

Amplitude of Green Marketing: Leveraged by Consumer Imagery

Dr. Tabith Durai,

Assiatant Professor & Research Supervisor,
Department of Commerce,
Madras Christian College, Tambaram, India.

B. Edith Hepburn Sylvia,

Ph.D Fulltime Research Scholar,
Department of Commerce,
Madras Christain College, Tambaram, India.

ABSTRACT

The novel psalm of the contemporary system in catching and holding the full absorption for the great amount of accumulated fortune has become green possessing energy. This specific length of time is characterized by the occurrences of certain events throughout accurately interval of time in modern marketing industries. Consumer imagery shows upon the rousing manner of an individual excellence of what an individual view, neither physically nor psychologically must be ecofriendly. When consumers are more emotionally attached towards any particular product commit to be loyal. These green loyal consumers became green loyal customers spreading the word of mouth, establishing beyond the doubt leveraging the business. Green Loyalty of an individual makes an appearance by blending a successful sequence of the entire preferred environmentally safe commodity by observing the way of manufacturing by giving up the some specific non-structural collaborating function of society. This philosophy of feelings keeps the green concerned industries in condition offensively condescending the supreme attitude of the consumer marketing community in the future. The study highlights consumer imagery is emotional consciousness of a consumer wish to be purchase products promoting healthy way of living life amplitude green marketing. The author gathered together the primary data from a considerable degree of structured questionnaire. The author used test to decide the essential elements of Amplitude of Green Marketing: Leveraged by Consumer Imagery. The essential elements that serve as a foundation for the study is Assurance, Beneficial need Custom, Gratitude, Impropriety, Peculiarity, Sanctimonious, Smugness, Superior virtue and Tattle.

Keywords: Amplitude, Smugness, Tattle, Impropriety, Sanctimonious.

INTRODUCTION:

Consumer imagery serves to identify a set of characteristic of consumer responsibility determining the conditions of widely used perception product of careful mental activity. This characteristic shows up on a balanced attention to arouse the interest of thorough acquaintance of a brand making an attempt by offering an understandable reason for the cause predicting the noticeable style of focal capability of acting between consumer- brand relationships precisely. Consumer imagery act as a compensation carrying a prime civilization acquiring information about the environmental issues, making consumers feel dissatisfied bring down the spirit of loyalty. In the book Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on the consumer by Richard L. Oliver (2014)¹ says Consumer satisfaction is a key role in judging the pleasurable level of consumer's preference in buying a particular product or service referring the maximum or minimum level of consumption fulfilments. Marketers were able to recognize the only pleasurable satisfaction of consumption fulfilment is achieving the purpose of green concerns which sets the modern consumers heart's on. This new promotion on green marketing made a great impact in the entire marketer's economy. Pratima Bansal and Mark R. Desjardine (2014)² in the book Business Sustainability Says most of the consumers with corporate social responsibility fall to repair the green yielding economy. These individuals simply points out to the span of period for the change to nourish the economy. Few other

Marketers try to force the provisional changes to protect the place in high competition. Mark J. Reid (September 1993)³ in his book *The Distance to the centre of the galaxy* says The firm dependability of green consumers is the steady going acquisition, holding a strong position act to be a yielding resource of the firm spreading a positive word of mouth others. In late 1980s within early 1990s Green marketing came into prominence as a part of the new marketing approach which do not just refocus, adjust or enhance existing marketing thinking and practices, but seek to challenge those approaches and provide a substantially different perceptive. From fashion to lifestyle demand for green oriented product has been a boom for the marketers. Every individual is thought when carbon dioxide is released into the atmosphere earth is heated affecting the entire global climate, but how to stop is still a big question. This change will affect the global climate, including the access to water, health, food and the well being of the environment. For instance, plastics are harmful for the environment, but is it banned completely. Only the legal implications a of marketing claims should call for caution or over stated claims can lead to regulatory or civil challenges providing some guidance on environmental marketing claims.

