Naylor, 2009; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Zitcer, 2015). In marketing, we observe studies that align with this orientation often assume that the consumer has a deontological orientation/motive (e.g., Irwin & Naylor, 2009), to consider their duties and responsibilities towards others in their consumption choices. Also in marketing, Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) argue that consumers take actions that are congruent with their personal beliefs. In some studies, such as those reviewed in political science, this internalised orientation equates to ethical citizenship in consumption. From philosophy, Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014) frame this in terms of virtue ethics, viewing consumer responsibility not in terms of sets of isolated practices but as an ongoing project. Similarly, in finance Glac (2012) also takes a more

holistic perspective to regard consumer ethics in terms of individuals and investors who should follow life principles.

In contrast, in studies giving primacy to responsibility as *outcome-focused*, the consumer's key motivation concerns the consequences of their individual choices. We find this perspective dominant in business-related disciplines. In marketing, for example, responsibility was most dominantly viewed in terms of consumers expressing their moral agendas through marketplace behaviour (Crockett & Wallendorf, 2004; Castalalo, Perrini, Misani and Tencarti, 2008; Lin, & Chang, 2012; Olsen, Slotegraaf, & Chandukala, 2014). This orientation is often concerned with minimising or inflicting no harm upon others through consumption. In terms of the former, Gershoff and Frels (2015:97) equate the ethical consumption choices of those concerned with environmental issues with choices that "cause less pollution, use fewer natural resources, and are less harmful to the environment overall." To scholars such as Gershoff and Frels (2015), motives of ethical consumption are underpinned by the consequences of consumption, rather than by an internal sense of moral duty.

Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014) represent an exception to the delineated positions between consumer ethics and ethical consumption generally taken in the literature. They suggest that "ethical consumption...extends to all types of practices as long as they are integrated into the individual's search for a morally good life *and* contribute to the good of the community in which she lives" (525) [emphasis added]. Such a view is shared by Soper (2007) who, in philosophy, uses the term "alternative hedonism" to reflect benefits for both self and community. Additionally, in psychology, Williamson (2008) favours the view that the 'good life' comes from pursuing selected morally appropriate pleasures with the best possible outcomes for all.

Interestingly, our review suggests the favouring of specific orientations to the locus of responsibility by a number of journals. Specifically, we note a weighting towards outcome-focused assumptions of responsibility in the Journal of Marketing. In contrast, however, the Journal of Consumer Research has a marked interest in internally-motivated consumer ethics, and the papers reviewed from Administrative Science Quarterly were exclusively underpinned by assumptions of internally-motivated consumption ethics. These journal orientations illustrate how specific positions on consumption ethics can become institutionalized within literature streams and journal-based conversations.

Agency

As noted above, responsibility can and often is exercised through the marketplace. Consumer demand is deemed important (Schuler & Christmann, 2011) and consumers with agency exercise their responsibility through consumption choices (Henry, 2010) to reward those they deem to be morally responsible (Chernev & Blair, 2015). This can often occur and be understood in terms of ‘consumer activism’ (Boczar, 1978; Kozinets & Handelman, 2004) and ‘consumer resistance’ (Case, 1955). Furthermore, consumers’ purchase decisions have the capacity to affect organisational buying decisions for future product ranges (Tate, Elram & Kirchoff, 2010).

Across disciplines, however, questions of consumer agency are framed differently placing serious doubt on the extent to which consumers freely and rationally decide both what constitutes ethically superior choices and how to enact them. For instance, several studies from within marketing, place the site of moral judgement firmly with the *external* producer (e.g., Gershoff & Frels, 2015; Lin & Chang, 2012). In these studies, producers get to decide what is ethical and sustainable, and which ethical attributes they are going to use to augment their market offer and increase consumer demand (e.g., Kotchen, 2006). For

example, Newman, Gorlin, and Dhar (2014) empower the producer with determining the “socially beneficial product enhancements” to be associated with their products and brands. These ethical options are derived externally to the consumer – what is ‘ethical’ is determined by the producer and the market, and the consumer is tasked with recognising the ethical augmentation and benefits, and to respond by adjusting their purchasing habits accordingly.

Non-market *external* institutions such as government regulators and religious structures are also present in research that both indirectly and directly questions the agency of the ethical consumer. This is particularly prevalent in political studies and corporate social responsibility (CSR) research. For instance, Schuler and Christmann (2011) determine ethics to relate to the guidelines and regulations set out in market-based initiatives, such as fair trade, and ethical products are those that comply with these regulations. This non-market external influence is also extended to activist groups who work to shift production and consumption practices (Wilson & Curnow, 2012). Further, the social norms present in the domains that an individual interacts with have also arisen in research as sources of moral logic (e.g., Giesler & Veresiu, 2014). Finally, it is argued that both corporations and the state are shifting responsibilities for ethics to the end consumer. Rosol (2012: 240), for example, suggests that ethical consumption can be “understood as part of a distinct political rationality which aims at passing on state responsibilities to civil society”. Similarly, Giesler and Veresiu (2014) contend that institutional actors work to construct the ethical consumer subject by dictating the moral norms and controlling the choices available to the consumer, then responsibilising the consumer with the moral capacity and agency to act ethically within the social and market constraints placed on them.

In contrast, some studies place the locus and outcome of moral judgement with the individual consumer in the form of self-derived *internal* moral guides, value and belief systems and moral identity projects (e.g., Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Irwin & Naylor, 2009;

Luedicke, Marius, Thompson & Giesler, 2010; Pelozo et al., 2013). For example, Irwin & Naylor (2009:235) suggest that what is deemed ethical by an individual when making consumption choices reflects the individual's "protected or sacred values, which are values that people state they are unwilling (or at least reluctant) to trade off". These values are "self-standards" (Pelozo et al., 2013) possessed by consumers who are moral agents with moral autonomy to make their own moral judgements about firms and the ethical attributes of their market offerings based on their own moral guides and the perceived self-interest of firms and ethicality of products (Chernev & Blair, 2015).

Notwithstanding, the majority of studies across disciplines view consumer action as—in one way or another—limited (e.g., Etzioni, 1958; Soper, 2007), being both constrained and enabled by institutions and social structures (Giesler & Veresiu, 2014) and the availability of relevant information (Schuler & Cording, 2006). Accordingly, the extent to which the Westernised conception of ethical consumption is limited to the daily spheres and financial reach of the agentic 'affluent' has been one of the questions that has been most broadly pondered and critically examined. Disciplinary agreement existed around the notion that ethical consumption is open to affluent consumers who can pay price premiums for ethics (Olson, McFerran, Morales & Dahl, 2016; Soper, 2007; Strizhakova & Coutler, 2013; McWilliams & Siegel, 2001). This can serve to fetishize ethical consumption (Brockington & Duffy, 2010; Carrier, 2010; Hawkins, 2011) through conspicuous acts of ethical consumption (Kitzmueller & Shimshack, 2012; van der Wal, van Horen & Grinstein, 2016). Such consumers can be open to manipulation (Edwards, 2014) which questions the extent to which the social change necessary for an equitable consumption ethics can be achieved within the context of constrained market choices (Amin & Thrift, 2005; Brockington & Duffy, 2010; Moragues-Faus, 2016; Rosol, 2012).

Phrasing the question somewhat differently, some geographers have pondered “where” is the ethical consumer, juxtaposing “Within-North” and “North-South” to “Within-South” and “South-South” relationships (Gregson & Ferdous, 2015). Soper (2007) argues that the geographic/proximal separation between production and consumption further delineates ethical consumption to the domain of the affluent, Northern, consumer. Thus, critical theorists argue that modern neoliberal adaptations position ethical consumption as a lifestyle choice of wealthy white social classes in the global north (Alkon & McCullen, 2011). Buying-in to the marketing rhetoric and social kudos that comes from shopping ethically, these consumers have little understanding or care for the minimal contribution that they may be making to social and ecological change, or the significant contribution that they may be making to corporate profits (Gonzalez & Waley, 2013; Hawkins, 2011; Moragues-Faus, 2016). It is also argued that proximal distance plays a role in selective choices by corporations and consumers to identify the beneficiaries of ethical consumption choices. For example, Brockington and Duffy (2010) argue that while we might look to mitigate consumption-related problems – social and ecological – in distant exotic locations, such problems closer to home remain hidden and unsupported.

Despite these constraints, for some, consumer market choices do have the potential to serve as supplements to other forms of political action (Barnett et al., 2005; Hawkins, 2011) and themselves serve as “influential minorities” (Hamilton, 2013) with agentic potential. This is explored by Barnett et al. (2010) who distinguish between the ethical consumer as an actual and as a rhetorical figure, the latter being part of a discourse mobilised by a variety of actors for purposes other than directly stimulating everyday consumer demand for ethical products.

Beyond the Individual: Collectivities

For some researchers across disciplines, the agency of ethical consumers is realised through collective action (den Hond, & de Bakker, 2007), an 'ethical shopping movement' (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapath, 2007) or social movements of consumers (Bartley & Child, 2011; Glac, 2012; King & Soule, 2007). Such movements can effect change through pressuring stakeholder groups and in generating media coverage (Wilson & Curnow, 2012).

