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Abstract

The popularity of the environmental movement during the last few decades has led to a growth in “green marketing” practices in many countries, including the Philippines. Nevertheless, there is still a lack of substantive research into the profile of the Filipino consumer as a marketing target audience for products with eco-friendly claims.

This study is a pioneering effort to understand the impact of green marketing on Filipino consumers and provide a better understanding of their profile as “Green” consumers. An exploratory study was undertaken using a series of focus group discussions in the National Capital Region as well as in Cebu, and the results provide intriguing insights on the perception and behavior of Filipino green consumers.
Significance of the Study

The progress of the environmental movement during the last few decades has prompted corporations to engage in “green marketing”, which utilizes environmentally friendly production and marketing processes. Some of the early efforts aimed at understanding the green consumer involved the profiling of consumers in terms of their demographic characteristics, their knowledge of, beliefs on, attitudes toward, and behavior regarding environmentally friendly consumer practices.

The study of the green consumer is not limited only to those consumers who exhibit a favorable attitude toward environmentally friendly marketing, but includes different consumer segments with varying characteristics.

These pioneering activities resulted in different customer segment profiles depending upon the country where the study was conducted, but there have been no published studies so far that profiled the Filipino green consumer. In view of the inherent flaws in indiscriminately adopting a foreign customer profile for the Philippine consumer market, there is a need to gain a better understanding of the Filipino green consumers.
The pioneering nature of this research necessitates the use of a qualitative study utilizing focus group discussions on issues already explored in earlier studies about green consumers in other countries. Some of the research issues to be explored relate to the attitudes of Filipino consumers toward the environment, their perceptions on the current environmentally friendly marketing practices, and their behavior in the face of “green” marketing claims.

The resulting findings from the discussions can provide insights into the profile of Filipino consumers vis-à-vis green marketing and serve as input into future quantitative studies that seek to create a more precise profile of the market.
As McDonagh and Clark (1995) have pointed out, the growth of concerns over the environment has led to demand by consumers for products that have claimed to be environmentally friendly (or “eco friendly”). Hence, it is of great value to marketing practitioners to gain a deeper understanding of the profile of green consumers.

A review of earlier studies shows that attempts to create a profile of these consumers have led to results that varied according to the population being studied and the variables used to classify them.

For instance, a segmentation study by do Paço and Raposo (2008) using a survey of Portuguese consumers had established a profile of customers belonging to three segments based on their demographics, knowledge of, attitudes toward, and behavior regarding environmental consumer practices. The various segments resulting from their study were categorized as (1) The Uncommitted (36% of the market and described as ages 18-34, with high educational attainment, either students or administrative workers, with negative positions on the environmental movement); (2) The Green Activists (35% of the market and described as 25-34 and 45-54, with highest educational levels, working in more prestigious and better-paying positions, with favorable positions on the environmental movement but skeptical of corporate green marketing campaigns); and (3) The Undefined (29% of the market and described as older, with lower educational levels, occupying jobs ranging from unskilled labor to senior management, with very
strong positions regarding environmental issues and very skeptical about corporate green marketing claims).

Another attempt to profile green consumers was done by Trivedi, Patel, and Savalia (2011) using a survey on Indian consumers. Their study resulted in three types of green consumers: (1) The Energy Economist (described as those who factor in economic considerations for their pro-environment behavior); 2) The Energy Conservist (described as those who take care of energy conservation); and (3) The Environmental Activist (described as those willing to take proactive actions to protect the environment).

