

GENERATION Z ATTITUDES TOWARD GREEN MARKETING: A CROSS COUNTRY AND GENDER ANALYSIS

BARAN TAMER

*LECTURER, PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY, KALE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, DENIZLI, TURKEY
tamerbaran65@gmail.com*

POPESCU CĂTĂLIN

*PROFESSOR, PETROLEUM-GAS UNIVERSITY, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DPT.,
PLOIESTI, ROMANIA
cpopescu@upg-ploiesti.ro*

Abstract

In social marketing definition, green marketing is the improvement and marketing of products layout to as far as possible minimize adverse effect level on the physical environment. As for environmental marketing definition, green marketing is defined for organizations endeavour to produce, promote, package and reclaim products in a manner that susceptible or responsive to environmental concerns. In this context we define green marketing performing marketing activities which include product improvement, pricing, promote and placing so as to minimize harm to the environment regardless of sector. Related to this approach it will be made a survey in order to analyse the attitude of young generation toward green marketing. It will be created a questionnaire that could offer a perspective about the behaviour of young people concern the environmental issues and future challenges.

Keywords: *Green Marketing, Generation Z, Green Consumer, Green Consumption*

JEL Classification: *M31, C18, C12*

1. WHAT IS THE GREEN MARKETING? WHAT ISN'T?

In the marketing literature it's possible to find many green marketing definitions. For example, Saha and Darnton (2005: 121-122) defined green marketing as the special product regarding improvement, pricing, promotion and placing that don't harm the environment. From this definition, it can be clearly understood that green marketing is not only associated with promotion or products with environmental features, but also includes all of the marketing elements. On the other hand, Polonsky (1994: 2), in his study, stated that green marketing is composed of whole activities made up for satisfying human expectation, needs and desires, with minimum effect harm on the environment. One of the earliest definitions of green marketing stated by Henion and Kinnear (1976) defined green marketing as the work of positive and negative orientation of marketing activity on environmental pollution, energy and non-energy resources consuming. One of the most important points of this definition declared that green marketing is consisting of a subset of the overall marketing activities (Polonsky, 1994: 2). Further AMA (2015) develops green marketing definitions in terms of retailing, social marketing and environmental marketing. In this approach, in retailing, green marketing can be defined as marketing of products that are assumed to be environmentally secure. On the other hand in social marketing definition, green marketing represents the improvement and marketing of products' layout to as possible to minimize adverse effect level on the physical environment. As regarding environmental marketing definition, green marketing is defined for organizations endeavour to produce, promote, package and reclaim products in a manner that is susceptible or responsive to environmental concerns (AMA, 2015).

According to green marketing definitions given above it can be pointed out that green marketing don't harm the environment but not in the same way such as activities like tree planting, greening etc. In this context we define green marketing performing marketing activities which include product improvement, pricing, promote and placing in order to minimize the impact to the environment.

Green marketing is important for both, companies and people. By green marketing strategies, companies can take some advantages such as be more socially responsible (Davies, 1992; Freeman and Liedtka, 1991; Keller, 1987), overcoming to governmental pressure (Saha and Darnton, 2005: 131), competitive advantages from competitors (Saha and Darnton, 2005: 131) etc. On the other hand, consumers are interested not only in purchasing and consuming but also in production process and in environmental problems and, also, they are considering themselves as green consumers (Zinkhan and Carlson, 1995: 2).

Another critical issue is that there are so many studies about consumers' environmental conscience. In this respect these studies have different findings that were revealed by authors. For example, based on Simmons Market Research Bureau's (SMRB) or research of Kalafatis et. al. (1999: 442) is stated that consumers are not enthusiastic about purchasing environmental friendly products. On the contrary, Ottman (1993: 43) found that more than half of the 16 countries' (included in his study) consumers are sensitive to environment pollution in his research. Similarly Fisher (1990), Cross (1990) and Donaton and Fitzgerald (1992) mentioned that consumers declared themselves as environmentalist (informed by Ay and Ecevit, 2005: 241). Similar findings were found by Turkish academicians. Aracıoğlu and Tatlıdil (2009: 459) found that Turkish consumers adopt an environmental protectionist attitude and when they have to make a selection, they choose the less harmful products to the environment option. Çoban and Sönmez (2014: 74) found that Turkish consumers have positive attitude towards green marketing. In this study, results showed that consumers are sensitive especially to the green products, green pricing and green promotion. According to Ay and Ecevit's study (2005: 250) Turkish university students try to have environmentally-conscious behaviour. Aslan and Çınar (2015: 183) stated that Turkish students are consciousness about purchasing and using environmentally harmful products. Also according to the results of this study, students believe that there is a relation between the nature of consuming products and contribution to environmental protection, they are aware about the importance of packaging type in product buying decision and they understand not to disturb natural balance, they are trying to reduce or eliminate different types of wastes and keep the environment clean, they are willing to get information about pre-purchasing period related to the products features and what happen during the purchasing period, taking in account environmentalist products.