It is noted that consumers acting as concerned citizens are stakeholders alongside other groups, including corporations and governments (Shrivastava, 1995). Thus, moving beyond the role of individual consumers, Bolsen et al. (2014) highlight the importance of a focus on the production of public goods, while Moore (2008) focuses on managers as a means to moderate consumption from within organisations. Similarly, supply chain management studies show that ethical consumption can go beyond consumer actions, as organisations' purchasing decisions can also impact upon society and the environment (e.g., Tate, Elram & Kirchoff, 2010). Organisational buyers can behave ethically by fostering sustainability among suppliers and, in turn, consumers can influence companies to behave more ethically by demanding certain attributes in products that can avert the consequential loss of consumer support (Busse, 2016; Deegan, & Shelly, 2014). From a contrasting social sciences perspective, Potoski and Prakash (2005) view companies as being engaged in ethical consumption when they voluntarily comply with externally set standards, investing significant resources in these programmes and re-structuring their operations and cultures accordingly. In return for this ethical conduct, complying firms enjoy a range of benefits and rewards, including, regulatory relief/freedom, goodwill, visibility of their 'good' environmental citizenship with external audiences and reputational benefits that deliver positive brand equity.

What Do Ethical Consumers Do?

The acts of ethical consumers involve modes of engagement with the market. We organise these acts of engagement with and/or withdrawal from the market into two approaches or orientations: (1) taking action through ethical forms of consumption and/or a citizenship; and (2) absence, or anti-consumption, to not consume or reduce aggregate levels of consumption. We now examine these distinct modes of *action* and *absence* evident in the interdisciplinary literature, which are illustrated by discipline in Table 4.

INSERT TABLE 4

Exercising Consumption Ethics Through Action

Ethical consumption practices live up to the consumer's own ethical self-standards (Peloza et al., 2013). We found two modes of active practice in the interdisciplinary literature: (1) active engagement with the market through ethical consumption choices; and (2) political action at individual and collective levels. In this first ethical consumption scenario, consumers are still consuming – just in ways that align with their personal ethics. Thus, ethical consumption focuses on buying and consuming our way to a better, more equitable world. These acts of ethical consumption are viewed as virtuous consumption practices (Garcia-Ruiz & Rodriguez-Lluesma, 2014) focused on internal 'goods' (i.e. virtues) rather than 'external' (commoditized) goods (Moore, 2008). These consumption acts of ethical consumers are often presented as relatively mundane elements of daily life that have ethical significance (Popke, 2006) on a quotidian and broader level – such as consumers activating their conservation intentions through recycling behaviours (White et al., 2011); actively choosing fair trade, sweatshop-free and animal cruelty-free products (De Pelsmacker & Janssens, 2007; Schuler & Christmann, 2011); conserving energy by switching off lights (Reid, Sutton & Hunter, 2009); and shopping at farmers' markets (Alkon & McCullen, 2011).

Unsurprisingly, the marketing and consumer research articles reviewed generally took this orientation towards consumers' enactment of ethics in marketplaces.

Despite assumptions of virtuosity, however, this active mode of ethical consumption is not above interdisciplinary criticism. For example, anthropologists like Graeber (2011) and Miller (2012), view "ethical consumer" practices as products of the specific separations of economic with social realms within the context in which academic work on consumer ethics takes place. To these scholars, the logics and practices of consumer ethics are the product of particular conjunctures in academic and lay worlds alike. A further critical and interdisciplinary perspective on the nature of ethical consumption emerging from our literature analysis, argues that acts of 'ethical consumption' equate to an uneasy conflation of capitalism and conservation. For example, Carrier (2010:674) argues that flawed assumptions that market transactions – labelled ethical or otherwise – are a panacea for all ills, are at the core of neoliberal versions of ethical consumption, and that these assumptions work to "fetishise commodities, market transactions and, indeed, people themselves". This argument is aligned with the view that all consumption decisions are inherently ethically-charged in nature (Hawkins, 2011). There are no amoral or ethics-free consumption domains, rather, all consumption practices have ethical dimensions (Popke, 2006).

Beyond consumption acts, consumption ethics is also viewed as a field for activist/political practice (e.g. Bolsen et al., 2014). For example, Kahr, Nyffenegger, Krohmer & Hoyer (2016) present a view of 'pro-social consumers' who act upon ethical motives by engaging in 'consumer brand sabotage', indicating an approach of resistance towards unethical market practices. Similarly, Xie et al. (2015) understand complaining directly to companies, negative word of mouth and boycotting behaviour on an individual level, as politicised tactics of ethical citizen consumers. This second mode of active practice is underpinned by the assumption that consumers effectively possess the power to act as

voters in their consumption decisions, to influence the level of social responsibility of the organisations with which they interact. For example, den Hond and de Bakker (2007) refer to “political consumerism” and how activist groups challenge business directly, rather than via established channels of public policy. In turn, activists can influence the extent to which political consumerism is exerted, by educating consumers about the ways in which their actions can effect change within corporations.

While the majority of journal articles reviewed take the view of consumers exercising their ethics through action (see Table 3), there were other approaches. In particular, some studies investigated consumers’ politically-motivated practices of anti-consumption, and the business and marketing disciplines link the behaviour of corporations to the boycott and boycott responses of consumers. We now detail these divergent approaches.

Exercising Ethics by Not Consuming: Anti-consumption

Drawing on criticisms of ethical consumption as an illusionary practice driven by growth-oriented business models, and disillusionment at the notion that the solution to the negative consequences of over-consumption and inequitable consumption is more consumption (just relatively more ethical), a second mode of consuming ethically is explored in the literature—anti-consumption or reduced consumption (e.g., Amin & Thrift, 2005, Soper, 2007; Moore, 2008; Sheth, Sethia & Srinivas, 2011). For example, Sheth et al. (2011) suggest that engaging in more ‘ethical’ forms of consumption does not address the dire economic and social consequences of over-consumption. Consumption reduction and regulation is needed, rather than simply the adoption of different forms of consumption (Moore, 2008). Similarly, Soper (2007) suggests that the ills of growth-oriented capitalism cannot be fixed through more consumption. Thus, in contrast to ethical consumption, anti-consumption is about not consuming at all—or at least with frugality—thereby reducing

aggregate consumption irrespective of whether that consumption is tagged as ethical or not (Amin & Thrift, 2005). Further, we note two levels of non- or anti- consumption in the literatures: individualised anti-consumption (e.g., consumer boycotts); and, collective anti-consumption (e.g., being part of the voluntary simplicity movement).

Collective Action: Boycotts and Buycotts

When individual acts of ethical consumption are considered within the broader contexts of consumer collectives and movements, these consumer movements can either disrupt business directly by boycotting their products, or, indirectly by raising their voice and affecting company reputation. In comparing the impact of direct and indirect ethical consumer activism on business, King and Soule (2007) found the reputational damage inflicted by negative media coverage to be more damaging than consumer boycotts by protest movements. From a broader perspective, Smith, Palazzo and Bhattacharya (2010) identified that consumers collectively target corporations' brand image via anti-corporate and anti-brand boycotting and activism, as well as ensuring that they reward positive CSR activities in corporations—an example of buycotting. Furthermore, McWilliams and Siegel (2001) found that consumers in general, could be said to provide demand for CSR by their interpretation of signals from organisations (such as labelling) that enable them to 'reward' companies for investing in CSR activities, even though this may result in paying a higher price.

Indeed, Aguilera et al. (2007) view the political role of consumers as citizens to pressurise companies to engage in CSR. Such action can lead to a wider influence when companies' competitors consequently also feel pressured to engage in responsible business practices to be perceived as socially responsible enterprises within a market sector (Barnett, 2007). Indeed, it is suggested that through collective social movements activist groups can go so far as to challenge the foundations of the capitalist system (Kozinets & Handelman, 2004).

This position and the assumption that consumers can make a difference at a macro-level is contentious. For example, Moragues-Faus (2016) suggests that while boycotts and buycotts do make an impact upon consumption decisions of the collective, there is often little social change as a consequence.

In this first phase of our review study we interrogate the literature across multiple disciplines to develop an interdisciplinary understanding of what is ethical consumption, who is the ethical consumer, and what do ethical consumers do. We now further build on these findings by, firstly, introducing our four thematic symposium papers and, secondly, illustrating how our interdisciplinary framings are reflected in these papers.

THEMATIC SYMPOSIUM PAPERS

In our first paper, Sandikci brings the extraordinary into everyday consumption through an examination of how religion is implicated in the consumption of nail polish. Drawing on recent debates in anthropology and sociology she builds on a moral economy framework to conceptualise social reproduction and resistance in consumption. In doing so, through an archival and netnographic study, she finds so called halal nail polish both problematic and acceptable as interactions between microsocial and macrosocial vantage points shape and inform views of ‘proper’ action. In moving beyond the tendency to focus on individual *or* social/structural perspectives, these perspectives are brought together through the exploration of multiple vantage points which develop a more holistic and connected disciplinary view.

In our second paper, Hietanen and Sihvonon bring a novel philosophical perspective to consumer ethics that builds on Levinasian ideas. This is corroborated through an ethnographic study of Restaurant Day – a consumer driven food festival. In this study, we find an emergent ethicality grounded in personal responsibility, where a desire to act generously to strangers takes precedence over conventional norms and rules, thus, revealing

personal responsibilities and a sense of justice. Restaurant Day provides a vantage point from which to observe possible Levinasian ethical relations that create opportunities for alternative modes of living.