The study by Suplico (2009) on Filipino college students merely used the Roper Organization’s five consumer segments based on a study on US consumers. The five segments used were: (1) True-blue Greens (20% of the market and described as the most actively pro-environmental willing to pay a 7% premium for eco-friendly products, are the oldest and wealthiest segment and who devote time and resources for environmental concerns); (2) Greenback Greens (20% of the market and described as those willing to spend time rather than money on environmental practices, the youngest and educated segment with a very busy lifestyle); (3) Sprouts (31% of the market and described as those who desire eco-friendly laws, slow to embrace green consumer practices and willing to pay only a premium of only 4% for eco-friendly products); (4) Grousers (9% of the market and described as those with below-average education and income who believe that business should deal with environmental problems and perceive green products to be more expensive); and (5) Basic Browns (33% of the market and described as the least involved in environmental practices, the poorest and least educated segment who are also predominantly male, Southern,
blue-collar and who believe that individuals cannot do anything about the environment).

An examination of the various segmentation studies mentioned above suggests that green consumer profiling appears to be country-specific due to inherent differences in lifestyles, beliefs, cultures, and practices. Hence, there are serious questions about the validity of simply applying a green customer profile from another country to the Philippine consumer market.
Methodology

1. FGD Discussion Procedure

   In view of the lack of studies on the Filipino green consumer, this research utilized a qualitative approach to a series of focus group discussions (or FGDs). The procedures employed in the conduct of the FGD sessions incorporated some of the suggestions of Calder (1977), Greenbaum (1988), and Edmunds (1999).

2. Group Design

   Since the planned survey intended to create a representative sample of the nationwide consumers, its design took into account those variables that would influence the characteristics of green consumers. Taking into consideration the issues raised by Vicsek (2012) regarding the effect of the profiles of the members of each group, the group design was further based on variables relevant in affecting the discussion results.

   To account for the cultural and attitudinal differences across the country, the sessions were held in two locations; namely, the National Capital Region and Metro Cebu.

   Although there are currently no published studies on Filipino consumers aside from that by Suplico (2009)---which used western green consumer classifications on a sample of Filipino undergraduate students---studies conducted on foreign consumers showed that there were a number of important socio-demographic variables that affect the knowledge, beliefs,
and behavior of green consumers. Thus, those variables taken into consideration in designing the group composition were:

a. **Age**

   Studies by Memery, Megicks, and Williams (2005) as well as by D’Souza, Taghian, Lamb, and Peretaitko (2007) find younger people to be more sensitive to environmental issues.

b. **Gender**

   Studies have shown mixed findings on the effect of gender on environmental attitudes. For instance, Ottman and Reilly (1998), Memery et al. (2005), and do Paco, Raposo, and Filho (2009) suggest that women exhibit greater sensitivity toward and better perception of environmental issues. However, studies by Mostafa (2007), D’Souza et al. (2007) show that men possess deeper knowledge about the environment.

c. **Socio-economic Class**


   Studies by Ottman and Reilly (1998); Memery et al. (2005); D’Souza et al. (2007); and do Paço et al. (2009) show that consumers with higher educational attainment exhibit better perception of and greater sensitivity to environmental issues.
d. Other Variables

There are other variables that tend to distinguish green consumers from each other such as psychographics (see, for example, do Paço, et al. (2009), disposition toward environmental consumer practices, psychological needs, and motives (Ottman & Reilly, 1998). However, for practical reasons, these variables could not be used when grouping the participants in the FGD sessions.

e. Resulting FGD Grouping

For the present study, the variables considered for the grouping were age and purchasing power. Because existing studies show mixed results on the effect of gender, this variable was not taken into consideration. Consequently, the group design used three classifications for age (16-30, 31-45, 46 and above) and two classifications for purchasing power (low to middle-class, and upper-middle to upper-class).

Given that this study involved two locations, three age groups, and two purchasing power classifications, a total of twelve sessions were conducted among a total of 112 participants.

Results of this exploratory study may subsequently be used as input in the design of a nationwide survey intended to create a profile of the Filipino green consumer.

