

Understanding Individual Responsibilization through the PACT Routine

Ricardo Morales

HONORS THESIS

Submitted In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements of the
College Scholars Honors Program
North Central College

May 15th, 2017

Approved: _____ Date: _____

Thesis Director Signature

Dr. William Muck, Thesis Director

Approved: _____ Date: _____

Second Reader Signature

Dr. Patricia Schacht, Second Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Abstract	3
Introduction	4
Literature Review	5
Consumer Responsibilization	6
Responsible Citizenship.....	8
Limitations of Individual Responsibilization	11
The PACT Routine	13
Hypothesis	15
Methods	16
Dependent Variable	20
Independent Variables.....	22
Findings	23
Discussion	27
Limitations	29
Conclusion	31
Works Cited	34
Appendix	37
A	37
B	41
C	42
D	43
E	44
F.....	48
G.....	49
H.....	50
I	51

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my family for their endless, long-distance support during my four years at North Central. This project would not have been possible without them. I would like to thank my dad for the sacrifices he has made for me, and for unconditionally supporting my passions. I would also like to thank all the people who have shaped me in my academic and personal life at North Central, the exceptional faculty I have had the opportunity to work with and learn from, Dr. Jack Shindler and the people working in the international students' program, and the College Scholars Honors community. Special thanks to my advisor, William Muck, for his guidance, determination, and insight during this project. Special thanks also to my second reader, Patricia Schacht, and my librarian, Melissa Proulx, for their valuable feedback and suggestions. Thanks to my friend Jose David Beltran for our ongoing discussions, which got me interested in this topic. Finally, thanks to all my friends at North Central who have shaped my ideas and been alongside me during this process, and to my girlfriend, Grace, for her patience and support.

Abstract

This project examines how individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior can be increased. It explores this through an experiment about socially responsible choices in clothing purchases. Subject groups were presented with vignettes testing two key variables extracted from the PACT routine, a method of consumer responsabilization, 1) personalization and 2) authorization, to gauge if either variable alters the respondents' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior. Personalization is the connection between an individual's behavior and the social issue. Authorization is the professional evidence used to legitimize this claim. The vignettes were followed by a survey measuring individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior. Findings suggest that personalization and authorization together have the greatest impact on respondents, that authorization alone has a greater impact on respondents than personalization alone, and that there are correlations between attitudinal engagement with social responsibility and time, gender, and study abroad experiences. The results from this project contribute to the broader literature exploring how individuals can be made aware of and responsive to calls for social responsibility.

Introduction

This study examines how people's disposition to adopt socially responsible attitudes can be increased through individual responsabilization, the promotion of socially responsible attitudes and behaviors in individuals (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). Although there is a substantial body of literature on individual responsabilization, most of it deals with the topic only at a theoretical level (Abbott and Stevens 2014; Deuchar 2004; Edwards 2012; Friedrich 2010; García, César, and Gasca-Pliego 2011; Hay, and Foley 1998; Prinsloo, Beukes, and De Jongh). This study builds off the existing literature on the topic, and conducts an experiment testing two variables of the PACT routine, a method of forming ethical consumers proposed by Giesler and Veresiu in their study: *Creating the Responsible Consumer: Moralistic Governance Regimes and Consumer Subjectivity* (2014). By isolating the steps of personalization and authorization from this routine, this study explores to what extent these variables promote socially responsible behavior. The results allow for a better understanding of how social responsibility can be promoted.

The experiment exposed a sample of 100 students from a liberal arts college in the suburbs of Chicago to vignettes containing videos and information about social issues in clothing consumer choices. The students were divided into four groups, and each group was presented with information that represented the variable that was being assessed. The four groups were personalization, authorization, personalization and authorization together, and a control group. Personalization consists of developing a personal connection between individuals' behavior and a social issue (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). Authorization is presenting individuals with professional, scientific evidence that legitimizes the process of individual

responsibilization (Giesler and Veresiu 2014).

The original hypothesis is that although personalization and authorization together have the greatest effect on individual behavior, personalization alone has a greater impact than authorization alone. This is attributed to the personal connection that personalization constructs between individuals and the issues presented to them and how this facilitates developing a sense of compassion for the rest of society (Singer 2015). The experiment is complemented by a literature review that explores the goals of individual responsibilization, its benefits and limitations, and the recommendations that can be made to implement it more effectively.

Literature Review

Social responsibility is a broad term used by several disciplines to describe the shared obligations that members of a group have concerning the well-being of the self and the rest of the population in the group (Pathak 2014). What these obligations consist of, and what the well-being of the self and the rest of the population encompasses, varies according to the context in which social responsibility is being used. Within the discussion of social responsibility, there is the process of promoting socially responsible behaviors and attitudes at the individual level, individual responsibilization.

The idea of promoting socially responsible attitudes in individuals has led to the creation or theorization of several types of socio-moral individuals: citizens that are involved in civil society and informed about the democratic process in their nations (Power and Scott 2014); global citizens that shape their actions to help address global issues, such as

deforestation (Arora-Jonsson, Westholm and Petitt 2015); informed patients that reduce medical waste and unnecessary medical procedures (Abbott and Stevens 2014); socially responsible business managers (Prinsloo, Beukes, and De Jongh). All of these individuals aim to improve the well-being of their societies by shaping their behavior.

This study identified two main categories that the conversation of individual responsabilization tends to focus on: the creation of responsible consumers, and the creation of responsible citizens. Although there is overlap between these two categories of individual responsabilization, there are notable distinctions that set them apart in the issues they aim to address, and the methods they proposed to shape individuals as socially responsible agents.

Consumer Responsibilization

When discussing this study with colleagues and professors, social responsibility was most often linked to responsible consumption and topics that derive from it, such as buying environmentally-friendly products. Consumer responsibility is understood as “the increased awareness of the impact of consumption decisions on the environment, on consumer health, and on society in general” (Giesler and Veresiu 2014, 840). Consumer responsabilization, however, extends this definition by taking into consideration how moralistic regimes make an active effort to treat consumers as moral subjects (Giesler and Veresiu 2014, 840). When consumers are considered moral individuals, they have a responsibility to society through their consumer choices. Consequently, the process of consumer responsabilization aims to achieve a personal transformation in which consumers embrace their role as moral individuals, and choose to address focal social issues through their consumer choices (Giesler and Veresiu 2014, 843).

