Association between Socio-demographics and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

Rajendra Kumar*
Syed Haider Ali**
*Research Scholar, ** Professor & Head, Department of Business Administration
Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Language University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India
E: mail: vision.agri@rediffmail.com

Abstract: This paper deals with the socio-demographics and psychogenic determinantsthat influence the consumers' decision in buying green products. Environment friendly green products are more preferred nowadays owing to increasing trend of environmental awareness. The objective of this paper is to get an in-depth understanding of the relationship between socio-demographic and psychogenic determinants about buying of green products. The study was conducted using survey method. The sample size was 405, of which 233 were males and 172 females. Age, education qualification and income were also taken in account for this study. Results suggests that there is no correlation between factors such as age, education and occupation and psychogenic determinants. However income influences the psychogenic determinants of consumers' green products buying behaviour. These results provide a preliminary idea about the factors influencing the buying behaviour of consumer, thereby raising issue to evolve the sustainability issue to the consumers.

Keywords: Green Products, Consumers, Socio-demographics, Psychogenic Determinants, Environment friendly

Introduction

Nowadays, the business ecosystem is witnessing a dramatic increase in environmental consciousness and sustainability, due to continuous degradation of the natural environment. This has emerged as a matter of concern not only for the people of developed countries but has also recently awakened developing countries to the green movement to protect and conserve the environment, leading to an increase in environmental awareness for better health, in turn, leading to demand for green products. Shamdasami et al., (1993) defined green product as the product that do not pollute the earth or deplore natural resources and can be recycled or conserved. Roberts (1996) opined that green product have gradually spread from small niche markets to large markets of consumer goods and services.

The consumer is the one who is the end-user of any goods or services. So, it is important for marketers to identify market segments in which consumers are more concerned about the environment and are more willing to purchase green products (Laroche, *et al.,* 2001). Many variables including values, beliefs/knowledge, needs & motivations, attitudes, and demographics were found to drive consumer choice regarding to purchase environmentally friendly products (Bui 2005).Karm(2008) reported that numerous estimations indicate that consumers take the environment seriously, but generally nothing is seen or observed in their acts, for example, in purchasing the green products.

In order to compress the broad domain influencing buying behaviour of consumers into a more specific area, relationship between socio-demographics and psychogenic determinants which drives consumer buying of green products were selected for investigation. Keeping this fact in view, present investigation on "Association between Socio-demographics and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products" was undertaken in the Lucknow district of Uttar Pradesh (India).

Literature Review:

Consumers' demographics, level of income and purchase power are the major factors that affects buying of green products (Rahman and Haque, 2011). Previous studies have identified the impact of demographics on green purchase. Age and educationqualification of consumer has alsobeen reported to have some positive impact on greenpurchase behaviour (Schwartz & Miller, 1991), besides young consumers seem more interested in green purchases (Anderson & Cunningham, 1977; Roberts & Bacon, 1997). Consumers who have a less environmental awareness often view price as the major barrier for green product consumption (Bonini and Oppenheim, 2008; Ginsberg and Bloom, 2004).Rai(2019) revealed that there is no significant difference between male and female in purchase intention in buying

Moisander (2007) argued that in environmental policy the focus of attention needs to be shifted from the individual consumer decision maker to the whole communities of consumers. More attention needs to be paid to the subcultural differences, historically and locally specific circumstances in which consumers live their everyday lives and make sense of the difficult moral, political, and practical problems that green consumerism involve.

Psychological determinants stand for internal factors influencing purchasing behaviour. These can be divided into motivation, perception, learning, and beliefs and attitudes. However, according to Maslow's Hierarchy of need, motivation of consumer's need strongly influences the behaviour of people as well as purchasing behaviour (Solomon,Bamossy and Askegaard, 1999).When it comes to decision making, the mind takes over everything. "Consumer motivation" is an enclosed state that drives individuals to identify and purchase products or services that fulfil conscious, and unconscious wants or desires. "Perception" is the process by which an individual chooses, organize, and interpret information to make a substantive image of the world. Changes occurring in an individual due to the experiences in his/her life can be termed as "learning". Learning helps an individual in acquiring beliefs and attitudes. A "belief" could be a descriptive thought that someone has regarding one thing. Beliefs framed about a product/ service by a customer helps in building the brand image, which eventually affects the purchase decision. "Attitude", on the other hand is the customer's relative consistent evaluation, feelings, and tendencies towards a product/service.