3. Discussion Guide

The FGD discussion guide (Appendix A) was based on questions used in a number of studies on the green consumers

4. Limitations of the Study
Just like most qualitative studies, the major limitation is the use of non-probability sampling techniques in the selection of respondents. Hence, it could not be determined whether or not the findings can be generalized to that of the Philippine population. As Kinnear and Taylor (1996) have pointed out about FGD participant selection, “the approach is not intended to provide statistically or scientifically accurate data.”
1. Responses to the Questions

a. General Thoughts About the Environment

Regardless of their demographic background, all respondents expressed concerns about the environment, not only for themselves but also for their children and the future generations.

All expressed the beliefs that the environment had gotten worse, the ozone layer has been disappearing, the weather has turned hotter and less predictable, and floods are becoming more frequent and severe. They also noted that the earth’s resources were limited and that people should not over-exploit these resources.

The two most common concerns raised were flooding and air pollution, both of which were attributed to three sectors: (a) business for adding to the pollution; (b) government for not exercising political will; and (c) the people for not having enough discipline.

For these problems, some blamed modernization. One respondent believed that life was a trade-off between modernization and living in harmony with nature (“Modernization versus Civilization”). Some also blamed technology for causing today’s generation to be too detached from other people and nature. However, a few
believed that technology can be used to help nature (for instance, by using paperless office procedures).

From the remarks, it seems that the concerns expressed about the environment actually reflected a selfish perspective, as these concerns were not really for the environment but for themselves. For instance, organic food was preferred because it was considered healthy for humans, and trees were not supposed to be cut down simply because they can prevent flooding and reduce air pollution, and not because the participants cared for the trees. In addition, the impact of pollution was never assessed in terms of their effects on plants and wildlife. To the respondents, saving the earth was only important because it was a way to save themselves and, in a sense, the views expressed about the environment were actually exploitative. The comments were quite revealing: “Trees need to grow so that we can have fresh air. They are important in preventing flooding”; and “The death of fish will result in hunger of Filipinos. Fish is the most affordable viand.”

This perspective of man’s domineering role over nature is also evident in the responses to the remaining questions.
b. What the Term “Eco-friendly” Means to Them

Participants believed the term meant that business should do its share in protecting the environment, especially since saving the environment can be a profitable venture for businesses of different sizes. The term also evoked a promise that “the technology being used (was) friendly to nature.”

When probed, it became clear that their concern was limited only to the welfare of humans. Comments ranged from “Our own lives will suffer”, “We need to love whatever God gave us because in return this will help us”, to “We will be the ones benefitting by taking care of nature.”, ” and “Eco-friendly means we need to protect the environment to sustain human life.”

The environment was seen as playing a vital role in determining human health:

- “We need to take care of our environment so that we will live longer. We already have too many types of diseases”;
- “It means that we need to use something good for our health”;
- “Air pollution contributes to aging”;
- “Garbage pollutes the river, and the chemicals destroy the corrals and the marine life. This is bad for the health of humans.”

It must be noted that the participants generally exhibited a stewardship role, with one of them noting that, “Eco-
friendly means we need to take care of our environment because there will be more children who will be born. For the future generations.”

c. **Awareness of Eco-friendly Products**

An analysis of the products mentioned and the reasons given for citing them showed that these were selected due to their contribution to human welfare. Organic foods and medicine were mentioned nine times because they do “not create side effects”; do “not harm humans”; and are “free from cholesterol.” Paper Bags were mentioned six times because “they do not cause flooding unlike plastic bags.” Hybrid cars and electric vehicles were mentioned four times because “they do not cause air pollution.” Eco-friendly appliances were also mentioned four times because they “do not destroy the ozone layer” or “emit radiation, which is bad for the health.” Also, eco-friendly bulbs “use less electricity.”

d. **Awareness of Eco-friendly Brands**

The most frequently mentioned brands perceived to be eco-friendly were actually those that provided health benefits. Boysen was mentioned three times due to the water-based paint that was “not painful to the throat.” Baygon was also mentioned three times because of its insecticide which was “not harmful to humans.” Samsung TV was mentioned twice because it emitted “less radiation.” Starbucks was chosen twice because as one participant noted, “Most of their products come from fruit extracts. They do not even serve soft drinks because it is bad for the health.” Nissan
was mentioned twice because of its recently introduced electric car.

e. Awareness of Stores Promoting Eco-friendly Practices

While several stores were mentioned during the discussions, when further probed, the participants were unsure if these store’s practices were due to compliance with local ordinances or due to the financial benefits gained to their businesses (e.g., use of waterless urinals).