The third paper by Tiia-Lotta Pekkannen builds on an eclectic interdisciplinary framework – comprising ideas and concepts from institutional theory and practice theory – to provide a more sophisticated account of the embeddedness of sustainable consumption. By embeddedness, Pekkannen refers not only to the social, historical, cultural, economic, political and technological context of everyday consumption activity, but also to its ever-shifting nature due to a variety of micro- and macro- level changes. An institutional ethnography of the everyday consumption practices of eighteen informants helps the author corroborate four layers that address the hierarchy of cultural context and agency, taking also into account institution formality and time needed to effect change. For instance, Pekkannen's model shows how and why sustainable practices that are embedded in the wider institutional structures of society are more likely to be achieved and maintained, as opposed to micro-level practices that are down to choice editing. As such, Pekkannen's study also provides a revisited response to long-standing debates in social sciences around the impasse of consumer agency versus structure (see e.g. Giesler and Veresiu, 2014 vs. Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001), reframing it as a question around the multi-layered relationship between conscious choice and socio-cultural embeddedness.

Whereas Pekkannen's study addresses (un)intentional and habitual sustainable routines and practices, the fourth paper by Zollo focuses on the role of unconscious emotions by integrating insights from socio-cognitive psychology and microsociology. Specifically, Zollo focuses on the concept of "moral intuition" defined as "the sudden appearance in consciousness of a moral judgment, including an affective valence (good–bad, like–dislike), without any conscious awareness of having gone through steps of searching, weighing

evidence, or inferring a conclusion” (Haidt 2001:818). This is extended via a more socially oriented approach that builds on symbolic interactionism. Subsequently, the author develops a holistic, integrated and interdisciplinary model that has both an “intuitionist” and a “social and moral emotions” component, along with five insightful propositions that demand future research.

Returning to our interdisciplinary definition of consumer ethics, we can see a range of views and dimensions reflected in these papers. For instance, Sandikci’s focus on halal nail polish can be viewed as consumer ethics that is self-orientated and motivated by the desire to wear a nail polish that is in keeping with Islamic law. Thus, action is internally-motivated by personal religious beliefs and personal interest. Consumers here, however, are non-agentic. We see individuals struggle with tensions between the moral acceptability of the product and powerful institutional structures, resulting in a consumer ethics that is both variable and evolving. In contrast, Hietanen and Sihvonnen reveal a consumer ethic that is other-orientated as participants in Restaurant Day seek to engage in protest while also focusing on the needs of others. These consumers are agentic in their actions and are both internally motivated by a sense of personal responsibility that is outcome focused on the positive experience of others. This represents consumer ethics around ethical relations that are evolving and open to change. Pekkannen’s paper reflects a consumer ethics that are (primarily) self-oriented, yet are also viewed as embedded in a variety of institutional structures that are in themselves variable as opposed to stable. Further, consumer ethics are enacted by individuals through both agentic and less agentic forms of action (and inaction), as the formality and rigidity of institutional structures plays out differently across contexts. Interestingly, by integrating insights from psychology and microsociology, Zollo views consumer ethics as both self- and other-oriented. However, relative to Pekkannen’s paper, ethics is viewed as more stable, and

enacted by individuals who are (primarily) internally motivated and agentic (despite being potentially driven by unconscious emotions).

In the above papers, we observe the successful integration and synthesis of theoretical frameworks and insights derived from differing disciplinary perspectives. The small number of papers in this symposium, however, points to the challenges of interdisciplinary research, resulting in limitations in terms of interdisciplinary scope. Indeed, we received no papers combining theories and concepts from three or more disciplines. A wider range of interdisciplinary offerings would serve to advance more multi-faceted disciplinary insights from, for example, macro to micro, consumption to production and across individuals, collectivities and social structure. Ultimately, it would attend to the development of understandings that *transcend* specific disciplinary interactions to advance new and holistic approaches. Accordingly, we now draw conclusions and outline directions for future research.

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The development of separate disciplinary literatures exploring ethical consumption in isolated parallel streams has resulted in the flourishing of multiple lexicons and varied tacit meanings. In this paper, we rigorously engage with, combine and decipher these disciplinary silos to draw out common and contrasting meanings, assumptions and threads. Through a systematic review of the literature we identify key themes that cut across disciplines and which help us to identify areas of convergence and divergence. Accordingly, we propose an interdisciplinary account of *consumer ethics* as self- versus other-oriented, stable versus variable that is *enacted by individuals and collectivities* who are internally-motivated versus outcome-focused, agentic vs non-agentic, and *through diverse modes* of action and absention.

Thus, contributing a first attempt to provide a common understanding of the intersection of ethics and consumption that acknowledges the contributions from distinct disciplinary traditions.

Despite the distinct contributions of our four inter-disciplinary papers, we observe that there is further scope in identifying areas of convergence and divergence across disciplines and outlining more holistic frameworks for interdisciplinary understanding(s). Our paper proposes some practical solutions to the inherent challenges in moralising and politicising everyday consumption. In this sense, our overall agenda can be more appropriately described as *transdisciplinary*, in that it aims to “overcome the disconnection between knowledge production, on the one hand, and the demand for knowledge to contribute to the solution of societal problems, on the other hand” (Hirsch Hadorn et al., 2008: vii) through transcending disciplinary paradigms, encouraging participatory research, searching for unity of knowledge across disciplines and focusing on life-world problems (Hirsch Hadorn et al., 2008). Our delineation of common themes across disciplines enables researchers to identify the foci and relative strengths of each discipline, assess omissions in current understandings and the complementarity of adjacent disciplines.

For instance, issues pertaining to the identity of the ‘ethical consumer’ have been extensively investigated within psychology and marketing but often from a micro-individual perspective (e.g., Irwin & Naylor, 2009; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Pelozo et al., 2013; Luedicke et al., 2010). Consequently, they do not sufficiently explain the socio-economic and cultural milieu within which identifications emerge in the first place; a topic that has long troubled disciplines that insist on the more socially constructed nature of identities (see Zollo, this issue), including anthropology, political and sociological studies. Within political science, for instance, a long-standing tradition has focused on identity politics and their intersection with questions of social and environmental justice (see e.g., Fraser, 2013).

Likewise, within our review the variety of approaches taken towards questions of identity is particularly prevalent in current attempts to profile the ‘ethical consumer’, starting with socio-demographic characteristics and moving on to address interrelated questions of *responsibility* and *agency*. More holistic, transdisciplinary understandings could integrate these profiles.

In our review, a parallel area of research seems to be more explicitly concerned with how ethical consumption is legitimated and normalised. For instance, legal and religious studies, as distinct disciplines, shed light onto how ethical consumption is “regulated” both strategically and tactically by formal laws as well as religious norms, customs and rituals (Wenell, 2009; Sandikci, this issue). The importance of social and ‘felt’ norms is highlighted in various anthropological treatments, and also in marketing and psychology studies where ‘ethical norms’ form part of consumers’ ethical decision making (e.g., Shaw & Shiu, 2003). As discussed above, various disciplines consider how moral logics are ultimately structurally constructed, institutionalised and regulated by powerful industry and government actors (e.g., Giesler & Veresiu, 2014; Pekkannen, this issue; Schuler & Christmann, 2011). Regulation, however, also has a broader meaning, one that emphasises the (re)production of particular patterns of moral and symbolic behaviour as inherently natural or more precisely, ideological. For instance, in marketing Carrington et al. (2016) consider ethical consumption as integral to the ideological construction of a greener and more socially just capitalist society, exactly at the point where such possibility proves to be even more elusive. Regulation is also about how more particular struggles over meanings are negotiated by top-down actors (e.g., legal institutions) *and* bottom-up/grassroots ones (e.g., adbusters.org; fashionrevolution.org) as we observe in Hietanen (this issue). Within management, for instance, Caruana and Chatzidakis (2014), discuss how the construction of “ethical consumption” is the outcome of discourses

and actions by a variety of actors operating at different levels. Ultimately then, we see further opportunities for cross-fertilisation in the regulatory and legitimacy fronts.

Finally, another key theme that is ripe for future inter- and trans- disciplinary research is processes of *production*. Economics, with its inherent focus on the “ethical externalities” of production and/or studies into consumer demand for ethical products, emerges as a key explanatory discipline; although, as mentioned above, some of the economics literature does not focus on ‘ethical externalities’ but on maintaining current production levels for the benefit of future generations (Fleurbaey, 2009; van der Ploeg, 2011). Production, however, is also decidedly cultural in so far as one can speak of different cultures of production (e.g., U.S. vs. Japan), and more broadly acknowledge that various economic processes and practices—from conducting market research to designing a product—are cultural phenomena (e.g., du Gay et al., 1997).