LITERATURE OF REVIEW:

Muhammad Mohsin Butt, Saadia Mushtaq, Alia Afzal, Kok Wei Khong, Fon Sim Ong, Pui Fong (2017)⁴, declares that green consumers gain knowledge of each and every green products with the image associated creating a trust for green brands influencing self concerning attitude for future consumers

Jialing Lin, Antonio lobo, Civilai Leckie (2017)⁵, claims The utilitarian green benefit is by practicing green consumption, which becomes green transparency intermediating the rules for green consumer perception building up the value of ecofriendly products by building green loyalty of green consumers

Jacquelyn Ottman (2017)⁶, affirms that Marketing industries concerned about environment portrayers supervising sensibility in buying green products which act as an important stream among green marketers canning green marketing strategies introducing green sustainability.

Ipkin Anthony Wong, Yim King Penny Wan and Shanshan Qi (2015)⁷, declares The modern consumers explore the green policies in practice by growing the interest with issues happening in the environment strongly involved with green services brings out the perceived green values promoting green initiatives.

Aaron M. Garvey, Frank Germann, Lisa E. Bolton (2015)⁸, affirms that The contribution of a green brand demonstrating the robotic intellectualizing of output anticipating the anxiety prevailing in consumption of a green brand making self efficacy over ecofriendly products.

OBJECTIVE:

In this paper, we propose identified essential element of Amplitude of Green Marketing leveraged by Consumer Imagery.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The study aims attention at primary data collected from individuals who are purchase goods with no intension. Totally 100 questionnaires were circulated for the survey. Questionnaire framed on single as well as multiple choices. The collected data are analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science version 23.0. The statistical technique used for analysis is Correlation Test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:

H₀: There is no relationship between Green marketing and Consumer Imagery.

H_a: There is relationship between green Marketing and Consumer Imagery.

Table 1: Result of Correlation Test

Factors	AE	BN	CM	GY	IY	PY	ST	SG	SV	TE
Assurance	1	.963	.775	.745	.691	.695	.698	.771	.879	.790
Beneficial Need		1	.851	.825	.751	.615	.750	.730	.884	.745
Custom			1	.812	.841	.734	.785	.791	.961	.722
Gratuity				1	.838	.823	.865	.654	.726	.639
Impropriety					1	.801	.841	.720	.729	.706
Peculiarity						1	.864	.859	.628	.546
Sanctimonious							1	.838	.646	.513

Factors	AE	BN	CM	GY	IY	PY	ST	SG	SV	TE
Smugness								1	.709	.439
Superior Virtue									1	.621
Tattle										1

Source: Computed Data.

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Beneficial Needs (BN) is 0.963 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Beneficial Needs (BN) is 0.927. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Beneficial Needs (BN) is 92.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Custom (CM) is 0.775 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Custom (CM) is 0.600. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Custom (CM) is 60% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Custom (CM) is 0.851 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial (BN) and Custom (CM) is 0.724. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Custom (CM) is 72.4% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Gratuity (GY) is 0.754 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Gratuity (GY) is 0.568. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Gratuity (GY) is 56.8% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Gratuity (GY) is 0.825 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Gratuity (GY) is 0.680. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Gratuity (GY) is 68% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Gratuity (GY) is 0.812 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Gratuity (GY) is 0.659. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Gratuity (GY) is 65.9% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Improprity (IY) is 0.691 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Improprity (IY) is 0.600. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Gratuity (GY) is 60% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Improprity (IY) is 0.751 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Improprity (IY) is 0.564. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Improprity (IY) is 56.4% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Improprity (IY) is 0.841 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Improprity (IY) is 0.707. The relationship between Custom (CM) and Improprity (IY) is 70.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Gratuity (GY) and Improprity (IY) is .838 which indicates positive relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Improprity (IY) is .702. The relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Improprity (IY) is 70.2% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.695 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.483. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Peculiarity (PY) is 48.3% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.615 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.378. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Peculiarity (PY) is 37.8% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.734 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.538. The relationship between Custom (CM) and Peculiarity (PY) is 53.8% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Gratuity (GY) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.823 which indicates positive relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Peculiarity (PY) is .677. The relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Peculiarity (PY) is 67.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Improprity (IY) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.801 which indicates positive relationship between Improprity (IY) and Peculiarity (PY) is 0.641. The relationship between Improprity (IY) and Peculiarity (PY) is 64.1% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.698 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.487. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 48.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.750 which indicates

positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.562. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 56.2% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.785 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.616. The relationship between Custom (CM) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 61.6% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Gratuity (GY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.865 which indicates positive relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is .748. The relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 74.8% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Impropriety (IY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.841 which indicates positive relationship between Impropriety (IY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.707. The relationship between Impropriety (IY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 70.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Peculiarity (PY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.864 which indicates positive relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 0.746. The relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Sanctimonious (ST) is 74.6% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Smugness (SG) is 0.771 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Smugness (SG) is 0.594. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Smugness (SG) is 59.4% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Smugness (SG) is 0.730 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Smugness (SG) is 0.532. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Smugness (SG) is 53.2% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Smugness (SG) is 0.791 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Smugness (SG) is 0.625. The relationship between Custom (CM) and Smugness (SG) is 62.5% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Gratuity (GY) and Smugness (SG) is 0.654 which indicates positive relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Smugness (SG) is .427. The relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Smugness (SG) is 42.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Impropriety (IY) and Smugness (SG) is 0.720 which indicates positive relationship between Impropriety (IY) and Smugness (SG) is 0.518. The relationship between Impropriety (IY) and Smugness (SG) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 51.8% level of significance.

The correlation between Peculiarity (PY) and Smugness (SG) is 0.859 which indicates positive relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Smugness (SG) is 0.737. The relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Smugness (SG) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 73.7% level of significance.

The correlation between Sanctimonious (ST) and Smugness (SG) is 0.838 which indicates positive relationship between Sanctimonious (ST) and Smugness (SG) is 0.702. The relationship between Sanctimonious (ST) and Smugness (SG) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 70.2% level of significance

The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.879 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.772. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 77.2% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.884 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.781. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 78.1% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.961 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.923. The relationship between Custom (CM) and Smugness (SG) is 92.3% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Gratuity (GY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.726 which indicates positive relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is .527. The relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 52.7% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.

The correlation between Impropriety (IY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.729 which indicates positive relationship between Impropriety (IY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.531. The relationship between Impropriety (IY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 53.1% level of significance.

The correlation between Peculiarity (PY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.628 which indicates positive relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.394. The relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Superior Virtue (SV) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 39.4% level of significance.

The correlation between Sanctimonious (ST) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.646 which indicates positive relationship between Sanctimonious (ST) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.417. The relationship between

Sanctimonious (ST) and Superior Virtue (SV) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 41.7% level of significance
The correlation between Smugness (SG) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.709 which indicates positive relationship between Smugness (SG) and Superior Virtue (SV) is 0.502. The relationship between Smugness (SG) and Superior Virtue (SV) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 50.2% level of significance
The correlation coefficient between Assurance (AE) and Tattle (TE) is 0.790 which indicates positive relationship between Assurance (AE) and Tattle (TE) is 0.624. The relationship between Assurance (AE) and Tattle (TE) is 62.4% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.
The correlation coefficient between Beneficial Need (BN) and Tattle (TE) is 0.745 which indicates positive relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Tattle (TE) is 0.555. The relationship between Beneficial Need (BN) and Tattle (TE) is 55.5% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.
The correlation coefficient between Custom (CM) and Tattle (TE) is 0.722 which indicates positive relationship between Custom (CM) and Tattle (TE) is 0.521. The relationship between Custom (CM) and Tattle (TE) is 52.1% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.
The correlation between Gratuity (GY) and Tattle (TE) is 0.639 which indicates positive relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Tattle (TE) is .408. The relationship between Gratuity (GY) and Tattle (TE) is 40.8% and null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance.
The correlation between Impropropriety (IY) and Tattle (TE) is 0.706 which indicates positive relationship between Impropropriety (IY) and Tattle (TE) is 0.498. The relationship between Impropropriety (IY) and Tattle (TE) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 49.8% level of significance.
The correlation between Peculiarity (PY) and Tattle (TE) is 0.546 which indicates positive relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Tattle (TE) is 0.298. The relationship between Peculiarity (PY) and Tattle (TE) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 29.8% level of significance.
The correlation between Sanctimonious (ST) and Tattle (TE) is 0.513 which indicates positive relationship between Sanctimonious (ST) and Tattle (TE) is 0.263. The relationship between Sanctimonious (ST) and Tattle (TE) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 26.3% level of significance
The correlation between Smugness (SG) and Tattle (TE) is 0.439 which indicates positive relationship between Smugness (SG) and Tattle (TE) is 0.192. The relationship between Smugness (SG) and Tattle (TE) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 19.2% level of significance
The correlation between Superior Virtue (SV) and Tattle (TE) is 0.621 which indicates positive relationship between Superior Virtue (SV) and Tattle (TE) is 0.385. The relationship between Superior Virtue (SV) and Tattle (TE) is and null hypothesis is rejected at 38.5% level of significance