Stores commended due to their products with health benefits included Healthy Options, Rustan’s, Watsons, and Starbucks. Bakeries that do on-site baking instead of merely offering packaged bread were mentioned because their products were “freshly-made.” 7-Eleven was also mentioned since “the process of buying assures you that the food is clean.”

The remaining stores mentioned were due to their minimal use of packaging. Examples cited were fruit and vegetable vendors and neighborhood bakeries that have always used paper bags.

f. Willingness to Buy Products that Underwent Animal Testing

When asked if they were willing to buy products tested on animals, 94 percent of the respondents indicated their willingness. The reasons given once again revealed the perspective that humans are a definite priority over other creatures. Reasons included
• “It is safer for humans”;
• “It’s proven safe”;
• “There is nothing wrong in trying it out on animals”;
• “Humans are higher forms of animals”; and
• “Anyway, everything is given to us by God and we just need to be responsible guardians.”

Only two people out of 112 expressed their unwillingness to buy the products due to their concern for animals. One referred to animal testing as “cruelty to animals.” Another noted that he was “not willing because animals are also living things.”

g. Perception on the Cost of Eco-Friendly versus Non-Eco-Friendly Products

When asked about whether or not they perceived eco-friendly products as more expensive, replies were mixed. Less than half (47%) believed that eco-friendly products were more expensive, citing reasons such as shorter life spans (e.g., paper bags). Specifically, the more expensive “natural products” were “better,” and provide “more safety” and “do not use preservatives.” Others reasons were

• eco-friendly products were “still new in the market and equipment used to manufacture these products are still more expensive”;
• “new equipment (was) necessary to make the eco-friendly products”; and
• the manufacturers needed “to recover their R&D costs for these products.”
One participant observed that “products made of recycled materials should be cheaper” and “the fact that it is not cheaper makes it too expensive.”

On the other hand, there were those who believed that eco-friendly products were actually cheaper or at least not “more expensive.” A few cited lower overall ownership costs (“Cheaper because they can be recycled”; “They are re-usable”; “Paperless office systems have lower operating cost.”) A few said that these products were at least not “more expensive” because of a marketing necessity (“They are cheaper in order to attract more customers.”), while others provided manufacturing-based explanations (“They are made using manual process, which costs less”; “They also use cheaper raw materials that are natural, recycled, and recyclable.”)

b. Perceptions on the Relative Quality of Eco-Friendly Products
Close to two-thirds (63%) perceived eco-friendly products as of better quality. Majority of the reasons centered around their health benefits such as: “Organic food is friendly”; “Organic food products are better. Natural ingredients are better for humans”; ”No chemicals, no preservatives”; “Water-based insecticide is not painful to the throat and chest”; and “Electric vehicles do not pollute.” Others noted a better sense of quality from these products because they offer lower overall costs such as in the case of eco-friendly light bulbs, which were “longer-lasting“ and had “lower energy consumption, which prevents energy shortage”.

---

*Detailed Analysis*
One participant also noted a technological advantage, saying, “Paperless systems (were) more efficient than paper-based.” Another even speculated that the reason was because “the manufacturers based their products on existing non-eco-friendly products and improved on them.”

Others had an opposing opinion, claiming that it is the non-eco-friendly products that actually had better quality as evidenced by their greater durability, noting that “they can be used many times”. In contrast, “paper bags are destroyed easily, especially when it becomes wet”; and “Products using bio-degradable plastics will not last as long.” Hence, one participant expressed a preference to “buy the non-biodegradable consumer durable product because it will be cheaper over the long-run.”