Within our review we find that production is represented as a key ethical locus where moral decisions and judgments are made. Particularly within the marketing discipline there is increasing recognition that it is producers that ultimately determine what is ‘ethical’ for consumers (see e.g., Lin, & Chang, 2012; Olsen et al., 2014; Newman et al., 2014). Interrelated points are made by sociologists, political scientists and human geographers that study, for instance, the life of objects, ethical or otherwise, and in doing so expose the various cultural and socio-economic contradictions (e.g., Cook, 2004) in the life span and supply chain of any commodity. Here, what emerges as ‘ethical’ is ultimately viewed as the product of particular cultural realms. There is also a contrasting insistence—following Harvey (1990) and others—that any commodity is underpinned by politics and ethics of labour and production that are specific to capitalist structures. More transdisciplinary understandings could integrate the economic and socio-cultural forces that sustain current supply chains

(ethical or otherwise), and in doing so, bring previously separated accounts of production and consumption together.

Altogether, we make a first attempt to systematically interrogate and synthesise perspectives, terminology and the language employed across the various disciplines that have focused on one or more facet of consumption ethics. We hope it will prove to be a significant stepping-stone to a more holistic and transdisciplinary stream of consumption ethics research.

REFERENCES

- Abela, A. V., & Murphy, P. E. 2008. Marketing with integrity: ethics and the service-dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 39-53.
- Alkon, A. H., & McCullen, C. G. 2011. Whiteness and farmers markets: Performances, perpetuations... contestations?. *Antipode*, 43, 937-959.
- Amin, A., & Thrift, N. What's left? Just the future. *Antipode*, 37, 220-238.
- Anderson, T., & Cunningham, W. H. 1972. The socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Marketing*, 36, 23-31.
- Aguilera, F. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapath, J. 2007. Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 32, 836-863.
- Auger, P., Burke, P., Devinney, T. M., & Louviere, J. J. (2003). What will consumers pay for social product features?. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 42(3), 281-304.
- Auger, P., & Devinney, T. M. (2007). Do what consumers say matter? The misalignment of preferences with unconstrained ethical intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76(4), 361-383.
- Auger, P., Devinney, T. M., & Louviere, J. J. (2007). Using best-worst scaling methodology to investigate consumer ethical beliefs across countries. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70(3), 299-326.
- Baker, A. 2005. Who wants to globalize? Consumer tastes and labor markets in a theory of trade policy beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 924-938.
- Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. M. 2012. Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39, 881-898.
- Barnett, M. L. 2007. Stakeholder influence capacity and the variability of financial returns to corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 794-816.
- Barnett, C., Cloke, P., Clarke, N., & Malpass, A. 2005. Consuming ethics: Articulating the subjects and spaces of ethical consumption. *Antipode*, 37, 23-45.

- Barnett, C., Cloke, P., Clarke, N., & Malpass, A. 2010. *Globalizing responsibility: The political rationalities of ethical consumption*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bartley, T., & Child, C. 2011. Movements, markets and fields: The effects of anti-sweatshop campaigns on U.S. firms, 1993-2000. *Social Forces*, 90, 425-451.
- Belk, R. W. 1988. Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 139-168.
- Boczar, G. E. 1978. Competition between banks and finance companies: a cross section study of personal loan debtors. *The Journal of Finance*, 33, 245-258.
- Bolsen, T., Ferraro, P. J., & Miranda, J. J. 2014. Are voters more likely to contribute to other public goods? Evidence from a large-scale randomized policy experiment. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58, 17-30.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Bray, J., Johns, N., & Kilburn, D. (2011). An exploratory study into the factors impeding ethical consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(4), 597-608.
- Bregman, R., Peng, D. X., & Chin, W. 2015. The effect of controversial global sourcing practices on the ethical judgments and intentions of US consumers. *Journal of Operations Management*, 36, 229-243.
- Brockington, D., & Duffy, R. 2010. Capitalism and conservation: the production and reproduction of biodiversity conservation. *Antipode*, 42, 469-484.
- Brown, G. M. 2000. Renewable natural resource management and use without markets. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38, 875-914.
- Busa, J. H., & Garder, R. 2015. Champions of the movement or fair-weather heroes? Individualization and the (A) politics of local food. *Antipode*, 47, 323-341.
- Busse, C. 2016. Doing well by doing good? The self-interest of buying firms and sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 52, 28-47.
- Carpenter, D., & Ting, M. M. 2007. Regulatory errors with endogenous agendas. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51, 835-852.
- Carrier, J. G. 2010. Protecting the environment the natural way: ethical consumption and commodity fetishism. *Antipode*, 42, 672-689.
- Carrier, J., & Luetchford, P. 2012. *Ethical consumption: Social value and economic practice*. New York: Berghahn.
- Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Canniford, R. 2015. Unmanageable multiplicity: consumer transformation towards moral self coherence. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49, 1300-1325.
- Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. 2010. Why ethical consumers don't walk their talk: Towards a framework for understanding the gap between the ethical purchase intentions and actual buying behaviour of ethically minded consumers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 139-158.
- Carrington, M. J., Zwick, D., & Neville, B. 2016. The ideology of the ethical consumption gap. *Marketing Theory*, 16, 21-38.

- Caruana, R., Carrington, M. J., & Chatzidakis, A. 2016. Beyond the attitude-behaviour gap: Novel perspectives in consumer ethics”: Introduction to the thematic symposium. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136, 1-4.
- Caruana, R., & Chatzidakis, A. 2014. Consumer social responsibility (CnSR): Toward a multi-level, multi-agent conceptualization of the “other CSR”. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121, 577-592.
- Caruana, R., & Crane, A. 2008. Constructing consumer responsibility: Exploring the role of corporate communications. *Organization Studies*, 29, 1495-1519.
- Case, F. E. 1955. The use of junior mortgages in real estate financing. *The Journal of Finance*, 10, 41-54.
- Castaldo, S., Perrini, F., Misani, N., & Tencati, A. (2009). The missing link between corporate social responsibility and consumer trust: The case of fair trade products. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(1), 1-15.
- Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S., & Smith, A. P. (2007). Why people don't take their concerns about fair trade to the supermarket: The role of neutralisation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(1), 89-100.
- Chatzidakis A., Maclaran, P., & Bradshaw, A. 2012. Heterotopian space and the utopics of ethical and green consumption. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28, 494-515.
- Chernev, A., & Blair, S. 2015. Doing well by doing good: the benevolent halo of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 1412-1425.
- Connolly, J., & Shaw, D. 2006. Identifying fair trade in consumption choice. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 14, 353-368.
- Cook, I. 2004. Follow the thing: Papaya. *Antipode*, 36(4): 642-664.
- Crocker, D. A., & Linden, T. 1998. *Ethics of consumption: The good life, justice, and global stewardship*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Crockett, D., & Wallendorf, M. 2004. The role of normative political ideology in consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 511-528.
- Dancey, L., & Goren, P. 2010. Party identification, issue attitudes, and the dynamics of political debate. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54, 686-699.
- de Groot, J. I. M., & Thøgersen, J. 2013. Values and pro-environmental behaviour. In L. Steg, A. E. van den Berg, & J. I. M. de Groot (Eds.), *Environmental psychology*. Chichester, U. K.: Wiley Blackwell/British Psychological Society.
- d'Astous, A., & Legendre, A. (2009). Understanding consumers' ethical justifications: A scale for appraising consumers' reasons for not behaving ethically. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87(2), 255-268.
- de Neve, G., Luetchford, P., Pratt, J., & Wood, D. C. 2008. *Hidden hands in the market: Ethnographies of fair trade, ethical consumption, and corporate social responsibility*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Deegan, C., & Shelly, M. 2014. Corporate social responsibilities: Alternative perspectives about the need to legislate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121, 499-526.
- den Hond, F., & de Bakker, F. G. A. 2007. Ideologically motivated activism: How activist groups influence corporate social change activities. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 901-924.

- De Pelsmacker, P., & Janssens, W. (2007). A model for fair trade buying behaviour: The role of perceived quantity and quality of information and of product-specific attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75(4), 361-380.
- Devezer, B., Sprott, D. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Czellar, S. 2014. Consumer well-being: Effects of subgoal failures and goal importance. *Journal of Marketing*, 78, 118-134.
- Devinney, T. M., Auger, P., & Eckhardt, G. M. 2010. *The myth of the ethical consumer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doran, C. J. (2009). The role of personal values in fair trade consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(4), 549-563.
- Douglas, M. 2003. *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dowell, G. W. S., & Muthulingam, S. 2017. Will firms go green if it pays? The impact of disruption, cost, and external factors on the adoption of environmental initiatives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38, 1287-1304.
- Dowling, R. 2010. Geographies of identity: climate change, governmentality and activism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34, 488-495.
- du Gay, P., Hall, S., Janes, L., Madsen, A. K., Mackay, H., & Negus, K. 1997. *Doing cultural studies: The story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, J. M. 2014. Consumer power and market control: Exploring consumer behaviour in affluent contexts (1946–1980). *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 21, 699-723.
- Ehrich, K. R., & Irwin, J. R. 2005. Willful ignorance in the request for product attribute information. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42, 266-277.
- Enderle, G. 2000. Whose ethos for public goods in the global economy?. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 10, 131-144.
- Etzioni, A. 1958. Administration and the consumer. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3, 251-64.
- Fleurbaey, M. 2009. Beyond GDP: The quest for a measure of social welfare. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47, 1029-1075.
- Fraser, N. 2013. *Fortunes of feminism: From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis*. London: Verso Books.
- Freestone, O. M., & McGoldrick, P. J. (2008). Motivations of the ethical consumer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(4), 445-467.
- Garcia-Ruiz, P., & Rodriguez-Lluesma, C. 2014. Consumption practices: A virtue ethics approach. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24, 509-531.
- Glac, K. 2012. The impact and source of mental frames in socially responsible investing. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 13, 184–198.
- Gershoff, A. D., & Frels, J. K. 2015. What makes it green? The role of centrality of green attributes in evaluations of the greenness of products. *Journal of Marketing*, 79, 97-110.
- Giesler, M., & Veresiu, E. 2014. Creating the responsible consumer: Moralistic governance regimes and consumer subjectivity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 840-857.