On the basis of literature review, it was found that there are various studies pertaining to above mentioned variables in developed nations. However,Indian consumers in general and consumers of Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh) particular, are different from their counterparts in developed countries. Therefore, considering this view in mind, the present investigation was conducted with an aim to get an in-depth understanding of the association between socio-demographic and psychogenic determinants about buying of green products and accordingly, following hypothesis were proposed:

H0: Socio-demographic determinants significantly correlated with psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.

To identify that weather Socio-demographic determinants significantly correlated with psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products we have divided this hypothesis in 4 sub hypotheses as follows

H1: There is Correlation between Age and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

H2: There is Correlation between Education and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

H3: There is Correlation between Occupation and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

H4: There is Correlation between Income and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

Research Methodology

The present research aimed to quantify the associationbetween socio-demographics and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products. Extant research is exploratory cum descriptive in nature. The target population included all those individuals who buy green products.Primary data used to test hypothesis and secondary data was used to construct the hypothesis while journals through internet were collected to support research study.The survey method was adopted to collect the primary datausing structured questionnaire and the secondary data was collected from sources such as books, periodicals, journals, research papers, magazines, along with searching web sources.

The population frame proposed for the study was the Lucknow district. The sample size for the study was determined using Cochran's formula at 95% confidence level with 5% margin of error. Cochran's formula: ($n_0 = (Z^2pq) / e^2$) where, "n" is sample size, "Z" is score value1.96 at 95% CI, e is the margin of error, "p" represents the estimated proportion of the population while "q" = 1 – p. Thus, applying the formula, the sample size obtained is as follows: $n_0 = ((1.96)^2 (0.5) (0.5)) / (0.05)^2 = 385$.The sample size determined was 385, but the chosen sample for this study was 400 respondents. Total 450 questionnaires were distributed through Google docs, out of which and 405 valid responses were reverted, giving the response rate of 90.00 per cent.

Non-probability sampling (convenience sampling technique) was appliedin a manner so that the sample truly represented the entire population Lucknow to select consumers who were ready to give information. The collection of primary data for the study was done for a period of 06 months, from October 2020 to March 2021.

Constructs Definition and Scales Developed

For the purpose the current study, constructs have been studied which are socio-demographics (Table-1) and psychogenic determinants (Table-2). The constructs are built up of statements which delineate relationship between both constructs to buy green products. These are rated by consumers on 5-point Likert scales.

Table-1:The sub-constructs for the Socio-demographics

Sub-constructs	Sub-constructs Definition
SD-1	Gender
SD-2	Age
SD-3	Educational background
SD-4	Occupation
SD-5	Family income (Rs. /Monthly)

Table-2:The sub-constructs for the psychogenic determinants

Sub-constructs	Sub-constructs Definition
PD-1	Environmental concern drives me to buy green products
PD-2	Environmental awareness motivates me to buy green products
PD-3	Environmental knowledge guides me to buy green products
PD-4	Emotional benefits of green products stimulate me to buy
PD-5	My pro-environmental attitude pushes me to buy green products
PD-6	My pro-environmental intention pushes me to purchase green products

Data Analysis Techniques

Reliability of the scale was measured with the help of Cronbach's Alpha. A value of 0.7 or higher is considered to be acceptable (Cronbach, 1951; Nunnally, 1978). A Cronbach Alpha value of 0.917 indicates the internal consistency of the items.The data obtained were analyzed using statistical tools Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 16.0) and descriptive statistics was used to characterize and summarize the data obtained. Inferential statistics such as hypothesis testing, regression analysis was opted to draw inference for the larger population. Parametric tests were used for the comparison of mean among the different level of variables.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