Noteworthy was a remark from a respondent because it reflected his attitude on the quality of recycled products: “If it is recycled, I do not feel that it is clean (either the product or its packaging). It is not pure anymore.”

i. **Awareness of the Universal Recycling Symbol**

All of the participants shown three variations of the Universal Recycling Symbol (Appendix B), and 73 percent indicated that they recognized. However, the meaning of the symbol was less clear to them, with some believing that it referred to the product while others believed that it referred to the packaging. A few even said that it was an instruction to the consumer to “Reduce, re-use, recycle.”
j. Habit of Checking for Eco-friendly Logo Before Purchase
   Even though almost three-fourths of the respondents recognized a product, only eight percent checked if it was eco-friendly before purchasing. To them, the most important considerations were price, expiration date, durability, and the brand that they were used to buying.

k. Use of Recycled Shopping Bag Instead of Disposable Plastic Bag
   Sixty percent of respondents reported that they used recycled shopping bags. These were used the least by Cebu CD and young Cebu AB participants, citing reasons such as expense, size, habit, and the hassle of bringing them along as factors that discouraged them from using this type of packaging.

l. Willingness to Pay a Premium for Eco-friendly Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Premium for Eco-Friendly Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above shows, on the average, the participants claimed that they were willing to pay a 12.5 percent premium for eco-friendly products with the AB groups and those from the National Capital Region indicating willingness to pay a premium above the average while those from the CD groups and from Cebu indicated below-average willingness to pay a premium.
m. *Preference for Energy-efficient Household Appliances*

Almost all respondents (i.e., 95%) indicated a preference for selecting energy-efficient household appliances. Reasons given were largely centered around the benefits to humans:

- “Saves money.”
- “Safe for humans.”
- “It helps me live long and also for my kids.”
- “To ensure energy supply in the future.”
- “To prevent energy shortage (the shortage might cause an increase in prices.”

n. *Eco-Friendly Brand-Switching Experience*

Forty percent reported they had switched to another more eco-friendly brand. However, it was apparent that the brand-switching experience did not leave a lasting impression on over 100 participants as only three specific brands were singled out. One noted a switch to Shell gasoline (“it causes less pollution”). Another mentioned switching from Collins to Samsung (“to save electricity costs”). A third switched from a generic container to Tupperware “because it [the former] does not have chemicals harmful to health.”

o. *Preference for Recycled or Biodegradable Products*

Eighty-four percent indicated a preference for recycled or biodegradable products. This figure is remarkable since only eight percent had checked if the product they were buying was recycled or bio-degradable.
Reasons cited for their preference pertained to the promotion of human health and safety. Comments included

- “Eco-friendly products are made of natural materials, which are better for the health.”
- “We can reduce garbage and help prevent flooding and protect our health.”

Another set of reasons indicated the financial benefits derived by the participants:

- “It saves me money.”
- “They are affordable.”
- “We can earn money by selling to junk dealers.”
- “It transforms the product from ‘useless to useful’ and makes the products cheaper.”
- “We can re-use the product.”

A couple of participants noted a lack of preference for recycled or bio-degradable products. One explained that it was “because of hygiene issues” while another noted that “mentally, we prefer it but we do not consciously do it.”

\( p. \) Habit of Purchasing Products in Refillable Containers

Almost three-quarters of respondents noted a habit of buying products in refillable containers, with the practice more prevalent among the CD groups and Cebuanos, usually citing “to save money” as the reason. Products purchased in refillable containers included purified water,
ball pens, LPG, shampoo, perfume, edible oil, and printer ink.

However, one participant indicated a refusal to engage in this practice because the container “gets dirty over time due to bacteria.”

q. Trash Segregation Behavior
Seventy-eight percent reported segregating their trash. Most did it so mostly to comply with local ordinances in their community—ie.: “to avoid fines” and “no segregation means no garbage collection.” Others cited the financial incentives from doing so, noting for example that “you can create compost and sell used plastic bottles”.