The meaning of these paragraphs is to establish the context of the paper. In this light the present paper is developed by bringing the specific literature first (quotations) and then is synthesized the current meaning of the investigated matter. In the following chapters are formulated the paper' goal under the form of hypotheses, questions or matters treated and are explained the method approach and, in brief, necessary arguments. Based on a survey conducted in Turkey and Romania, were studied some features related to the Turkish and Romanian consumers.

2. GENERATION Z ATTITUDES TOWARDS GREEN MARKETING AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Methodology

Sampling, Data Collection and Scaling

The sampling was determined for the study by using convenience and judgement sampling methods. The data gathered with a face-to-face questionnaire method were delivered from 135 respondents. Questionnaire was built up according to Roberts and Bacon's (1997) ecologically conscious consumer scale and appropriately adopted for the study. Frequency analysis and Mann Whitney U Test were used for achieve the aims of the study through SPSS 20 statistical programme.

Findings

Respondents' demographics were given in detail in Table 1. As can be seen in this table almost 75% of the respondents are Turkish consumers. More than half of total respondents are female. Moreover, major part of the respondents is having low income.

Table 1. Country*Gender*Income Cross Tabulation

Country			Gender		Total
			F	M	
Turkish	Income (Euro)	Less than 310	5	15	20
		Between 311-620	30	24	54
		Between 621-930	12	5	17
		Between 931-1240	2	1	3
		More than 1240	1	4	5
Total			50	49	99
Romanian	Income (Euro)	Less than 310	10	4	14
		Between 311-620	6	5	11
		Between 621-930	2	3	5
		Between 931-1240	1	1	2
		More than 1240	0	2	2
Total			19	15	34
Total	Income	Less than 310	15	19	34

(Euro)	Between 311-620	36	29	65
	Between 621-930	14	8	22
	Between 931-1240	3	2	5
	More than 1240	1	6	7
Total		69	64	133

Cronbach's alpha value of the scale is 0,782 for 16 items. This value can be considered as satisfactory acceptable (Malhotra, 2004: 268). Furthermore, in order to decide what type of parametric or nonparametric test to be used was applied Kolmogorov-Smirnov distribution test. According to the results of this test, because the distribution is normal (K-S(z)=1,205; $p>0,05$), Independent Samples T Test was used as statistical method.

The applied Independent Samples T Test for determining whether variances are equal or not, Levene's test for Equality of Variance was used and it was found that variances are not equal between Turkish and Romanian consumers ($F= 11,050$; $p<0,05$). Thus, related to variances, results generated for analysis are not equal.

Table 2. Green Marketing Attitudes Means by Turkish and Romanian Z Generation

	Nationality	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t	p	Reject/Accept
Item1	Turkish	98	4,69	2,107	-,336	-1,053	,295	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,03	1,381				
Item2	Turkish	100	5,78	1,947	-,132	4,484	,630	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,91	1,111				
Item3	Turkish	100	4,60	2,287	-,547	-1,543	,127	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,15	1,579				
Item4	Turkish	99	4,19	2,122	-,543	-1,788	,077	Rejected
	Romanian	34	4,74	1,263				
Item5	Turkish	101	5,17	2,093	-,538	-1,785	,077	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,71	1,268				
Item6	Turkish	100	5,65	1,904	-,203	-,785	,434	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,85	1,019				
Item7	Turkish	97	5,95	1,839	,037	,143	,887	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,91	1,026				
Item8	Turkish	97	4,63	1,986	-,371	-1,198	,234	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,00	1,371				
Item9	Turkish	98	4,67	1,999	-,238	-,766	,446	Rejected
	Romanian	34	4,91	1,379				
Item10	Turkish	99	4,69	1,957	-,254	-,767	,445	Rejected
	Romanian	34	4,94	1,556				
Item11	Turkish	99	5,47	2,027	-,290	-1,009	,316	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,76	1,182				
Item12	Turkish	96	3,77	2,120	-,729	-2,087	,040	Accepted
	Romanian	34	4,50	1,600				
Item13	Turkish	99	5,08	1,952	-,184	-,650	,517	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,26	1,189				
Item14	Turkish	101	4,80	2,025	-,433	-1,305	,196	Rejected
	Romanian	34	5,24	1,539				
Item15	Turkish	100	4,55	1,982	-,068	-,216	,830	Rejected
	Romanian	34	4,62	1,415				
Item16	Turkish	100	4,06	2,219	,148	,492	,624	Rejected
	Romanian	34	3,91	1,190				

It can be seen that there is only item 12 (“*I do not buy products in aerosol containers*”) that has statistically significant difference between Turkish and Romanian consumers. In this item Turkish consumers' has lower mean than Romanian consumers. There is no statistically significant difference for other all items. For all these remained items, especially for item 7 (“*I have switched products for ecological reasons*”) and item 15 (“*I try only to buy products that*”).

can be recycled”) it is proved that they have the smallest difference. Even for all other items the mean difference for Turkey and Romania shows that they aren't statistically significant. All these findings were shown in Table 2.