The gender of the population comprised of two categories i.e., male & female (Table 3). 57.5 % data comprised of male respondents and 42.5 % data comprised of female respondents, measured on a nominal scale. This indicates that data is dominated by male respondents. As far as age of respondents is concerned (Table 4), the data collected comprised of the age groups *viz.*below 20, 20-30,31-40 and above 40 years, having the contribution of 6.7%, 34.1%, 26.7 % 32.6 % respectively. This shows that majority of respondents belonged to the 20 to 30 age group. The education level of the respondents comprised of S.S.C., H.S.C., graduate, post-graduate, and others (Table 5). 50.4% respondentswere post-graduate followed by others (27.4%). The occupation categories of the respondents (Table 6) included student, service holder, business,and others, reflecting majority of service holderrespondents (47.95) followed by students (26.4%). Table 7 indicates the income level of the respondents that was measured through a four-point scale data with categories*viz.*,below 20000 (6.9%), 20000-35000(13.1%),36000-50000(21%) and above 50000(59.0%).

Table3:Frequency Distribution of Gender of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	233	57.5	57.5	57.5
	Female	172	42.5	42.5	100.0
	Total	405	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Frequency Distribution of age of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 20 Year	27	6.7	6.7	6.7
	20-30 Year	138	34.1	34.1	40.7
	31-40 Year	108	26.7	26.7	67.4
	Above 40 Year	132	32.6	32.6	100.0
	Total	405	100.0	100.0	

Table 5:Frequency Distribution of Education of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S.S.C	8	2.0	2.0	2.0
	H.S.C	11	2.7	2.7	4.7
	Graduate	71	17.5	17.5	22.2
	Post-Graduate	204	50.4	50.4	72.6
	Others	111	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	405	100.0	100.0	

Table 6:Frequency Distribution of Occupation of the respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Student	107	26.4	26.4	26.4
	Service holder	194	47.9	47.9	74.3
	Business	19	4.7	4.7	79.0
	Others	85	21.0	21.0	100.0
	Total	405	100.0	100.0	

Table 7:Frequency Distribution of Family income of the respondents
Family income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 20000	28	6.9	6.9	6.9
	20000-35000	53	13.1	13.1	20.0
	36000-50000	85	21.0	21.0	41.0
	Above 50000	239	59.0	59.0	100.0
	Total	405	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's own calculation

Hypothesis Testing

H1.0: There is Correlation between Age and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.
H1.1: There is no Correlation between Age and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.

Table-8

SD-2		PD-1	PD-2	PD-3	PD-4	PD-5	PD-6
Below 20 Year	Mean	3.63	3.81	4.07	3.74	3.81	3.89
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27
	Std. Deviation	1.043	.921	.917	1.023	.921	.847
20-30 Year	Mean	4.00	4.10	3.96	3.70	3.67	3.67
	N	138	138	138	138	138	138
	Std. Deviation	.904	.822	.875	.866	.881	.881
31-40 Year	Mean	4.06	4.01	3.96	3.69	3.77	3.79
	N	108	108	108	108	108	108
	Std. Deviation	.846	.902	.853	.903	.913	.876
Above 40 Year	Mean	3.94	3.97	4.02	3.61	3.89	3.84
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132
	Std. Deviation	1.097	1.048	.937	.923	.888	.881
Total	Mean	3.97	4.01	3.99	3.67	3.78	3.77
	N	405	405	405	405	405	405
	Std. Deviation	.968	.928	.890	.903	.896	.878

ANOVA Table

			SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
PD-1 * SD-2	Between Groups	(Combined)	4.343	3	1.448	1.551	.201
		Linearity	.291	1	.291	.312	.577
		Deviation from Linearity	4.052	2	2.026	2.170	.115
	Within Groups		374.358	401	.934		
	Total		378.701	404			
PD-2 * SD-2	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.388	3	.796	.924	.429
		Linearity	.137	1	.137	.159	.690
		Deviation from Linearity	2.251	2	1.125	1.306	.272
	Within Groups		345.523	401	.862		
	Total		347.911	404			