The moralistic discourse of consumer responsibility is associated to neoliberalism because this mode of governance advocates for a blend between the social and economic realms of society (Howard and King 2014; Shamir 2008). This combination results in the adoption of market-driven attitudes in non-profit actors, known as the marketization of society, and the responsabilization of market entities by assuming socio-moral obligations, the moralization of markets. This mode of governance allows individuals to adopt self-regulatory practices, such as responsible consumption and responsible citizenship (Shamir 2008).

The marketization of society consists in grounding social relations in the economic rationality of the markets (Shamir 2008). Howard and King define it as “the introduction of market-mimicking arrangements to those areas where genuine markets are inappropriate” (2014, 6). This means that social actors, such as governments and non-governmental organizations (NGO’s), must adopt market-guided attitudes to earn a trustworthy reputation in neoliberal governments. Consequently, these institutions are motivated to self-regulate through forces that typically shape markets such as competition, efficiency, and profitability. For neoliberalism, the marketization of society serves as an alternative means of control to the coercive, top-down approach of government regulation (Shamir 2008; Howard and King 2014).

The marketization of society is also accompanied by the moralization of markets. Neoliberal governments not only push social actors to be shaped by market forces, but also for a shift in socio-moral duties from civil society organizations, governmental entities, and state agencies, to the private sector and the individual (Shamir 2008). This means that there is a void in socio-moral obligations left by the neoliberal state for corporations, citizens, and consumers to assume.

The moralization of markets is achieved in a variety of ways: business education, academic discourse, and organizational incentives (Shamir 2008; Garcia, Cesar, and Gasca-Pliego 2011; Prinsloo, Beukes, and De Jongh). However, one of the main forces that motivates the private sector to adopt these socio-moral obligations is social pressure from civic groups, activists, consumers, and NGO's (Shamir 2008; Snyder 2008, 325). In the same way that neoliberalism advocates for markets to regulate social duties, its markets are regulated by a civil society that utilizes market forces and market mechanisms to demand social responsibility from the private and public sectors (Shamir 2008). Consequently, social responsibility becomes an asset for corporations and governments, which comes into consideration during their decision-making process, and their evaluations of costs and benefits, all based on the idea that "the pursuit of sustainable development is good for business and business is good for sustainable development" (Shamir 2008). The marketization of society and the moralization of markets make adopting ethical practices become the commercially and politically "wise" thing to do. They do so by providing individuals with greater leverage to shape the attitudes and behaviors of public and private sector actors (Shamir 2008).

Responsible Citizenship

Although individual responsabilization is commonly associated with consumer responsabilization, the literature also addresses this topic through the creation of responsible citizenship (Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin 2014; Deuchar 2004; García, César, and Gasca-Pliego 2011; Hay and Foley 1998; Le Bryuns 2012; Lacey and Ilcan 2006; Pathak 2014; Power and Scott 2014; Salehi, Pazuki, Mahmoudi, and Knierim; Sharon 2014). Citizen education aims to develop "well-informed, skilled individuals who are sensitive, responsible and visionary" about the

political, economic, social, and cultural issues that confront them and their communities (Deuchar 2004). Citizenship, in this context, is understood as a compilation of rights and duties. People can enjoy the benefits of being a citizen, but a responsible citizen must also contribute to the common good of their community. Beyond a basic human right, citizenship is considered an identity that individuals are responsible for achieving (Friedrich 2010, 651).

In contrast to consumer responsibility, citizenship responsibility focuses on how individual can contribute positively to society through choices other than those related to their purchases. Power and Scott argue in favor of civic education for children through schools, for instance (2014). Similarly, Garcia, Cesar, and Gasca-Pliego talk about the role of public universities in developing democratically responsible citizens (2011). These two studies talk about the improvement of society through political engagement. Their arguments are not concerned with issues related to consumption, and do not look at individuals as consumers, but rather as citizens who can contribute to the well-being of society by becoming involved and informed about the democratic process of their nation (Garcia, Cesar and Gasca-Pliego 2011; Power and Scott 2014).

Greater social responsibility has also been demanded of citizens through *ethopolitics*, particularly in neoliberal governmentalities (Pathak 2014). Ethopolitics can be understood as a mode of self-governance in which individuals evaluate the impact of their behaviors in relation to their moral obligations to the self, and society (Pathak 2014, 97). In this framework, citizenship is understood as “an ethical endeavor composed of a set of interlocking dispositions, which regulate and calibrate everyday” (Pathak 2014, 97). Particularly in the context of neoliberalism, ethopolitics regards individuals as responsible citizens, and sets itself the

objective of transferring social responsibility to the individual in order to reduce the need for state regulation and intervention to address social issues (Pathak 2014; Lacey and Ilcan 2006; Howard and King 2014).

At a broader level, responsible citizenship education is framed in the context of global issues (Arora-Jonsson, Westholm, and Pettit 2015; Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin 2014; Prinsloo, Beukes, De Jongh 2006). Global citizenship education seeks to expand the promotion of responsible citizenship beyond local communities and into the identity of a global community. It serves as a way for individuals to identify with people from all around the world through the common issues that they face such as environmental degradation, global poverty, immigration, and overpopulation (Giesler and Veresiu 2014; Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin 2014; Singer 2015).

Furthermore, the promotion of responsible global citizenship appears in various contexts. Prinsloo, Beukes, and De Jongh argue that a redefinition of global leadership through “corporate citizen education” is required to address the environmental and social issues that are related with business practices (2006). Because corporations have become very influential actors in the global community, they have a responsibility to all their stakeholders, to act in a socially responsible and sustainable way. Responsible business practices can be achieved through reform in business education and training (Prinsloo, Beukes, and De Jongh 2006). Corporate citizen education reevaluates business goals by assessing the ethical, environmental, and social issues that derive from business. The article claims that corporate citizen education should be part of the curriculum that business schools deliver to their students (Prinsloo, Beukes, and De Jongh 2006). In this context, business leaders are being shaped as globally responsible leaders, who take into consideration the global social impact of the corporations

they are heading.