- Goggin, G. 2012. *Cell phone culture: Mobile technology in everyday life*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Graeber, D. 2011. Consumption. *Current Anthropology*, 52, 489-511.
- Gregson, N., & Ferdous, R. 2015. Making space for ethical consumption in the South. *Geoforum*, 67, 244-255.
- Gurrero-Bole, V., & Moya-Anegón, F. 2012. A further step forward in measuring a journals' scientific prestige: The SJR2 indicator. *Journal of Informetrics*, 6, 674-688.
- Hall, S. 1997. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices (Culture, media & identities series)*. Milton Keynes/London: The Open University & Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hall, S. 1973. Encoding/Decoding ['Encoding and decoding in television discourse'], In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (Ed.), *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies*: 128-138. London: Hutchinson.
- Hamilton, T. 2008. Politics, products, and markets: Exploring political consumerism past and present. Edited by Michele Micheletti, Andreas Follesdal and Dietlind Stolle. *Economic Geography*, 84, 123-125.
- Hamilton, T. 2013. Beyond market signals: Negotiating marketplace politics and corporate responsibilities. *Economic Geography*, 89, 285-307.
- Harrison, R., Newholm, T., & Shaw, D. 2005. *The ethical consumer*. London; Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Harvey, D. 1990. Between space and time: Reflections on the geographical imagination. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 80, 418-434.
- Hawkins, R. 2011. 'One pack = one vaccine' = one global motherhood? A feminist analysis of ethical consumption. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 18, 235-253.
- Henry, P. C. 2010. How mainstream consumers think about consumer rights and responsibilities. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 670-687.
- Hirsch Hadorn, G., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Biber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., Wiesmann, U., & Zemp, E. 2008. (Eds.). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Holt, D. B. 2002. Why do brands cause trouble? A dialectical theory of consumer culture and branding. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 70-90.
- Howlett, E. A., Burton, S., Bates, K., & Huggins, K. 2009. Coming to a restaurant near you? Potential consumer responses to nutrition information disclosure on menus. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36, 494-503.
- Huang, M-H., & Rust, R. T. 2011. Sustainability and consumption. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39, 40-54.
- Humphery, K. 2009. *Excess: Anti-consumerism in the West*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Irwin, J. R., & Naylor, R. W. 2009. Ethical decisions and response mode compatibility: Weighting of ethical attributes in consideration sets formed by excluding versus including product alternatives. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46, 234-246.
- Jain, V. K., & Sharma, S. 2014. Drivers affecting the green supply chain management adaptation: A review. *IUP Journal of Operations Management*, 13, 54.

- Johnson, R. 1986. What is cultural studies anyway?. *Social Text*, (16): 38-80.
- Kähr, A., Nyffenegger, B., Krohmer, H., & Hoyer, W. D. 2016. When hostile consumers wreak havoc on your brand: The phenomenon of consumer brand sabotage. *Journal of Marketing*, 80, 25-41.
- Karababa, E., & Ger, G. 2011. Early modern Ottoman coffeehouse culture and the formation of the consumer subject. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 737-760.
- Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. 2013. Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: Political ideology and congruent appeals. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40, 350-367.
- King, B. G., & Soule, S. A. 2007. Social movements as extra-institutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 413-442.
- Kitzmueller, M., & Shimshack, J. 2012. Economic perspectives on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50, 51-84.
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C., & John, A. 2004. Why we boycott: Consumer motivations for boycott participation. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 92-109.
- Kronrod, A., Grinstein, A., & Wathieu, L. 2012. Go green! Should environmental messages be so assertive?. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 95-102.
- Kotchen, M. J. 2006. Green markets and private provision of public goods. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114, 816-834.
- Kotler, P. 2011. Reinventing marketing to manage the environmental imperative. *Journal of Marketing*, 75, 132-135.
- Kozinets, R. V., & Handelman, J. M. 2004. Adversaries of consumption: Consumer movements, activism, and ideology. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 691-704.
- Lacey, R., Kennett-Hensel, P. A., & Manolis, C. 2015. Is corporate social responsibility a motivator or hygiene factor? Insights into its bivalent nature. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 315-332.
- Laestadius, L. I., Neff, R. A., Barry, C. L., & Frattaroli, S. 2014. We don't tell people what to do": An examination of the factors influencing NGO decisions to campaign for reduced meat consumption in light of climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 29, 32-40.
- Lange, D., & Washburn, N. T. 2012. Understanding attributions of corporate social irresponsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 300-326.
- Laran, J., Dalton, A. N., & Andrade, E. B. 2011. The curious case of behavioral backlash: Why brands produce priming effects and slogans produce reverse priming effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 999-1014.
- Leve, A. M. 2012. *The circuit of culture as a generative tool of contemporary analysis: Examining the construction of an education commodity*. Paper presented at the Joint AARE / APERA Conference, Sydney.
- Lewis, T., & Potter, D. 2011. *Ethical consumption: A critical introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Lin, Y-C., & Chang, C-C. A. 2012. Double standard: The role of environmental consciousness in green product usage. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 125-134.
- Littler, J. 2008. *Radical consumption: Shopping for change in contemporary culture*. Berks: Open University Press.

- Luedicke, M. K., Thompson, C. J., & Giesler, M. 2010. Consumer identity work as moral protagonism: How myth and ideology animate a brand-mediated moral conflict. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36, 1016-1032.
- Mann, H., Kumar, U., Kumar, V., & Mann, I. J. S. 2010. "Drivers of sustainable supply chain management. *IUP Journal of Operations Management*, 9, 52-63.
- Mansvelt, J. 2008. Geographies of consumption: citizenship, space and practice. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32, 105-117.
- Marinova, D., & Singh, J. 2014. Consumer decision to upgrade or downgrade a service membership. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 42, 596-618.
- Markkula, A., & Moisander, J. 2012. Discursive confusion over sustainable consumption: a discursive perspective on the perplexity of marketplace knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 35, 105-125.
- Massey, D. 2013. *Space, place and gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Michaelson, C. 2010. Revisiting the global business ethics question. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 237-251.
- Micheletti, M. 2003. *Political virtue and shopping: Individuals, consumerism and collective action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. 2001. Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 117-127.
- Miller, D. 2012. *Consumption and its consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Miller, J., & Stanczak, G. 2009. Redeeming, ruling, and reaping: British missionary societies, the East India company, and the India-to-China opium trade. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48, 332-352.
- Minton, E. A., Kahle, L. R., Jiuan, T. S., & Tambyah, S. K. 2016. Addressing criticisms of global religion research: A consumption-based exploration of status and materialism, sustainability, and volunteering behaviour. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 55, 365-383.
- Moore, G. 2008. Re-imagining the morality of management: A modern virtue ethics approach. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 18, 483-511.
- Moragues-Faus, A. 2016. Emancipatory or neoliberal food politics? Exploring the "politics of collectivity" of buying groups in the search for egalitarian food democracies. *Antipode*, 49, 455-476.
- Murray, K. B., & Montanari, J. B. 1986. Strategic management of the socially responsible firm: Integrating management and marketing theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 815-827.
- Naoi, M., & Krauss, E. 2009. Who lobbies whom? Special interest politics under alternative electoral systems. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53, 874-892.
- Neuendorf, K. A. 2002. *The content analysis guidebook*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Newholm, T., Newholm, S., & Shaw, D. 2015. A history for consumption ethics. *Business History*, 57, 290-310.