PD-3 * SD-2	Between Groups	(Combined)	.506	3	.169	.212	.888	
		Linearity	.031	1	.031	.039	.843	
		Deviation from Linearity	.475	2	.237	.298	.743	
	Within Groups		319.454	401	.797			
	Total		319.960	404				
PD-4 * SD-2	Between Groups	(Combined)	.849	3	.283	.345	.793	
		Linearity	.769	1	.769	.938	.333	
		Deviation from Linearity	.079	2	.040	.048	.953	
	Within Groups		328.815	401	.820			
	Total		329.664	404				
PD-5 * SD-2	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.091	3	1.030	1.288	.278	
		Linearity	1.927	1	1.927	2.407	.122	
		Deviation from Linearity	1.165	2	.582	.728	.484	
	Within Groups		320.909	401	.800			
	Total		324.000	404				
PD-6 * SD-2	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.348	3	.783	1.016	.385	
		Linearity	.726	1	.726	.943	.332	
		Deviation from Linearity	1.621	2	.811	1.053	.350	
	Within Groups		308.754	401	.770			
	Total		311.101	404				

Measures of Association

	R	R Squared	Eta	Eta Squared
PD-1 * SD-2	.028	.001	.107	.011
PD-2 * SD-2	-.020	.000	.083	.007
PD-3 * SD-2	.010	.000	.040	.002
PD-4 * SD-2	-.048	.002	.051	.003
PD-5 * SD-2	.077	.006	.098	.010
PD-6 * SD-2	.048	.002	.087	.008

Source: Author's own calculation

Table 8 shows there is no correlation between age and all the parameter about psychogenic determinants driver as the significance values (p) at 95% confidence level is >0.05 which shows that psychogenic determinants is not dependent upon the age. At any age group this can be derived to buy green product, motivation can come to buy, or intention pushes to buy the green product. So, we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

H2.0: There is Correlation between Education and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.

H2.1: There is no Correlation between Education and psychogenic determinantsof consumers aboutbuying of green products.

SD-3		PD-1	PD-2	PD-3	PD-4	PD-5	PD-6
S.S.C	Mean	3.75	3.88	4.13	3.50	3.38	3.13
	N	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Std. Deviation	1.035	.991	.835	1.309	1.061	.835
H.S.C	Mean	3.73	3.55	3.73	3.55	3.64	3.82
	N	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Std. Deviation	1.104	1.128	.905	.934	.674	.982
Graduate	Mean	3.93	4.11	4.07	3.77	3.85	3.86
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71
	Std. Deviation	.900	.803	.946	.929	.873	.883
Post-Graduate	Mean	3.89	4.00	3.91	3.65	3.71	3.74
	N	204	204	204	204	204	204
	Std. Deviation	.989	.912	.900	.878	.916	.834
Others	Mean	4.20	4.05	4.10	3.67	3.91	3.82
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111
	Std. Deviation	.932	1.004	.831	.908	.869	.936
Total	Mean	3.97	4.01	3.99	3.67	3.78	3.77
	N	405	405	405	405	405	405

Std. Deviation	.968	.928	.890	.903	.896	.878

ANOVA Table

			SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
PD-1 * SD-3	Between Groups	(Combined)	8.325	4	2.081	2.248	.063
		Linearity	5.063	1	5.063	5.468	.020
		Deviation from Linearity	3.262	3	1.087	1.174	.319
	Within Groups		370.376	400	.926		
	Total		378.701	404			
PD-2 * SD-3	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.440	4	.860	.999	.408
		Linearity	.342	1	.342	.397	.529
		Deviation from Linearity	3.099	3	1.033	1.199	.310
	Within Groups		344.471	400	.861		
	Total		347.911	404			
PD-3 * SD-3	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.934	4	.984	1.245	.291
		Linearity	.268	1	.268	.340	.560
		Deviation from Linearity	3.666	3	1.222	1.547	.202
	Within Groups		316.026	400	.790		
	Total		319.960	404			
PD-4 * SD-3	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.288	4	.322	.392	.814
		Linearity	.003	1	.003	.004	.950
		Deviation from Linearity	1.284	3	.428	.522	.668
	Within Groups		328.377	400	.821		
	Total		329.664	404			
PD-5 * SD-3	Between Groups	(Combined)	4.832	4	1.208	1.514	.197
		Linearity	1.725	1	1.725	2.161	.142
		Deviation from Linearity	3.107	3	1.036	1.298	.275
	Within Groups		319.168	400	.798		
	Total		324.000	404			
PD-6 * SD-3	Between Groups	(Combined)	4.372	4	1.093	1.425	.225
		Linearity	.624	1	.624	.814	.367
		Deviation from Linearity	3.747	3	1.249	1.629	.182
	Within Groups		306.730	400	.767		
	Total		311.101	404			