These moral discourses exemplify the types of socially responsible individuals that exist beyond the identity of consumers, and within the realm of responsible citizenship. Citizens are encouraged to shape their financial habits, such as saving and investing, and their involvement in the political process of their nations, by considering the well-being of society. Similarly, entrepreneurs and business leaders are encouraged to pursue business activity through the identity of responsible global citizenship, which takes into consideration the impact that their actions have on the global community. In this sense, the identity of responsible citizenship is broader than that of responsible consumption.

Limitations of Individual Responsibilization

The positive societal effects of individual responsibilization can be severely limited by structural constraints (Pathak 2014; Giesler and Veresiu 2014). An ethopolitical framework can make it seem as though social issues are solely the result of individual moral shortcomings, which undermines the role that structural problems have in the creation and perpetuation of these issues (Pathak 2014). In his article *Ethopolitics and the Financial Citizen*, Pathak describes how ethopolitics can enable neoliberal governments to overlook structural constraints related to overindebtedness in the UK (2014). Structural constraints are macro-level societal conditions that perpetuate focal social issues (Pathak 2014; Giesler and Veresiu 2014). Without distinction between irresponsibility and incapability from individuals to adopt socially responsible attitudes, ethopolitics can lead to an “overemphasis on individual agency”, which enables governments to ignore its responsibility over structural constraints (Pathak 2014, 91).

Additionally, the positive effects of individual responsibilization on society can be

limited by the reinterpretation and refusal to follow the moralistic discourse of individual responsabilization (Sharon 2014). Sharon highlights the challenges of making individuals adopt socially responsible behavior in her study *Healthy citizenship beyond autonomy and discipline: tactical engagements with genetic testing* (2014). She focuses on De Certeau's *Model of the creativity of ordinary people* to explain how individuals adapt to the model of "healthy citizenship" that has emerged in neoliberal governmentalities (Sharon 2014). This theory states that individuals resist institutional control by reinterpreting and appropriating the discourse of responsible citizenship through healthy citizenship, and to use it for their own interests (Sharon 2014). Sharon moves forward the critique of ethopolitics from a discourse of control and dominance to one where individuals create alternate modes of conduct and reasoning, which are neither intellectually nor morally incompetent, but rather different from the dominant discourse (2014).

It is important to recognize the weaknesses of individual responsabilization as a means of addressing social issues for this framework to be adopted and implemented successfully in society. The moralization of markets, and responsabilization of governments over structural constraints are vital steps in this process. As suggested by Pathak (2014) and the PACT routine's step of capabilization, for individuals to address social issues through their behavior, there must be a market and societal conditions that allow them to do so (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). It is possible to approach social issues from a bottom up perspective, which focuses on the individual as the main agent for change in society, so long as individuals are operating in a society that enables them to act this way (Giesler and Veresiu 2014; Pathak 2014).

Furthermore, because individuals are likely to respond in unexpected ways to the

discourse of individual responsabilization, this topic should be studied from a psychological and sociological perspective (Sharon 2014; Singer 2015). In his book *Invisible Influence*, Jonah Berger describes how elements such as conformity, familiarity, and novelty shape individual behavior in social contexts (2016). He talks about how these ideas have been used to promote specific consumer behaviors. For example, social facilitation was utilized to reduce household energy consumption by shaping consumer behavior according to what their neighbors were doing (Berger 2016, 202). This is an example of the role that sociology and could play in successfully promoting socially responsible behaviors in society at large. These ideas should be taken into consideration by governments, members of civil society, private entities, NGO's, and individuals who are looking to promote socially responsible behaviors.

The PACT Routine

In their study, *Creating the Responsible Consumer: Moralistic Governance Regimes and Consumer Subjectivity*, Giesler and Veresiu (2014) conclude that there are four responsible consumer models promoted by the problem-solving initiatives proposed at the World Economic Forum (WEF): the green consumer, the bottom-of-the-pyramid consumer, the financially literate consumer, and the health-conscious consumer. These consumer models have the intention of addressing the focal social issues of environmental degradation, poverty, financial instability, and chronic illnesses, respectively.

The green consumer acknowledges its power to change the behavior of private and public institutions towards environmental issues, and understands that he/she can also improve their own behavior to live more sustainably. The bottom-of-the-pyramid consumer, exemplifies how responsabilization can be used as a tool of empowerment to help people

afflicted by severe poverty change their social reality through entrepreneurship. The financially literate consumer results from shifting the task of solving economic problems through financial regulations, to educating consumers so that they can become conscious, financial decision makers. Finally, the health-conscious consumer, takes control over his/her own health issues through the process of responsabilization instead of relying on public health services. Giesler and Veresiu develop the PACT routine of consumer responsabilization to account for the creation of these four consumers (2014).

The PACT routine is comprised of four steps that achieve consumer responsabilization (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). *Personalization* is the idea of making consumers feel connected to these problems on a personal and moral level so that they feel responsible and motivated to address them. *Authorization* is the process of reinforcing personalization through expert scientific knowledge that can serve as valid evidence to consumers that their consumption decisions can truly change these social issues. *Capabilization* is the process of developing a market that can provide the means to responsible consumption by redesigning the relation between public and private institutions and consumers, and offering moral products and services. Finally, *transformation* is the process in which consumers accept these new moral standards and shape their behaviors accordingly.

This study chose to evaluate two variables of the PACT routine because it is a theory that can be applied to both fields of individual responsabilization, responsible consumption and responsible citizenship. Although the authors' original theory is identified within the WEF's problem-solving initiatives aimed at creating responsible consumers (Giesler and Veresiu 2014), the PACT routine's four steps are present in strategies of responsible citizenship education, as

well. For instance, Pathak's argument that structural constraints restrict citizens from being financially responsible (2014), is reminiscent of the third step of the PACT routine, capabilization, which claims that individuals need a "market" that allows them to be socially responsible (Giesler and Veresiu 2014, 843). In Pathak's research, indebted households attempt to behave in financially responsible ways, but their efforts are not effective in addressing overindebtedness because of the structural constraints at play (2014). Similarly, there are consumers who are willing to shape their behavior according to what personalization and authorization have proved to them, but that are not capable to do so because of lack of access to the appropriate goods and services.