3. CONCLUSIONS

In this study it was studied a cross country comparison of Generation Z attitude towards green marketing. In this context after the description related to Generation Z and after were explained the concepts linked with green marketing, were gathered data through face-to-face questionnaire from 135 respondents coming from Turkey and Romania. Then, data were analysed using Independent Samples T Test to SPSS 20 statistical programme.

At the end of the analysis was found that there is no difference between Turkish and Romanian Z Generations towards green marketing. Some proves concern this conclusion could be found in other research (Asmalı, 2015; Agaoglu, 2014). On other words Turkish and Romanian youths attitudes towards green marketing is similar. This finding can help especially for international companies which are operating to both countries. These companies can apply similar green marketing strategies in Turkey and Romania, as well.

Methods of data collecting and numbers of questionnaire can be considered as limitations of this paper. Also researchers can investigate to other type of consumers apart from youths in further researches.

4. REFERENCES

- [1]. **Agaoglu F.**, *Religious perspective of business ethics principles in Turkey and Romania: a cross country comparison*, SEA-Practical Application of Science, Volume II, Issue 1 (3) / 2014, 11-22;
- [2]. **Aracioglu B. & Tatlidil R.**, *Tüketicilerin Satın Alma Davranışında Çevre Bilincinin Etkileri*. *Ege Academic Review*, 9(2), 2009, 435-461;
- [3]. **Aslan F. & Çınar, R.**, *Yeşil Pazarlama Faaliyetleri Çerçevesinde Kafkas Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Çevreye Duyarlı Ürünleri Kullanma Eğilimlerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma*. *Kafkas Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(9), 2015;
- [4]. **Asmalı M., Bilki U., Duban C.A.**, *A Comparison of the Turkish and Romanian students' willingness to communicate and its affecting factors in English*, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, vol.11, no.1, 2015, 59-74;
- [5]. **Canan A. Y. & Ecevit Z.**, *Çevre Bilinçli Tüketiciler*. *Akdeniz University Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences Faculty Journal/Akdeniz Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(10), 2005;
- [6]. **Çoban S. & Sönmez Y.**, *Yeşil Pazarlama Karmasına Yönelik Tüketici Tutumlarının Demografik Özelliklere Göre Farklılaşması: Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Örneği*. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3, 2014, 65-82;
- [7]. **Cross F. B.**, *The weaning of the green: Environmentalism comes of age in the 1990s*. *Business Horizons*, 33(5), 1990, 40-46;
- [8]. **Davis Joel J.**, "Ethics and Green Marketing." *Journal of Business Ethics* 11 (2): 1992, 81-87;
- [9]. **Donaton S. & Fitzgerald, K.**, *Polls show ecological concern is strong*. *Advertising Age*, 63(3), 1992, 19-23;
- [10]. **Fisher A. B.**, *What consumers want in the 1990s*. *Fortune*, 121(3), 1990, 108-112;
- [11]. **Freeman R. E. and Liedtka J.**, "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Critical Approach" *Business Horizons*, 1991, 34 (4): 92-98;
- [12]. **Henion K. E., & Kinnear T. C.**, *A guide to ecological marketing*. *Ecological Marketing*. Columbus, Ohio: American Marketing Association, <https://www.ama.org/resources/Pages/Dictionary.aspx?dLetter=G>, 1976;
- [13]. **Kalafatis S. P., Pollard M., East R. & Tsogas M. H.**, *Green marketing and Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour: a cross-market examination*. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 16(5), 1999, 441-460;
- [14]. **Keller G. M.**, "Industry and the Environment: Toward a New Philosophy." *Vital Speeches*, 1987, 54 (5): 154-157;
- [15]. **Malhotra N. K.**, *Marketing research: An applied orientation*, 4/e. Pearson Education New Jersey, 2004;
- [15]. **Polonsky M. J.**, *An introduction to green marketing*. *Electronic Green Journal*, 1(2), 1994;
- [16]. **Roberts J. A., & Bacon D. R.**, *Exploring the subtle relationships between environmental concern and ecologically conscious consumer behavior*. *Journal of Business Research*, 40(1), 1997, 79-89;
- [17]. **Saha M., & Darnton G.**, *Green Companies or Green Con-panies: Are Companies Really Green, or Are They Pretending to Be?* *Business and Society Review*, 110(2), 2005, 117-157;
- [18]. **Zinkhan G. M., & Carlson L.**, *Green advertising and the reluctant consumer*. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 1995, 1-6.