Measures of Association

	R	R Squared	Eta	Eta Squared
PD-1 * SD-3	.116	.013	.148	.022
PD-2 * SD-3	.031	.001	.099	.010
PD-3 * SD-3	.029	.001	.111	.012
PD-4 * SD-3	-.003	.000	.062	.004
PD-5 * SD-3	.073	.005	.122	.015
PD-6 * SD-3	.045	.002	.119	.014

Source: Author's own calculation

The **Table 9** shows there is no correlation between education and all the parameter about psychogenic determinants driver as the significance values (p) at 95% confidence level is >0.05 which shows that psychogenic determinants is not dependent upon the education. At any educational background group, they can be derived to buy green product and motivation can come to buy the green product. So we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

H3.0: There is Correlation between Occupation and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.

H3.1: There is no Correlation between Occupation and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.

Table 10

SD-4	PD-1	PD-2	PD-3	PD-4	PD-5	PD-6

Student	Mean	3.79	3.93	3.95	3.62	3.64	3.64
	N	107	107	107	107	107	107
	Std. Deviation	.949	.908	.905	.987	.936	.954
Service holder	Mean	4.07	4.08	4.07	3.73	3.87	3.82
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194
	Std. Deviation	.936	.854	.792	.882	.829	.823
Business	Mean	4.11	4.05	4.05	3.84	3.84	3.84
	N	19	19	19	19	19	19
	Std. Deviation	.459	.524	.524	.602	.501	.501
Others	Mean	3.94	3.96	3.84	3.55	3.74	3.81
	N	85	85	85	85	85	85
	Std. Deviation	1.116	1.159	1.111	.893	1.037	.957
Total	Mean	3.97	4.01	3.99	3.67	3.78	3.77
	N	405	405	405	405	405	405
	Std. Deviation	.968	.928	.890	.903	.896	.878

ANOVA Table

			SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
PD-1* SD-4	Between Groups	(Combined)	5.740	3	1.913	2.057	.105
		Linearity	.586	1	.586	.630	.428
		Deviation from Linearity	5.154	2	2.577	2.771	.064
	Within Groups		372.962	401	.930		
	Total		378.701	404			
PD-2* SD-4	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.987	3	.662	.768	.513
		Linearity	.007	1	.007	.008	.928
		Deviation from Linearity	1.980	2	.990	1.148	.318
	Within Groups		345.924	401	.863		
	Total		347.911	404			
PD-3* SD-4	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.563	3	1.188	1.505	.213
		Linearity	.999	1	.999	1.266	.261
		Deviation from Linearity	2.564	2	1.282	1.625	.198
	Within Groups		316.398	401	.789		
	Total		319.960	404			
PD-4* SD-4	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.775	3	.925	1.135	.335
		Linearity	.263	1	.263	.322	.570
		Deviation from Linearity	2.512	2	1.256	1.541	.216
	Within Groups		326.890	401	.815		
	Total		329.664	404			
PD-5* SD-4	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.867	3	1.289	1.615	.185
		Linearity	.233	1	.233	.291	.590
		Deviation from Linearity	3.635	2	1.817	2.276	.104
	Within Groups		320.133	401	.798		
	Total		324.000	404			
PD-6* SD-4	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.396	3	.799	1.038	.376
		Linearity	1.041	1	1.041	1.352	.246
		Deviation from Linearity	1.356	2	.678	.880	.415
	Within Groups		308.705	401	.770		
	Total		311.101	404			