Hypothesis

This experiment explores the impact that two elements of the PACT routine have on individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors. It hypothesizes two results:

- 1) *Personalization and authorization together have the greatest effect on individual behavior* – individuals who are exposed to the personalization and authorization vignettes will demonstrate a higher disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior than the control group, and the personalization and authorization groups measured individually.
- 2) *Personalization alone has a greater impact than authorization alone* – establishing a personal connection between individuals and the issues presented to them is predicted to have a greater effect on their disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors than presenting them with professional, scientific evidence that supports

idea of addressing social issues through individual behavior.

Personalization and Authorization together are hypothesized to have a greater impact because in the original PACT routine they work together in the process of individual responsabilization. Personalization alone, however, is hypothesized to have a greater effect than authorization alone because it is expected to develop a sense of compassion for the rest of society in individuals. Singer describes compassion for other members of society as a key component for the creation of global citizenship identity (2015). She claims that there is an intrinsic kinship compassion present in animal nature. Humans, however, have the capacity to expand this compassion beyond the kinship level. Singer believes that people can be motivated to expand their compassion to a global level, feeling compassion for other groups of people and individuals in the global community (2015).

Methods

This study's experiment replicates the macro-level PACT model at a micro-level by isolating the variables of personalization and authorization through a series of vignettes containing videos and information related to clothing consumer choices. It includes a brief introduction accompanied by a consent form; a presentation tailored to four different groups: control group, personalization group, authorization group, and personalization and authorization group; an anonymous post-vignettes survey to measure the subjects' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors; and debriefing the respondents through a question and answer section and a debriefing form. A written script was utilized to keep presentations consistent across all four groups (Appendix B).

The experiment was conducted in four different classes from a small liberal arts college in the suburbs of Chicago. Each classed contained approximately 20 students. The classes consisted of three courses that fulfilled general education requirements, and one political science course. Despite one of these classes being a political science course, the sample student population for each of the experiments represents a diverse variety of majors. The professors of the courses remained present during the study, but did not participate nor intervene in it. They took a seat in the back of the classroom, and allowed students to focus on the vignettes and the survey. Consequently, they are not considered to have influenced the study. 112 respondents participated in the experiment. The total population consisted of 64 females and 48 males (including 1 transgender male), ages ranging between 18-26 years of age, and a predominantly white racial majority of 77%.

Classrooms were chosen for this study because they are a space with minimal distractions, and contain a relatively homogenous and consistent population of college students. This study is not looking at the change in respondents' behavior, but at the change in their disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior; therefore, even though the conditions of the spaces in which individuals act as social responsible individuals can be very different from classrooms, these are an appropriate space to evaluate the effects that the vignettes have on the respondents' disposition to change their behavior.

This study isolated the variables of personalization and authorization with the purpose of understanding how these two elements influence individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior. Namely, the contrast between a personal connection with the social issue obtained through personalization, and the legitimacy of the claim to adopt responsible

consumption provided through professional, scientific evidence through authorization (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). Because personalization and authorization work together as part of the PACT routine, separating these variables through information that represented exclusively one of them was challenging. Although the vignettes for each group overwhelmingly represented a specific variable, it was concluded that there will always be some degree of overlap between the two.

In this experiment, social responsibility is framed to the respondents as being aware of how clothing consumer choices impact the well-being of garment factory workers. Specifically, the working conditions, wages, and ages of these workers. The PACT routine's steps of personalization and authorization are present in strategies utilized by various social actors to promote social responsibility. For instance, in his video *The Cost of Fashion*, the comedian John Oliver utilizes a framework in which he exposes a social issue to his audience, legitimizes it through professional expertise and empirical evidence, and concludes by giving a message to his audience in which he shows the connections between them as individuals and the issue (Oliver 2015). Similarly, corporations that have socially responsible behaviors advertise by connecting a social issue with their audience, explaining how their business practices are helping address that issue, and finally giving consumers the message that by supporting their business, they can be part of the solution. Krochet Kids International follows this framework in their video *Empowerment* (2014). The New York Times video of the Rana Plaza factory collapse makes a personal connection with the viewer by showing the consequences of the garment manufacturing industry, and the brands that were associated with this catastrophe (Fitch 2014). These videos were chosen to represent the variables of personalization and authorization in

this experiment. The Krochet Kids International (2014) and the Rana Plaza collapse (Fitch 2014) videos were used for personalization, and an excerpt of *The Cost of Fashion* (2015) was used for authorization.

The experiment varied according to the variable that was being tested. For the personalization group, before being exposed to the vignettes, students were asked to look at the brands in their own clothes, the brands that other students were wearing, and where these clothing items were manufactured. This was incorporated to the personalization presentation to further emphasize the personal connection between the respondents and their clothing consumer choices. During the question and answer section, one of the respondents mentioned looking at his clothes made him recall where he had purchased his clothing articles, and increased his awareness of where they were manufactured. After that, respondents were shown the Rana Plaza collapse (Fitch 2014) and the Krochet Kids International (2014) videos.

The authorization group was exposed to an excerpt of *The Cost of Fashion* video (2015), and to a set of vignettes with information about addressing social issues through individual behavior (Appendix E). The personalization and authorization group received combined the information presented to the groups of personalization and authorization. Respondents were shown the Rana Plaza Collapse, *The Cost of Fashion*, *Empowerment* videos (Fitch 2014; Oliver 2015; Krochet Kids 2014). The control group was not exposed to any vignettes. Respondents in this group only received the introduction to the project, and the survey.

The survey includes questions about the respondents' demographic information, study abroad experiences, consumer habits, and disposition to change their behavior based on the presentation (Appendix A). The survey's main goal is to compare the change in the

respondents' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors before and after being exposed to the vignettes, and across different groups. To compare individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior, questions 15 and 16 ask respondents to reflect on their previous consumer choices, and their expected future consumer choices (Appendix A). Additionally, the control group is utilized to compare the answers of individuals that were not exposed to personalization or authorization with those who were.