- Newholm, T., & Newholm, S. 2016. Consumption ethics in history. In D. Shaw, A. Chatzidakis, & M. Carrington (Eds.), *Ethics and morality in consumption: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. London: Routledge, forthcoming.
- Newig, J., Voß, J.-P., & Monstadt, J. 2008. *Governance for sustainable development: Coping with ambivalence, uncertainty and distributed power*. New York: Routledge.
- Newman, G. E., Gorlin, M., & Dhar, R. 2014. When going green backfires: How firm intentions shape the evaluation of socially beneficial product enhancements. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 823-839.
- Nordhaus, W. D. 2007. A review of the "stern review on the economics of climate change". *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45, 686-702.
- Öberseder, M., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Gruber, V. (2011). "Why don't consumers care about CSR?": A qualitative study exploring the role of CSR in consumption decisions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104(4), 449-460.
- Olsen, M. C., Slotegraaf, R. J., & Chandukala, S. R. 2014. Green claims and message frames: how green new products change brand attitude. *Journal of Marketing*, 78, 119-137.
- Olson, E. L. 2013. It's not easy being green: the effects of attribute tradeoffs on green product preference and choice. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41, 171-184.
- Olson, J. G., McFerran, B., Morales, A., & Dahl, D. 2016. Wealth and welfare: Divergent moral reactions to ethical consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42, 879-96.
- Peloza, J., White, K., & Shang, J. 2013. Good and guilt-free: The role of self-accountability in influencing preferences for products with ethical attributes. *Journal of Marketing*, 77, 104-119.
- Popke, J. 2006. Geography and ethics: everyday mediations through care and consumption. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30, 504-512.
- Potoski, M., & Prakash, A. 2005. Green clubs and voluntary governance: ISO 14001 and firms' regulatory compliance. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 235-248.
- Raco, M. 2005. Sustainable development, rolled-out neoliberalism and sustainable communities. *Antipode*, 37, 324-347.
- Rawwas, M. Y. (1996). Consumer ethics: An empirical investigation of the ethical beliefs of Austrian consumers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(9), 1009-1019.
- Reid, L., Sutton, P., & Hunter, C. 2009. Theorizing the meso level: the household as a crucible of pro-environmental behaviour. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34, 309-327.
- Ridoutt, B. G., & Pfister, S. 2010. A revised approach to water footprinting to make transparent the impacts of consumption and production on global freshwater scarcity. *Global Environmental Change*, 20, 113-120.
- Roberts, W. 1996. Will the socially responsible consumer please step forward?. *Business Horizons*, 39, 79-84.
- Rosol, M. 2012. Community volunteering as neoliberal strategy? Green space production in Berlin. *Antipode*, 44, 239-257.
- Sandlin, J. A., & McLaren, P. 2010. *Critical pedagogies of consumption living and learning in the shadow of the "shopocalypse"*. New York: Routledge.

- Schlegelmilch, B., & Öberseder, M. 2010. Half a century of marketing ethics: Shifting perspectives and emerging trends. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93, 1-19.
- Schrempf-Stirling, J. 2013. The Myth of the Ethical Consumer. *The Myth of the Ethical Consumer*, by T. M. Devinney, P. Auger, & G. M. Eckhardt Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Paperback, 258 pp., ISBN: 978-0-5217-4755-4. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23, 622-624.
- Schor, J. B. 2007. In defence of consumer critique: revisiting the consumption debates of the twentieth century. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611, 16-30.
- Schuler, A. A., & Cording, M. 2006. A corporate social performance–Corporate financial performance behavioral model for consumers. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 540-558.
- Schuler, D. A., & Christmann, P. 2011. The effectiveness of market-based social governance schemes: The case of fair trade coffee. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 21, 133-156.
- Schwartz, D. T. 2010. *Consuming choices: Ethics in a global consumer age*. Plymouth: U.K.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. 2001. Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, 225-243.
- Shaw, D., Carrington, M., & Chatzidakis, A. 2016. *Ethics and morality in consumption: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Shaw, D., & Shiu, E. 2003. Ethics in consumer choice: a multivariate modelling approach. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37, 1485-1498.
- Sheth, J. N., Sethia, N. K., & Srinivas, S. 2011. Mindful consumption: a customer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39, 21-39.
- Shrivastava, P. 1995. The role of corporations in achieving ecological sustainability. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 936-960.
- Sine, W. D., & Lee, B. H. 2009. Tilting at windmills? The environmental movement and the emergence of the US wind energy sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 123-155.
- Singh, V. P., Hansen, K. T., & Gupta, S. 2005. Modeling preferences for common attributes in multicategory brand choice. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42, 195-209.
- Smith, N. C., Palazzo, G., & Bhattacharya, C. B. 2010. Marketing's consequences: Stakeholder marketing and supply chain corporate social responsibility issues. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 617-641.
- Soper, K. 2007. Re-thinking the good life: The citizenship dimension of consumer disaffection with consumerism. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7, 205-229.
- Soper, K., & Trentmann, F. 2008. *Citizenship and consumption*. Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spaargaren, G. 2011. Theories of practices: Agency, technology, and culture: Exploring the relevance of practice theories for the governance of sustainable consumption practices in the new world-order. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, 813-822.
- Spaargaren, G., & Mol, A. P. J. 2008. Greening global consumption: Redefining politics and authority. *Global Environmental Change*, 18, 350-359.

- Starkey, K., & Crane, A. 2003. Toward green narrative: Management and the evolutionary epic. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 220-237.
- Steger, M. B., & Wilson, E. K. 2012. Anti-globalization or alter-globalization? Mapping the political ideology of the global justice movement, *International Studies Quarterly*, 56, 439-454.
- Straughan, R. D., & Roberts, J. A. 1999. Environmental segmentation alternatives: a look at green consumer behavior in the new millennium. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16, 558-575.
- Strizhakova, Y., & Coulter, R. A. 2013. The “green” side of materialism in emerging BRIC and developed markets: The moderating role of global cultural identity. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 30, 69-82.
- Talukdar, D., & Lindsey, C. 2013. To buy or not to buy: Consumers' demand response patterns for healthy versus unhealthy food. *Journal of Marketing*, 77, 124-138.
- Tate, W. L., Elram, L. M., & Kirchoff, J. F. 2010. Corporate social responsibility reports: A thematic analysis related to supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 46, 19-44.
- Uslay, C., Morgan, R. E., & Sheth, J. N. 2009. Peter Drucker on marketing: an exploration of five tenets. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37, 47-60.
- van der Ploeg, F. 2011. Natural resources: Curse or blessing?. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49, 366-420.
- van der Wal, A. J., van Horen, F., & Grinstein, A. 2-16. The paradox of ‘green to be seen’: Green high-status shoppers excessively use (branded) shopping bags. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 33, 216-219.
- Varman, R., & Belk, R. W. 2009. Nationalism and ideology in an anticonsumption movement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36, 686-700.
- Vitell, S. J. (2003). Consumer ethics research: Review, synthesis and suggestions for the future. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(1-2), 33-47.
- Weber, K., Heinze, K. L., & DeSoucey, M. 2008. Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 529-567.
- Webster, Jr. F. E. 1975. Determining the characteristics of the socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2, 188-196.
- Wenell, K. 2009. All consuming Christmas? Religion, culture and challenges of consumption. *The Expository Times*, 121, 105-114.
- Wenell, K. 2014. A markan ‘context’ kingdom? Examining biblical and social models in spatial interpretation. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 44, 123-132.
- White, K., MacDonnell, R., & Dahl, D. 2011. It's the mind-set that matters: The role of construal level and message framing in influencing consumer efficacy and conservation behaviors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48, 472-485.
- White, K., MacDonnell, R., & Ellard, J. H. 2012. Belief in a just world: Consumer intentions and behaviors toward ethical products. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 103-118.
- White, K., & Simpson, B. 2013. When do (and don't) normative appeals influence sustainable consumer behaviors?. *Journal of Marketing*, 77, 78-95.

- Williamson, T. 2008. The good society and the good soul: Plato's Republic on leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 397-408.
- Williams, E. F., & Steffel, M. 2014. Double standards in the use of enhancing products by self and others. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 506-525.
- Wilson, B. R., & Curnow, J. 2013. Solidarity™: Student activism, affective labor, and the fair trade campaign in the United States. *Antipode*, 45, 565-583.
- Wood, B. D. 2009. Presidential saber rattling and the economy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53, 695-709.
- Xie, C., Bagozzi, R. P., & Grønhaug, K. 2015. The role of moral emotions and individual differences in consumer responses to corporate green and non-green actions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 333-356.
- Yates, M. 2011. The human-as-waste, the labor theory of value and disposability in contemporary capitalism. *Antipode*, 43, 1679-1695.
- Zhao, X., & Belk, R. W. 2008. Politicizing consumer culture: Advertising's appropriation of political ideology in China's social transition. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35, 231-244.
- Zitcer, A. 2015. Food co-ops and the paradox of exclusivity. *Antipode*, 47, 812-828.

Figure 1. Consumer Ethics: Key Interdisciplinary Themes and Assumptions




Table 1. Key Books on Consumption Ethics

Authors	Book Title	Main Discipline
Carrier and Luetchford (2012)	<i>Ethical consumption: Social Value and Economic Practice</i>	Anthropology
Crocker and Linden (1998)	<i>Ethics of Consumption: The Good Life, Ethics and Global Stewardship.</i>	Various Disciplines
Devinney, Auger and Eckhardt (2011)	<i>The Myth of the Ethical Consumer</i>	Marketing and Consumer Studies
Harrison, Newholm and Shaw (2005)	<i>The Ethical Consumer</i>	Marketing and Consumer Studies
Shaw, Carrington, and Chatzidakis (2016)	<i>Ethics and Morality in Consumption: Interdisciplinary Perspectives</i>	Various Disciplines
Humphery (2009).	<i>Excess: Anti-consumerism in the West.</i>	History
Lewis and Potter (2010)	<i>Ethical Consumption: A Critical Introduction</i>	Media and Cultural Studies
Little (2008)	<i>Radical Consumption: Shopping for Change in Contemporary Culture.</i>	Cultural Studies
de Neve, Luetchford, Pratt and Wood (2008)	<i>Hidden Hands in the Market Ethnographies: Ethnographies of Fair Trade, Ethical Consumption and Corporate Social Responsibility.</i>	Anthropology
Micheletti (2003)	<i>Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism and Collective Action</i>	Politics
Newig, Voß and Monstadt (2008)	<i>Governance for sustainable development: Coping with ambivalence, uncertainty and distributed power</i>	Governance and Sustainability
Sandlin and McLaren (2010)	<i>Critical Pedagogies of Consumption: Living and Learning in the Shadow of the “Shopocalypse”</i>	Education
Schwartz (2010)	<i>Consuming Choices: Ethics in a Global Consumer Age</i>	Philosophy
Barnett, Cloke, Clarke and Malpass (2010)	<i>Globalizing responsibility: The political rationalities of ethical consumption.</i>	Geography
Soper and Trentmann (2008)	<i>Citizenship and Consumption</i>	History and Philosophy

Table 2.