Measures of Association

	R	R Squared	Eta	Eta Squared
PD-1* SD-4	.039	.002	.123	.015
PD-2* SD-4	.005	.000	.076	.006
PD-3* SD-4	-.056	.003	.106	.011
PD-4* SD-4	-.028	.001	.092	.008

PD-5* SD-4	.027	.001	.109	.012
PD-6* SD-4	.058	.003	.088	.008

Source: Author's own calculation

The tables 10 shows there is no correlation between Occupation and psychogenic determinants driver as the significance values (p) at 95% confidence level is >0.05 which shows that psychogenic determinants is not dependent upon the Occupational segments. Any can be derived to buy green product and motivated to buy the green product in spite of their Occupational segments. So we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

H4.0: There is Correlation between Income and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

H4.1: There is no Correlation between Income and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products

Table 11

SD-5		PD-1	PD-2	PD-3	PD-4	PD-5	PD-6
Below 20000	Mean	3.82	3.93	4.00	3.54	3.61	3.64
	N	28	28	28	28	28	28
	Std. Deviation	.863	.663	.720	.793	.875	.826
20000-35000	Mean	4.02	4.09	4.00	3.72	3.53	3.55
	N	53	53	53	53	53	53
	Std. Deviation	.820	.904	.920	.948	.973	.952
36000-50000	Mean	4.02	3.95	3.87	3.64	3.68	3.62
	N	85	85	85	85	85	85
	Std. Deviation	.845	.858	.842	.814	.916	.926
Above 50000	Mean	3.96	4.03	4.03	3.69	3.89	3.89
	N	239	239	239	239	239	239
	Std. Deviation	1.051	.985	.919	.938	.860	.833
Total	Mean	3.97	4.01	3.99	3.67	3.78	3.77
	N	405	405	405	405	405	405
	Std. Deviation	.968	.928	.890	.903	.896	.878

ANOVA Table

			SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
PD-1 * SD-5	Between Groups	(Combined)	.999	3	.333	.354	.787
		Linearity	.034	1	.034	.037	.849
		Deviation from Linearity	.965	2	.482	.512	.600
	Within Groups		377.702	401	.942		
	Total		378.701	404			
PD-2 * SD-5	Between Groups	(Combined)	.919	3	.306	.354	.786
		Linearity	.046	1	.046	.053	.818
		Deviation from Linearity	.873	2	.437	.505	.604
	Within Groups		346.992	401	.865		
	Total		347.911	404			
PD-3 * SD-5	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.589	3	.530	.667	.573
		Linearity	.189	1	.189	.239	.625
		Deviation from Linearity	1.400	2	.700	.881	.415
	Within Groups		318.371	401	.794		
	Total		319.960	404			
PD-4 * SD-5	Between Groups	(Combined)	.787	3	.262	.320	.811
		Linearity	.224	1	.224	.273	.601
		Deviation from Linearity	.562	2	.281	.343	.710
	Within Groups		328.878	401	.820		
	Total		329.664	404			
PD-5 * SD-5	Between Groups	(Combined)	7.741	3	2.580	3.272	.021
		Linearity	6.598	1	6.598	8.365	.004
		Deviation from Linearity	1.143	2	.571	.725	.485

	Within Groups		316.259	401	.789		
	Total		324.000	404			
PD-6 * SD-5	Between Groups	(Combined)	8.416	3	2.805	3.717	.012
		Linearity	6.236	1	6.236	8.262	.004
		Deviation from Linearity	2.180	2	1.090	1.444	.237
	Within Groups		302.685	401	.755		
	Total		311.101	404			

Measures of Association

	R	R Squared	Eta	Eta Squared
PD-1 * SD-5	.010	.000	.051	.003
PD-2 * SD-5	.011	.000	.051	.003
PD-3 * SD-5	.024	.001	.070	.005
PD-4 * SD-5	.026	.001	.049	.002
PD-5 * SD-5	.143	.020	.155	.024
PD-6 * SD-5	.142	.020	.164	.027

Source: Author's own calculation

The tables 11, shows there is some correlation between income and psychogenic determinants driver as the significance values (p) at 95% confidence level is <0.05 which shows that psychogenic determinants is dependent upon the income segments up to some extent but not fully. Which can be concluded that anyone can be derived to buy green product and motivated to buy the green product in spite of their income segments. So we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Conclusions

Thus we can conclude that Socio-demographic determinants significantly do not correlated with psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products as 3 out of 4 sub hypothesis shows that there is no correction between Socio-demographic determinants and psychogenic determinants of consumers about buying of green products.