The questions about study abroad experiences were included to discern the degree to which individuals previously identified themselves with a sense of global citizenship, and whether this would influence their disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors. Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin argue that studying abroad can help develop a sense of global citizenship in adults (2014, 158). To evaluate this hypothesis, the authors study the perceptions of a group of students, who are part of an itinerant graduate study abroad program. The findings showed that through study abroad experiences students developed a sense of cultural sensitivity, and professional attitudes. Consequently, study abroad experiences were considered important to determine individuals' sense of global social responsibility before the experiment.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable for this study is the respondents' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors. This variable is understood through the respondents' attitude towards individual social responsibility, and how they think they will behave as consumers after having been exposed to the vignettes.

The respondents' attitude towards individual social responsibility is measured through multiple-choice questions 9, 10, and 11. These questions deal with the impact that individual

choices have on social issues such as poverty, health issues, financial instability, and environmental degradation, and with the role of consumers and corporations in addressing these issues. Respondents are given the options of: *Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Strongly Disagree*. A short sentence option labeled as *Other* was also included in the multiple-choice questions to give respondents the opportunity to express a response different from the given options, or to provide more detail about their stance on the question. Furthermore, question 12 is an open-ended question about the ways in which personal behavior can help address these social issues, other than through consumer choices. It is included to get a more comprehensive view of the respondents' perspective on social responsibility.

Questions 13, 14, 15, and 16 provide an insight on how respondents would behave, or think they would behave after having been exposed to this information. Questions 13 and 14 are open-ended reflection questions about the impact of the presentation on the respondents' belief about consumer choices (13), and about the impact that individuals have on the society at large (14). Questions 15 and 16 are multiple choice questions about consumer behavior. Question 15 asks respondents about their awareness over socially responsible consumption before the presentation. It gives respondents the option to mark *Every time I made a purchase, Most of the times I made a purchase, Only When purchasing from companies that advertised this relationship, and Never*. The response from this question is contrasted with the answer from question 16, which asks respondents to rate their disposition to adopt responsible consumption habits after having been exposed to the presentation. Question 16 is also a multiple-choice question, and it gives respondents the same options as question 15. This

determines the degree of self-perceived change that individuals had regarding their socially responsible attitudes and behaviors.

Additionally, to understand how the independent variables of personalization and authorization influence individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors, this survey evaluates the change in individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior in each group, and then compares it across groups. The results from personalization, authorization, and personalization and authorization together are contrasted with each other, and with the results from the control group, to measure whether one of the variables had a greater influence on individuals disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors than the others.

Independent Variables

The independent variables are the steps of personalization and authorization from the PACT routine (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). As previously stated, personalization is the step in the process of individual responsabilization where a personal connection is built between individuals and the social issues at hand (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). For this experiment, a personal connection is established by making respondents aware of how their consumer choices impact the lives of garment factory workers (Krochet Kids 2014; Snyder 2008; Fitch 2014). On the other hand, authorization legitimizes the claim of individual responsabilization through professional, scientific evidence (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). In this case, respondents were exposed to facts about the garment manufacturing industry and the issues surrounding it, such as child labor, low wages, and unsafe working conditions (Oliver 2015). Additionally, respondents were presented with professional research that demonstrates ways in which

macro-level social issues can be addressed through consumer choices (Abbott and Stevens 2014; Shamir 2008; Snyder 2008).

Additional variables in this study include the respondents' age, gender, ethnicity/race, and study abroad/international travel experiences. These variables are taken into consideration because of the potential influence they can have on individuals disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior (Salehi, Pazuki, Mahmoudi, and Knierim 2015; Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin 2014; Hay and Foley 1998).

Findings

Findings in this study do not support the original hypothesis that although personalization and authorization together would have the greatest impact on respondents, personalization alone would have a greater impact than authorization alone. Findings show that all groups, including the control group, increased respondents' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors in a similar manner. Questions 15 and 16 help understand the change in individuals' disposition to adopt social responsibility, and the effect that the variables of the PACT routine had on respondents.

For the data analysis of questions 15 and 16, respondents' disposition to adopt social responsibility is understood by dividing the responses into two groups for both questions: positive, and neutral/negative. A positive response is understood as one in which the respondents are actively seeking to adopt the identity of socially responsible consumers. In the context of these questions, which deal with respondents taking into consideration the relationship between their consumer decisions and the social issues mentioned in the survey,

the options *Every time I make a purchase*, and *Most of the times I make a purchase* are considered positive. Neutral/negative responses are ones in which the respondents do not voluntarily seek to act as socially responsible consumers, or do not want to act according to the moral discourse of socially responsible consumption. The options *Only when purchasing from companies that advertise this relationship*, and *Never* are considered negative responses. Additionally, the responses from *Other (please specify)* are analyzed to classify them as positive or neutral/negative.

The overall increase of positive responses between questions 15 and 16 is 44%; meaning that, on average, 44% more respondents had positive responses in question 16 than in question 15 (Appendix H). Separately, each group had a positive increase of:

- Personalization and authorization (P&A) – 53% (Highest)
- Personalization – 30% (Lowest)
- Authorization – 43%
- Control Group – 46%

As expected, P&A has the highest positive percentage change. However, authorization and the control group also have levels of percentage change that are statistically comparable to the overall percentage change (44%). Personalization had the lowest level of positive percentage (30%). Nonetheless, all groups had a positive impact on individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors.

Questions 15 and 16 also provide insight into trends related to gender, race, study abroad, and international travel experiences. In the context of gender, contrasting questions 15 and 16 shows that after being exposed to the experiment, female respondents' disposition to

adopt socially responsible behaviors increased at a greater rate than males' (Appendix H). In question 15, which asks respondents about their consumer habits before the presentation, the positive group was comprised of 62% females, and the neutral/negative group was comprised of 59% females. However, for question 16, in which respondents expressed whether they will take into consideration social responsibility when they engage in future consumer decisions, the positive percentage for females increased by 3% to 65%, and the negative percentage decreased by 23% to 36% (Appendix). For percentage change in males, this represents an equivalent decrease in positive percentage (-3%), and an equivalent increase in negative percentage (+23%) (Appendix H).