Still others noted the benefit to nature from such practice (which ultimately will benefit humans): “Because it helps to conserve our environment. If I contribute to the environment, I am also contributing to myself.”

Those who did not practice segregation claimed to be either too busy or left it to the garbage collectors to segregate their trash.

r. Trash Reduction Behavior
Close to two-thirds (63%) consciously reduced the amount of trash they created. Similar to the pattern of responses to the other questions, the reasons given were either the financial gains obtained (e.g., “I reuse
disposable plastic bags for my nephew’s store.”) or the health and safety issues involved (e.g., “This is beneficial to our health.”)

5. Closing Remarks from Some Participants

Toward the end of some of the sessions, some noteworthy comments were elicited from the AB group from the National Capital Region. Essentially, they themselves noticed the incongruity between their beliefs regarding the environment and their behavior as consumers.

Some attributed their lack of eco-friendly consumerism was probably “due to convenience”, given that there were “more non-eco-friendly than eco-friendly products.” Some complained about the eco-friendly logo because “the labels should be clearer” and “the meaning of the logos (was) not clear; consequently, “The eco-friendly labeled products (were) not really registering in my mind” and “maybe people (did) not actually know what to look for.”

A few observed that eco-friendly marketing was not very effective (“People have more influence on our behavior than eco-friendly marketing” and “brand loyalty is more important”). Consequently, as a couple of participants observed: “We do not care enough to be bothered to look for these products. It takes too much effort” and “Eco-friendly things remain just an awareness issue but it is not a way of life.”

These insights about their own behavior astonished some participants. A young professional remarked that “this (was)
very depressing because we (had) a lot of ideas from the discussion, we are doing very little.” Another participant, an environmental activist who leads tree-planting projects for school children, was bewildered when she realized that her behavior as a consumer was totally different from her life as an eco-warrior.

2. Understanding the Underlying Motives

a. What is Eco-Friendly Consumerism?

To put the analysis of the responses in proper perspective, it is essential to go back to the fundamental definitions of eco-friendly consumerism.

Elkingto, Hailes and Makower (1990) defined environmentally sound products and services as those that (a) are not dangerous to the health of people or animals; (b) do not cause damage to the environment during manufacture, use, or disposal; (c) do not consume a disproportionate amount of energy and other resources during manufacture, use, or disposal; (d) do not cause unnecessary waste due either to excessive packaging or to a short life span; (e) do not involve the unnecessary use of or cruelty to animals; and (f) do not use materials derived from threatened species or environments (emphasis added).

Chryssides and Kaler (1993) defined eco-friendly consumerism as a “multifaceted concept” that includes (a) preservation of the environment; (b) minimization of pollution; (c) responsible use of nonrenewable resources;
and (d) animal welfare and species preservation (emphasis added).

b. Conceptual Framework for Understanding Motives and Beliefs

According to Roberts and Bacon (1997), it was essential to understand the motives, attitudes, behavior, and actions of consumers with regard to ecological issues so as to alleviate the damage to the environment brought about by consumers.

Two theories are helpful in understanding the dynamics among values, norms, and behavior. The first is the Value Theory (Schwartz, 1994), which states that values underlie actions. The second is the Value-Belief-Norm (or VBN) Theory (Stern, 2000) which states that values directly determine beliefs, and beliefs affect norms.