CONCLUSION:

There is a gaining upward state of anxiety in the totality of circumstance affecting the development around the universe. Life conditioning ecosystem minds as a purpose inflating the environment which could be desired of an individual enclosed with the well developed environment with good air, water, and atmosphere. On the other hand, green products are the products that produce confined range of traces of harmful chemicals. It may demand insistently not too many things having economic value to create by putting together using up all the minor chemicals emit non hazardous emission. This able to reason logically for green my action are put two and two together of emphatitically establishing beyond the doubt the condition of actualization on the environment at the mercy of mind and wave by purchasing green products. Consumers are both buyers as well as the sellers boosting the economy of the country. Many firms actually putting the money, effort in order to attract more customers because the customers create business opportunities generating profits. As the world now a days facing so many problems regarding to an environmental issues, the consumers and their attitude or behaviour to purchase a green product are the important factors to be considered. The consumer has got more choice due to the effect of globalization. To conclude, for healthier future the consumer emotionalbenefits switch's actual consumption to ecofriendly purchasing intention

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

I would like to express my special thanks of gratitude to my guide Dr.Tabitha Durai who helped me in bringing out this wonderful article on the topic Amplitude of Green Marketing: Leveraged by Consumer Imagery, which also helped me in doing lot of research about exploring new ideas. Secondly, I would thank the International Journal of Management Studies helping me to publish my article. Thank you.

REFERENCES:

- Bansal, P., & DesJardine, M. R. (2014). Business sustainability: It is about time, *Strategic Organization*, 12(1), 70-78.
- Butt, M. M., Mushtaq, S., Afzal, A., Khong, K. W., Ong, F. S., & Ng, P. F. (2017). Integrating behavioural and branding perspectives to maximize green brand equity: a holistic approach, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(4), 507-520.
- Garvey, A. M., Germann, F., & Bolton, L. E. (2015). Performance brand placebos: How brands improve performance and consumers take the credit, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(6), 931-951.
- Green marketing and the Australian Consumer Law <https://www.accc.gov.au/system/files/Green%20marketing%20and%20the%20ACL.pdf>
- Lin, J., Lobo, A., & Leckie, C. (2017). The role of benefits and transparency in shaping consumers' green perceived value, self-brand connection and brand loyalty, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 35, 133-141.
- Oliver, R. L. (2014). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, Routledge.
- Ottman, J. (2017). *The new rules of green marketing: Strategies, tools, and inspiration for sustainable branding*, Routledge.
- Reid, M. J. (1993). The distance to the center of the Galaxy, *Annual review of astronomy and astrophysics*, 31(1), 345-372.
- The Influence of green marketing on consumer purchase behaviour [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ee.07\(2\).2016.8](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ee.07(2).2016.8).
- Wong, I. A., Wan, Y. K. P., & Qi, S. (2015). Green events, value perceptions, and the role of consumer involvement in festival design and performance, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(2), 294-315.