Similarly, analyzing questions 15 and 16 independently suggests that females have a general higher disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors than males. Despite females making up 57% of the total sample, in question 15 female respondents made up 62% of the positive group, and 59% of the negative group (Appendix F). For question 16, females made up 65% of the positive group, but only 34% of the negative group (Appendix G). These results match previous studies, which suggest that females have a higher behavioral engagement in addressing social issues than males (Salehi, Pazuki, Mahmoudi, Knierim 2015).

The overall (average of the complete population) results of questions 15 and 16 show that more people in the positive group had studied abroad than in the neutral/negative group (Appendix H). In question 15, the overall percentage of respondents who have studied abroad is 27% for the positive group and 16% for the neutral/negative group (Appendix F). In question 16, the overall percentage of respondents who have studied abroad is 30% for the positive group and 9% for the neutral/negative group (Appendix G). These results also support previous

studies that promote study abroad as means for develop responsible global citizenship (Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin 2014). However, International travel experiences in general do not seem to be related to individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior. Respondents from both the positive and negative groups in questions 15 and 16 have high percentages of travel experiences (Appendix H).

When looking at race, both in question 15 and 16, minorities, particularly Black/African American and Hispanic, are comparatively more present in the neutral/negative group than in the positive group. Conversely, White respondents are more present in the positive group than in the negative group (Appendices F and G). However, comparing respondents' disposition to adopt social responsibility through race in this study can be misleading because of the disproportionately White majority population. A study with a balanced population could shed more light on the relationship between race and individual responsabilization. In this study, no conclusions are drawn from this relationship.

Another interesting finding of this study is the frequency with which people described the vignettes and the survey (in the case of the control group) as reminders of issues that they were already aware of, but not necessarily acting upon or thinking about when making consumer choices. In open-ended question 13, 10% of the total number of respondents (including control group) stated that they were previously aware, to some extent, of the issues surrounding the garment manufacturing industry, but that the information presented to them brought those issues back to their minds. It is interesting to note that 7% of the respondents from the control group marked that the survey alone had served as a reminder of these issues. This is reinforced by the results from question 15, where 54% of all the participants in this study

marked that they only thought about consumer social responsibility when purchasing from companies that advertised it.

Discussion

A possible explanation as to why all groups, including the control group, increased respondents' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors is that most of this sample population finds the idea corporate and individual social responsibility appealing. For questions 9, 10, and 11, which ask respondents if they believe corporations should adopt socially responsible behaviors, and their consumer choices had an impact on social issues, all groups had a high percentage of positive responses (Appendix I). In the context of these questions, *Strongly Agree* and *Somewhat Agree* are considered positive responses, and *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, *Somewhat Disagree*, and *Strongly Disagree* are considered neutral/negative (positive and neutral/negative having the same meaning as they did for questions 15 and 16). The average overall result for these questions is that 93% of the respondents agree with the idea of individual and corporate social responsibility (Appendix I). Individual groups had some level of deviance from this norm, for example the Control group having the lowest positive result in question 9 (81%), and personalization having the highest positive result (100%) in question 11. Overall, however, the groups are statistically comparable to each other (Appendix I). Additionally, as mentioned above, all groups increased respondents disposition to adopt social behaviors as measured by the contrast between questions 15 and 16. This means that regardless of the stimulus in this study (vignettes for personalization, authorization, and P&A, and surveys for the control group), respondents were supportive of the idea social

responsibility.

The biggest difference across groups was reflected in the contrast between the consumer behaviors of respondents before the survey, and their self-expected future consumer behavior. This is evidenced in questions 15 and 16 in which, as originally hypothesized, P&A had the highest percentage of change in positive responses (54%). In contrast with the original hypothesis, personalization had the lowest change in positive responses (30%). One possible explanation for this result is that personalization alone made respondents feel as though the claim of consumer social responsibility was not back by enough evidence. In open-ended question, for example, a respondent whose disposition did not change after the presentation stated: "No, not really. I don't think these videos were adequate in driving home the ideas. The second just seemed like an advertisement to invoke an emotional reaction and the first was lacking in information and hard facts." Similar responses were found from other respondents that did not react positively to personalization. This suggest that certain individuals can perceive personalization without authorization as a claim without enough evidence to support it.

Finally, the high percentage of individuals that only considered the relationship between consumer decisions and social issues when purchasing from companies that advertised this relationship (questions 15 and 16) suggests that exposing individuals to information about individual social responsibility increases their disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors in the short-term. The final step of the PACT routine, transformation, in which individuals' identity becomes that of socially responsible individuals, seems to be temporarily embraced when people are exposed information about social responsibility, regardless of the variable.

Further studies can focus on this finding to test how the time between being exposed to information about social responsibility, and engaging with decisions of social responsibility affects individual disposition to adopt socially responsible behavior.

Limitations

The experiment conducted in this study had various limitations. One of the most significant ones is that it can only evaluate the immediate effect of these variables on the respondents' claim of how they would behave. It does not evaluate the long-term effect on people's attitudes. To measure long-term results, an experiment in which subjects are routinely exposed to these variables across a long period, several months to a year for example, and where their changes in attitudes and behaviors were recorded periodically during this time, would be needed.

Furthermore, this experiment does not evaluate a real change in behavior, as it does not evaluate real consumer choices. This study evaluates what individuals think their consumer behavior would be while taking the survey. In practice, people's actions could differ from how they responded in the survey. A survey that more accurately reflects how respondents would behave in real consumer situations would need to include more detail about the products in question, such as price, quality, variety, accessibility. This concept is addressed by the PACT routine in the step of capabilities, which claims that for consumers to change their behavior, they must have access to socially responsible options in the market (Giesler and Veresiu 2014). This means that there must not only be options that enable consumers to be socially responsible, but that these options must be accessible to consumers in terms of prices and

distribution.