In addition, the research of Lopez and Cuervo-Arango (2008) demonstrated that ecological beliefs, personal norms, and eco-altruistic values were the main psychological explanatory variables of environment protective behavior.

c. Cultural Differences Affecting Norms

From the results, one issue to be considered is whether or not it is human nature to have an exploitative view of the environment--where the plants and animals are to be protected only because of their value to the welfare of humans. To address this issue, it is worth noting that a number of studies have pointed out differences in consumer attitudes and behaviors due to differing cultural traditions.
Several scholars have suggested that Chinese consumers possess a bio-centric or eco-centric view of the world. For instance, Zhang (1998) noted that the Chinese were influenced by the thoughts of Taoism by Lao Tzu, which proposed a concept of “man-nature unity” where humans were supposed to integrate with the natural world rather than to try to master it. Others such as Yau (1988) and Chan (2001) noted that the Chinese placed great emphasis on living in harmony with nature. According to Chan, Wong, and Leung (2007), this world-view extended to consumers whose beliefs and actions were guided by their Taoist view of the world.

In contrast, some scholars proposed that Christian consumers possessed an anthropocentric view of the world. For instance, White (1967) proposed a direct link between a particular set of VBN and environmental behaviors and claimed that Christian theology was distinctly anti-environmental. In addition, he suggested that western technology and science were shaped by the Christian tenet of man’s dominion over nature. Research by scholars such as Eckberg and Blocker (1989), Schultz, Zeleny and Dalrymple (2000), and Zepeda and Li (2007) showed that religious beliefs played a role in environmental concerns and behaviors and found evidence to support White’s views.
Indeed, in the Old Testament, it is written that:

“Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth’.”

- (Genesis 1:26 Revised Standard Version, Oxford University Press)

This tenet from the bible could explain the attitude of most participants in the present study with regard the relations between man and nature. As one of them remarked in response to the question on animal testing, “Anyway, everything is given to us by God and we just need to be responsible guardians.”
Implications for Future Research

This exploratory study has provided some insights that may be of use to future researchers who wish to continue the investigation in this area.

First of all, it has become apparent that green customer profiles are country-specific due to inherent differences in lifestyles, beliefs, cultures, and practices. Hence, any attempt to create a profile of the Filipino green consumer needs to use data-collection instruments that incorporate variables appropriate for the Filipino consumer, instead of merely using customer profiles derived from somewhere else.

Second, any attempt to create a profile of the Filipino green consumer needs to include an investigation into the motivational issues behind the behavior instead of creating data-collection instruments that merely focus on the behavior. This way, the study can unmask the underlying motivation. This approach is important because two people behaving in the same manner may be doing it for two very different reasons (which would imply that their profiles are not the same).

A final recommendation regarding future studies involves the sampling methodology. The responses from the various FGD groups suggest differences in attitudes and behavior across socio-economic
groups and regional locations. Hence, it is suggested that more comprehensive profiling studies on the Filipino green consumer should utilize sampling designs that take into consideration the differences across various demographic segments and regions in the country.
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Appendix A

*FGD Discussion Guide Questions*

I. **Perceptions and Attitudes**
   1. Can you give us your thoughts about the environment?
   2. When you hear the term “eco-friendly”, what comes to your mind?
   3. What eco-friendly products are you aware of?
   4. Can you name the brands of eco-friendly products?
   5. Can you name the stores that promote eco-friendly practices?
   6. Are you willing to buy products that have been tested on animals?
   7. How concerned are you about pollution?
   8. Do you think eco-friendly products are more expensive than non-eco-friendly products?
   9. Do you think that being eco-friendly affects the quality of the product?

II. **Behavior**
   1. Do you recognize this label? (Universal Recycling Logo)
   2. Do you check if a product is labeled as eco-friendly before making a purchase?
   3. Do you use a recycled shopping bag instead of a plastic bag when shopping?
   4. By how much more are you willing to pay for eco-friendly products?
   5. Do you prefer to buy energy-efficient household appliances?
   6. Have you switched to another brand that is more eco-friendly?
   7. Do you prefer recycled or biodegradable products?
   8. Do you buy products in refillable containers?
   9. Do you segregate your trash?
  10. Do you reduce the amount of trash that you create?
Appendix B

*Universal Recycling Symbol*
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