		Beneficiaries of ethical consumption		Ethics Stability		
		<i>Self-Oriented</i>	<i>Other-Oriented</i>	<i>Stable</i>	<i>Variable</i>	
BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT & ACCOUNTING	Marketing and Consumer Research	<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	van der Wal et al. (2016)	Strizhakova and Coulter (2013);	Strizhakova and Coulter (2013); van der Wal et al. (2016)	
		<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	Devezer et al. (2014);	Klein et al. (2004); Kronrod et al. (2012); Kotler (2011) Peloza et al. (2013) Gershoff, and Frels (2015); Olsen et al. (2014); Lin and Chang (2012); Kähr et al. (2016); White et al. (2012); White and Simpson (2013)	Kähr et al. (2016); Klein et al. (2004); Kotler (2011); Peloza et al. (2013);	Devezer et al. (2014); Gershoff and Frels (2015); Lin and Chang (2012); Olsen et al. (2014); White et al. (2012); White and Simpson (2013);
		<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	Huang and Rust (2011);	Lacey et al. (2015) Olson (2013); Sheth et al. (2011); Xie, Bagozzi, and Grønhaug (2015)	Lacey et al. (2015); Marinova and Singh (2014); Olson (2013); Uslay, Morgan, and Sheth (2009);	Huang and Rust (2011); Sheth et al. (2011)
		<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	Ehrich and Irwin (2005);	Irwin and Naylor (2009); Sen and Bhattacharya (2001); White et al. (2011)	Ehrich and Irwin (2005)	Irwin and Naylor (2009); Sen and Bhattacharya (2001); White et al. (2011);
		<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	Luedicke et al. (2010); Chernev and Blair (2015)	Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012); Crockett and Wallendorf (2004) Giesler and Veresiu (2014); Henry (2010); Kidwell et al. (2013); Kozinets and Handelman (2004); Newman et al. (2014); Olson et al. (2016); Varman and Belk (2012); Zhao and Belk (2008)	Chernev and Blair (2015); Varman and Belk (2012)	Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012); Crockett and Wallendorf (2004); Henry (2010); Kidwell et al. (2013); Kozinets and Handelman (2004); Newman et al. (2014); Zhao and Belk (2008).
	Management and	<i>Journal of Operations Management</i>		Bregman et al. (2015)		Bregman et al. (2015)
		<i>Journal of Supply Chain Management</i>		Tate, Elram, and Kirchoff (2010)		

SOCIAL SCIENCES, ARTS & HUMANITIES		<i>Business Ethics Quarterly</i>	Michaelson (2010)	Bhattacharya (2010) Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014); Enderle (2000); Schuler (2011); Smith et al. (2010)	Michaelson (2010)	Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014)
		<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	Auger and Devinney (2007) Castaldo, Perrini, Misani and Tencarti (2008) D'Astous and Legendre (2009) Rawwas (1996)	Auger, Burke, Devinney, and Louviere (2003) Auger, Devinney & Louviere (2007) Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) Carrington, Neville, Whitwell (2010) Chatzidakis, Hibbert and Smith (2007) Chen, Wang and Leung (2008) DePelsmacker & Janssens (2007) Doran (2009) Freestone & McGoldrick (2008) Oberseder, Schlegelmilch and Gruber (2011) Rawwas (1996) Vitell (2003)	D'Astous and Legendre (2009) Doran (2009) Freestone & McGoldrick (2008)	Auger, Burke, Devinney, and Louviere (2003) Auger and Devinney (2007) Auger, Devinney & Louviere (2007) Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) Carrington, Neville, Whitwell (2010) Castaldo, Perrini, Misani and Tencarti (2008) Chatzidakis, Hibbert and Smith (2007) Chen, Wang and Leung (2008) DePelsmacker & Janssens (2007) Oberseder, Schlegelmilch and Gruber (2011) Rawwas (1996) Vitell (2003)
		<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>	Dowell and Muthulingam (2017)	Barnett (2007) den Hond and de Bakker (2007); McWilliams and Diegel (2001); Murray and Montanari (1986); Lange and Washburn (2012); Shrivastava (1995); Starkey and Crane (2003);		
		<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>		King and Soule (2007) Weber, Heinze and DeSoucey (2008)	King and Soule (2007)	
		<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>	Baker (2005);	Bolsen et al. (2014); Dancey and Goren (2010);	Bolsen et al. (2014);	Dancey and Goren (2010); .
	<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>		Steger and Wilson (2012)	Steger and Wilson (2012)		
	<i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>		Minton et al. (2016)	Minton et al. (2016)		

ECONOMICS, ECONOMETRICS & FINANCE	Gender Studies	<i>Gender, Place & Culture</i>		Hawkins (2011)	Hawkins (2011)	
	Philosophy	<i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>		Williamson (2008)	Williamson (2008)	
	Geography, Planning & Development	<i>Antipode</i>	Brockington and Duffy (2010); Carrier (2010); Wilson and Curnow (2010);	Alkon and McCullen (2011) Amin and Thrift (2005) Barnett (2005); Busa and Garder (2015); Moragues-Faus (2016); Rosol (2012); Zitcer (2015);	Amin and Thrift (2005) Carrier (2010); Brockington and Duffy (2010); Zitcer (2015); Rosol (2012)	Alkon and McCullen (2011) Barnett (2005); Wilson and Curnow (2010); Busa and Garder (2015); Moragues-Faus (2016); Raco (2005);
		<i>Economic Geography</i>		Hamilton (2013)	Hamilton (2013)	
		<i>Global Environmental Change</i>	Laestadius et al. (2014)	Spaargaren and Mol (2008); Spaargaren (2011);	Ridoutt and Pfister (2010); Spaargaren (2011); Laestadius et al. (2014)	Spaargaren and Mol (2008)
		<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	Dowling (2010) Mansvelt (2008);	Popke (2006); Reid et al. (2009)	Dowling (2010)	Mansvelt (2008); Popke (2006); Reid et al. (2009)
	Economics and Finance	<i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>	Brown (2000); Fleurbaey (2009); Guthrie (2006); van der Ploeg (2011)	Kitzmueller and Shimshack (2012)		
		<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>		Kotchen (2006)	Kotchen (2006)	
		<i>The European Journal of History of Economic</i>	Edwards (2014)			Edwards (2014)

Table 3.

		Locus of Responsibility		Consumer Agency		
		<i>Internally-Motivated</i>	<i>Outcome-Focused</i>	<i>Agentic</i>	<i>Non-Agentic</i>	
BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT & ACCOUNTING	Marketing and Consumer Research	<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	Strizhakova and Coulter (2013); van der Wal et al. (2016)		Strizhakova and Coulter (2013); van der Wal et al. (2016)	
		<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	Peloza et al. (2013); Devezer et al. (2014);	Devezer et al. (2014); Gershoff and Frels (2015); Olsen et al. (2014); Kähr et al. (2016); Klein et al. (2004); Lin and Chang (2012); White and Simpson (2013); Kronrod et al. (2012); Kotler (2011) Talukdar and Lindsey (2013); White et al. (2012)	Devezer et al. (2014); Peloza et al. (2013); Kähr et al. (2016); Klein et al. (2004); White et al. (2012); White and Simpson (2013);	Gershoff and Frels (2015); Olsen et al. (2014); Kotler (2011); Lin and Chang (2012); Talukdar and Lindsey (2013);
		<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	Xie et al. (2015); Lacey et al. (2015)	Huang and Rust (2011); Olson (2013); Uslay et al. (2009); Sheth et al. (2011)	Huang and Rust (2011) Uslay et al. (2009); Lacey et al. (2015); Sheth et al. (2011); Xie et al. (2015)	Olson (2013)
		<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	Ehrich and Irwin (2005); Irwin and Naylor (2009); Sen and Bhattacharya (2001);	White et al. (2011)	Ehrich and Irwin (2005) Irwin and Naylor (2009); Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) White et al. (2011)	
		<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012); Chernev and Blair (2015); Henry (2010); Laran et al. (2011); Karababa and Ger (2011); Kidwell et al. (2013); Varman and Belk (2012); Luedicke et al. (2010); Olson et al. (2016).	Crockett and Wallendorf (2004) Howlett et al. (2009); Kozinets and Handelman (2004); Newman et al. (2014); Zhao and Belk (2008); Giesler and Veresiu (2014)	Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012); Chernev and Blair (2015); Henry (2010); Kozinets and Handelman (2004); Laran et al. (2011); Luedicke et al. (2010); Karababa and Ger (2011); Varman and Belk (2012)	Crockett and Wallendorf (2004); Giesler (2010); Giesler and Veresiu (2014); Howlett et al. (2009); Kidwell et al. (2013); Newman et al. (2014); Olson et al. (2016); Zhao and Belk (2008)
		<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>		Kotchen (2006)		Kotchen (2006)
		<i>The European Journal of History of Economic</i>		Edwards (2014)		Edwards (2014)