Furthermore, this experiment can look at the influence of personalization and authorization on people's behavior, but it does not explain why these variables exert influence on behavior. Speculation based on the literature suggests that personalization makes a connection with individuals that generates compassion, which Singer believes to be a driver behavioral and attitudinal change (2015). Further experiments should be conducted on this topic to determine whether in effect, compassion is a main component for adopting a socially responsible attitude. Increasing research between the fields of psychology, sociology, politics, and economics to promote this sense of global compassion should be one of the next steps in the conversation in social responsibility.

Another limitation of this study is that the population analyzed is relatively small and homogenous. Respondents are all within the same age range 18-22, and they all part of the same liberal arts college, which translates to a high degree of demographic homogeneity among respondents. Replicating this experiment with a more numerous and diverse population could yield different results. In fact, future studies are encouraged to replicate this study with a demographically different population to determine whether the variables of personalization, authorization, and P&A, have a similar impact on respondents. It is possible that a different population, which is not as receptive to calls for social responsibility, would react differently to the different variables.

Finally, although the objective of this experiment was to test the variables of personalization and authorization separately, these variables work together in the PACT routine. It was challenging to create vignettes and find information that separated these two

variables because of this close relationship. For example, although the videos utilized for personalization were not validating socially responsible consumer choices through professional, or scientific authorities, the fact that one of the videos came from a reputable source such as the New York Times could have an “authorization” effect on the subjects. Consequently, the presentations of personalization and authorization are not completely exclusive of the other variable. There was a degree of influence of the other variable on both presentations, however, this influence was minimized by selecting data that focused specifically on each variable.

Conclusions

This experiment shed light on the process of individual responsabilization and the elements that influence it. In particular, it analyzed personalization and authorization, two variables of the PACT routine. Findings suggest that exposing a population that is supportive of individual responsabilization to information regarding social responsibility increases its disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors. This means that people who believe in the idea of addressing social issues by shaping individual behavior will be willing to behave more responsibly after being exposed information of individual social responsibility.

The experiment also concluded that personalization and authorization have the greatest impact on individuals together. This was expected since they were conceived as part of the same process of consumer responsabilization, the PACT routine. However, when looking at each variable independently, there were respondents who perceived the personal connection between individual behavior and the social issue, which personalization is meant to develop, to be questionable, without the professional, scientific evidence provided by authorization to

legitimize its claim.

Findings support Coryell, Spencer, and Sehin's claim that study abroad experiences help develop an identity of responsible global citizenship (2014). However, international travel of other nature, such as leisure, did not seem to be correlated to individuals disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors. Future research could explore more in depth different types of international travel experiences, by taking into account destination of the travel and purpose of the trip, to determine whether this influences individuals' disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors.

Future research is also encouraged to focus on the trends between individual responsabilization and time, gender, and race. For example, future research should look at how individuals disposition to adopt socially responsible behaviors after being exposed to information about social responsibility changes across time. The results from this experiment suggest that even though individuals are aware of the relationship between social issues and individual responsibility, they tend to act upon it mostly when reminded about this relationship. This means that exposing individuals to information about social responsibility at the moment in which they ought to act as socially responsible individuals, could be an effective strategy to increase socially responsible behavior.

Furthermore, future research should explore the reasons why females seem to respond more positively to calls for social responsibility, and have a higher behavioral and attitudinal engagement in social responsibility than males (Salehi, Pazuki, Mahmoudi, Knierim 2015). Finally, even though this study did not draw any conclusions about the relationship between individual responsabilization and race, it was noted that there could be a potential correlation

between them. Future research could evaluate whether a relationship between race and individual responsabilization exists, and the potential reasons behind this relationship.

Works Cited

- Abbott, Ryan., Stevens, Carl (2014). *Redefining Medical Necessity: A Consumer-Driven Solution To The U.S. Health Care Crisis*, 47 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 943-965
- Arora-Jonsson S., Westholm L., & Petitt, A. (2015). Carbon and Cash in Climate Assemblages: The Making of a New Global Citizenship. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 48, 74-96
- Berger, Jonah. "Come On Baby, Light My Fire" *Invisible Influence: The Hidden Forces That Shape Behavior*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. 2016, 187-223. Print.
- Coryell, J., Spencer, B., & Sehin, O. (2014). Cosmopolitan Adult Education and Global Citizenship: Perceptions from a European Itinerant Graduate Professional Study Abroad Program. *Adult Education Quarterly*. Vol. 64(2), 145-164.
- Deuchar, Ross. (2004). Changing paradigms- the potential of enterprise education as an adequate vehicle for promoting and enhancing education for active and responsible citizenship: illustrations from a Scottish perspective. *Oxford Review of Education*.,Vol. 30, No.2, June, 223-239.
- Edwards, Keith E (2012). "Moving Beyond Green: Sustainable Development Toward Healthy Environments, Social Justice, and Strong Economies." *Wiley Periodicals, Inc.*, vol. 137, Spring 2012, pp. 19–28. *JSTOR*.
- Fitch, Nathan. "The Deadly Cost of Fashion." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 14 Apr. 2014, www.nytimes.com/2014/04/15/opinion/the-deadly-cost-of-fashion.html. Accessed 2 May 2017.
- Friedrich D. (December 2010). Historical consciousness as a pedagogical device in the production of the responsible citizen. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of*

Education, Vol. 31, No. 5, 649-663.

- García, O., César J., & Gasca-Pliego, E. (2011). Construir ciudadanía desde las universidades, responsabilidad social universitaria y desafíos ante el siglo XXI. *Convergencia. Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, May-August, 37-58
- Giesler, M., & Veresiu, E. (October 2014). Creating the Responsible Consumer: Moralistic Governance Regimes and Consumer Subjectivity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 840-857.
- Giesler, Marcus, and Ela Veresiu. "Interview with the Authors." *Markus Giesler*, www.markusgiesler.com/consumer-responsibilization.
- Hay, I., & Foley, P. (1998). Ethics, Geography, and Responsible Citizenship. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. Vol. 22, No. 2, 169-183.
- Howard, M.C., and J.E. King (2014). "Introduction." *Rise of Neoliberalism in Advanced Capitalist Economies: a Materialist Analysis*, Palgrave Macmillan, N.A, pp. 1–11.
- Krochet Kids International. "This Is Empowerment." *Vimeo*, 2014, vimeo.com/76026527. Accessed 11 Mar. 2017.
- Lacey, A., & Ilcan, Suzan. (2006). Voluntary Labor, Responsible Citizenship, and International NGO's. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 47(1), 34-53.
- Le Bruyns, Clint. (2012). The Church, Democracy, and Responsible Citizenship. *Religion and Theology*, 19, 60-73.
- Oliver, John. "Fashion: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver (HBO)." *YouTube*, YouTube, 26 Apr. 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=VdLf4fihP78&t=3s. Accessed 11 Mar. 2017.
- Pathak, Pathik (2014). Ethopolitics and the financial citizen. *The Sociological Review*, Vol 62,

90116.