Limitations of the Study

The study has got limited due to "error of recall" on part of the respondents. They might have exaggerated their opinion while responding to the questionnaire. As research work was self-financed, resources were not used to track the respondents in the data collection process. The study is restricted only to specific Area of Uttar Pradesh; hence it does not focus on other areas. So research study leaves a proper scope for the further researches which can be conducted in other areas as well.

Scope of the Further Research

The research paper has a great scope for marketers and consumers as its ushers in era of green

market in U.P. Nevertheless, the study is limited to a small geographical area and has limited

generalization and therefore ought to be conducted on a bigger scale. However, it provides good insight into the association between socio-demographics and psychogenic determinantsof consumers towards buying of green products. This research study has been conducted in smaller geographical area i.e. only Lucknow. If this kind of study is conducted on a larger-on-larger geographical area, the results might be more reluctant. Nevertheless, the study aims at raising issue to evolve the sustainability issue to the consumers which has been achieved.

References:

Anderson, T. Jr. & Cunningham, W.H. (1972), 'The socially conscious consumer',
Journal of Marketing, 36, (7), pp. 23 – 31.
Bonini, S. and Oppenheim, J. (2008), "Cultivating the green consumer", Stanford
Social Innovation Review, Vol. 6 No. 4,pp. 56-61.
Bui, My H. (2005). Environmental marketing: a model of consumer behavior. Loyola
University New Orleans. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association of Collegiate Marketing Educators, page 20, http://www.experimentresources.com/probabilitysampling.html#ixzz1SLdVkgtg.
Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests.
Psychometrika, 16, 297–334.
Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.).New York: John Wiley &
Sons.
Ginsberg, J.M. and Bloom, P.N. (2004), "Choosing the right green marketing
strategy", MITSloan Management Review, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 79-84.
Karim N.(2008). Impact of marketing mix on consumer purchasing behavior. Master's
Thesis,University of Tarbiat Modarres;
Laroche, M., Bergeron, J. and Barbaro-Forleo, G. (2001), "Targeting consumers who
are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products", Journal of Consumer Marketing, Vol. 18 No. 6, pp. 503-520.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory: New York : McGraw-Hill, c1978. 2d ed.

Michael R. Solomon, Gary Bamossy, Gary J. Bamossy, Soren Askegaard.'(1999).
Consumer Behaviour: A European Perspective, Prentice Hall Europe.

Moisander, J. (2007) Motivational complexity of green consumerism.International
Journal of Consumer Studies 31, 404–409.

Rahman, K.M. and Haque, M. (2011), "Exploring price sensitivity of a green brand: a
consumers' perspective", World Review of Business Research, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 84-97.

Rai, Bharat. (2019).The Effect of Demographic Factors on ConsumerPurchase
Intention in Buying Television Set inKathmandu Valley: An Empirical Study, PRAVAHA, Vol. 25 No.1

Roberts, J.A. (1996), "Green consumers in the 1990s: profileand implications for
advertising", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 217-232.

Roberts, J.A. & Bacon, D.R. (1997). Exploring the subtle relationships between
environmental concern and ecologically concious consumer behavior. Journal of Business Research, 40, 79-89.

Schwartz, J. &Miller,T. (1991). 'The Earth's best friends'. American
Demographics, 13(2), pp.26-35. Seguin, C., Pelletier, L. &Hunsley, J. (1998)
Toward a model of environmental activism. Environment and Behavior, 30,
628–652.

Shamdasani, P., Chon-Lin, G. and Richmond, D. (1993). Exploring green consumers
in anoriental culture: Role of personal and marketing mix. Advances in consumer research, 20, 488-493.