SOCIAL SCIENCES, ARTS & HUMANITIES	Management and Organisation Studies	<i>Journal of Operations Management</i>	Bregman et al. (2015)	Bregman et al. (2015);	Bregman et al. (2015)	
		<i>Journal of Supply Chain Management</i>		Tate et al. (2010)		Tate et al. (2010)
		<i>Business Ethics Quarterly</i>	Enderle (2000); Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014); Michaelson (2010)	Schuler (2011); Smith et al. (2010)		Enderle (2000); Michaelson (2010); Schuler (2011); Smith et al. (2010)
		<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	Auger and Devinney (2007) Carrington et al. (2010) Chen, Wang and Leung (2008) Doran (2009) Freestone & McGoldrick (2008) Vitell (2003)	Auger, Burke, Devinney, and Louviere (2003) D'Astous and Legendre (2009) Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) Castaldo, Perrini, Misani and Tencarti (2008) Chatzidakis, Hibbert and Smith (2007) DePelsmacker & Janssens (2007) Oberseder, Schlegelmilch and Gruber (2011) Vitell (2003)	D'Astous and Legendre (2009) Carrington et al. (2010) Castaldo, Perrini, Misani and Tencarti (2008) Chen, Wang and Leung (2008) DePelsmacker & Janssens (2007) Doran (2009) Freestone & McGoldrick (2008) Oberseder, Schlegelmilch and Gruber (2011)	Auger and Devinney (2007) Auger, Burke, Devinney, and Louviere (2003) Auger, Devinney & Louviere (2007) Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) Chatzidakis, Hibbert and Smith (2007) Vitell (2003)
		<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>		Aguilera et al. (2007); Dowell and Muthulingam (2017); den Hond and de Bakker (2007); Shrivastava (1995)	Barnett (2007); McWilliams (2001); Shrivastava (1995)	Aguilera et al. (2007); den Hond and de Bakker (2007); Basu and Palazzo (2008)
		<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	King and Soule (2007); Sine and Lee (2009); Weber et al. (2008)		Weber et al. (2008)	
	Political Science & International Relations	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>	Baker (2005); Bolsen et al. (2014)	Carpenter and Ting (2007); Dancey and Goren (2010)	Baker (2005); Bolsen et al. (2014); Dancey and Goren (2010);	
		<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>		Steger and Wilson (2012)		Steger and Wilson (2012)
		<i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>	Minton et al. (2016)			Minton et al. (2016)

	Gender Studies	<i>Gender, Place & Culture</i>		Hawkins (2011)		Hawkins (2011)
	Philosophy	<i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>		Williamson (2008)	Williamson (2008)	
	Geography, Planning & Development	<i>Antipode</i>	Carrier (2010); Rosol (2012); Wilson and Curnow (2010); Zitcer (2015); Amin and Thrift (2005)	Barnett (2005); Brockington and Duffy (2010); Alkon and McCullen (2011); Busa and Garder (2015); Moragues-Faus (2016)	Olivers (2004) Barnett (2005); Alkon and McCullen (2011); Busa and Garder (2015); Moragues-Faus (2016)	Brockington and Duffy (2010); Carrier (2010); Rosol (2012); Yates (2011); Wilson and Curnow (2010); Zitcer (2015)
		<i>Economic Geography</i>	Hamilton (2013)		Hamilton (2013)	
		<i>Global Environmental Change</i>	Spaargaren (2011); Laestadius et al. (2014)	Ridoutt and Pfister (2010); Spaargaren and Mol (2008)	Spaargaren and Mol (2008)	Laestadius et al. (2014); Ridoutt and Pfister (2010); Spaargaren (2011);
		<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	Dowling (2010); Mansvelt (2008); Popke (2006)	Reid et al. (2009)	Mansvelt (2008); Popke (2006); Reid et al. (2009)	Dowling (2010)
	Economics and Finance	<i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>		Brown (2000); Fleurbaey (2009); Kitzmueller and Shimshack (2012); Nordhaus (2007).		Brown (2000); Guthrie (2006); Fleurbaey (2009); Kitzmueller and Shimshack (2012); van der Ploeg (2011)
		<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>		Kotchen (2006)		Kotchen (2006)
		<i>The European Journal of History of Economic</i>		Edwards (2014)		Edwards (2014)
		<i>The Journal of Finance</i>		Boczar (1978)		Boczar (1978)

Table 4.

		Modes of Ethical Consumption Engagement		
		Action	Abstention	
BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT & ACCOUNTING	Marketing and Consumer Research	<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	Strizhakova and Coulter (2013); van der Wal et al. (2016)	
		<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	Devezer et al. (2014); Gershoff and Frels (2015); Kotler (2011); Kronrod et al. (2012); Lin and Chang (2012); Olsen et al. (2014); Peloza et al. (2013); White et al. (2012); White and Simpson (2013)	Kähr et al. (2016); Klein et al. (2004); Kravets and Sandikci (2014); Talukdar and Lindsey (2013);
		<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	Abela and Murphy (2008); Lacey et al. (2015); Marinova and Singh (2014); Olson (2013); Uslay et al. (2009)	Huang and Rust (2011); Sheth et al. (2011); Xie et al. (2015)
		<i>Business Ethics Quarterly</i>	Enderle (2000); Garcia-Ruiz and Rodriguez-Lluesma (2014); Schuler and Christmann (2011);	Moore (2008); Michaelson (2010); Smith et al. (2010)
		<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	Auger and Devinney (2007) Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) Carrington, Neville & Whitwell (2010) Castaldo, Perrini, Misani and Tencarti (2008) Chen, Wang and Leung (2008) D'Astous and Legendre (2009) DePelsmacker & Janssens (2007) Doran (2009) Oberseder, Schlegelmilch and Gruber (2011) Rawwas (1996) Singh, Sanchez and Bosque (2009) Vitell (2003)	Doran (2009) Freestone & McGoldrick (2008)
		<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	White et al. (2011)	Ehrich and Irwin (2005); Irwin and Naylor (2009); Sen and Bhattacharya (2001); Singh et al. (2005).

SOCIAL SCIENCES, ARTS & HUMANITIES		<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012); Chernev and Blair (2015); Crockett and Wallendorf (2004); Giesler and Veresiu (2014); Henry (2010); Holt (2002); Howlett et al. (2009); Laran et al. (2011); Karababa and Ger (2011); Kidwell et al. (2013); Kozinets and Handelman (2004); Luedicke et al. (2010); Newman et al. (2014); Olson et al. (2016);	Varman and Belk (2012); Williams and Steffel (2014)
		<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>	Kotchen (2006)	
		<i>The European Journal of History of Economic</i>		Edwards (2014)
	Management and Organisation Studies	<i>Journal of Operations Management</i>	Mann et al. (2010); Jain and Sharma (2014)	Bregman et al. (2015)
		<i>Journal of Supply Chain Management</i>	Tate et al. (2010)	Busse (2016)
		<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>	Barnett (2007); Branzei et al. (2004); Dowell and Muthulingam (2017) den Hond and de Bakker (2007); McWilliams and Seigal (2001)	Aguilera et al. (2007); Shrivastava (1995)
		<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	Eesley and Hannah (2012); Sine and Lee (2009); Weber et al. (2008)	King and Soule (2007);
	Political Science & International Relations	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>	Baker (2005); Bolsen et al. (2014); Carpenter and Ting (2007) Dancey and Goren (201); Naoi and Krauss (2009); Potoski and Prakash (2005); Wood (2009);	
		<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>	Steger and Wilson (2012)	
		<i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>	Miller and Stanczak (2009); Minton et al. (2016)	

ECONOMICS, ECONOMETRICS & FINANCE	Gender Studies	<i>Gender, Place & Culture</i>	Hawkins (2011)	
	Philosophy	<i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>	Williamson (2008)	
	Geography, Planning & Development	<i>Antipode</i>	Alkon and McCullen (2011); Barnett (2005); Busa and Garder (2015); Carrier (2010); Moragues-Faus (2016); Olivers (2004); Raco (2005); Rosol (2012); Wilson and Curnow (2010); Zitcer (2015);	Amin and Thrift (2005); Brockington and Duffy (2010); Yates (2011)
		<i>Economic Geography</i>	Hamilton (2013)	
		<i>Global Environmental Change</i>	Spaargaren (2011);	Laestadius et al. (2014); Ridoutt and Pfister (2010); Spaargaren and Mol (2008)
		<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	Popke (2006); Dowling (2010); Reid et al. (2009)	Mansvelt (2008);
	Economics and Finance	<i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>	Brown (2000) Kitzmueller and Shimshack (2012)	
		<i>The Journal of Finance</i>	Barnes et al. (2016) Glac (2012)	