Power F. Clark, Scott Sarah E., (2014). Democratic citizenship: Responsible life in a free society. *School Psychology International*, Vol 35(1), 50-66.

Prinsloo, P., Beukes C. & De Jongh, D. (2006). Corporate citizenship education for responsible business leaders. *Development Southern Africa*. Vol. 23, No. 2, June, 197-211.

Salehi S., Pazuki Z., Mahmoudi H., & Knierim A. (March 2015). Gender, responsible citizenship and global climate change. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 50, 30-36.

Singer, Tania., *New Economic Thinking*. "Intersections of Psychology and Economics." *YouTube*, YouTube, 12 Sept. 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=RrXoEMTB1SY. Accessed 13 Mar. 2017.

Shamir, Ronen (February 2008). The age of responsabilization: on market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society*, Vol 37(1), 1-19.

Sharon, Tamar (October 2014). Healthy citizenship beyond autonomy and discipline: tactical engagements with genetic testing. *BioSocieties*, Vol 10, 3, 295-316.

Snyder, Rachel Louise. "Afterword." *Fugitive Denim: a Moving Story of People and Pants in the Borderless World of Global Trade*, 1st ed., W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 2008, pp. 321-333.

Appendix A

Survey

1. How old are you?

2. What is/are your gender identification(s)?

3. What race do you identify with? Please mark all responses that apply

White

Black or African American

American Indian or Alaskan Native

Asian

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Hispanic

A race or races not listed

4. What is/are your intended major(s)/minor(s)?

5. Have you studied abroad? Where?

6. What countries have you travelled to?

7. Do you think your travel experiences have changed your perspectives on global problems like poverty, wealth inequality, and environmental degradation? How and why?

8. Do you take into consideration any of the following social practices when engaging/buying from a company or business: Check all that apply.

- Its environmental footprint: where and how it gets its resources, how it disposes of its waste, taking into account environmental sustainability in its production process
- A work environment that take into account the physical, emotional, or psychological well-being of its workers
- Its impact on the economy of the communities it operates in: the amount and quality of jobs/economic opportunities it provides for people in the community
- Partners with NGO's, charities, or has its own programs to help address social issues (poverty, health issues, education, environmental sustainability)

9. Do you feel more inclined to support businesses that take into consideration the practices mentioned in the previous question, and shape themselves in a "socially responsible way"?

- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

10. Companies should consider the socially responsible practices mentioned above as priorities, and balance them with traditional business goals (ex: maximizing profits)

- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Other (please specify)

11. Your consumer choices have an impact on social issues such as poverty, health issues, financial instability and debt, and environmental degradation

- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Other (please specify)

12. Leaving aside the impact of consumer choices, do you believe that there are other ways in which changing your personal behavior can help address the social issues mentioned in the previous question? Why?

13. Did this presentation change how you think about the choices you make as a consumer? Why?

14. Did this presentation change the way you think about the responsibility that people have regarding the impact of their actions on the rest of society? Why?

15. Before this presentation, when did you think about the relationship between consumer decisions and social issues?

- Every time I made a purchase
- Most of the times I made a purchase
- Only when I was purchasing from companies that advertised this relationship
- Never

Other (please specify)

16. Do you think you will take into consideration the relationship between consumer/individual decisions and social issues next time you make a purchase?

- Every time I make a purchase
- The majority of times I make a purchase
- Only when buying from products that advertise this relationship
- Never
- Other (please specify)

Appendix B – Presentation Script

Good morning, my name is Ricardo Morales, and I am conducting research for my Honors Thesis. Before starting, I will hand out a consent form which I need you to read, and sign if you agree on participating in this study. Participation is completely optional; if you read the consent form and decide that you do not want to participate, that is absolutely fine. You also may opt out of the experiment at any moment if you wish to do so.

(Hand out consent forms. Give participants time to read and sign the form)

Thank you for deciding to participate in this research project, let me give you a brief explanation of what it consists of. This study is concerned with the relation between social responsibility and individual behavior, particularly regarding consumer choices of clothing items.

Omit for Control Group – You will be shown a series of vignettes with information about the clothing industry, which will be followed by a survey with questions about consumer choices. If you have any questions regarding the vignettes, I would like you to write them down and bring them up after the surveys.

Only for Personalization – To get started, I want you to take a moment and look at the clothes you are wearing right now. I want you to look at the tags and see where these clothing items came from. Also, look at what brands you and the rest of the people in this room are wearing. Think about where you got these and the rest of the clothes you own from.

(Give participants a moment to look at their clothes)

Omit for Control Group – Now we will proceed to the vignettes, which will consist of a series of videos about the clothing industry and consumer choices.

(Show them vignettes)

Thank you for your attention. I will pass out some surveys for you to fill out.

(Pass out surveys. Collect Surveys)

Thank you for filling those out. To conclude, I will pass out a debriefing form and answer any questions you have regarding the experiment.

(Pass out debriefing forms. Questions and answers)

My contact information is on the debriefing form in case you are interested in knowing more about the experiment or this topic in the future. Thank you for your participation.

Appendix C

CONSENT FORM

Purpose of the research: This study is concerned with the promotion of social responsibility in individual behavior, particularly regarding consumer choices of clothing items.

What you will do in this experiment: You will be shown materials with information about the garment manufacturing industry, which will be followed by a survey about consumer choices.

Time required: 20 minutes.

Only for personalization – Risks: There is a New York Times video about the 2013 Rana Plaza building collapse, which contains images that some viewers might find disturbing.

Benefits:

This study will give you an idea of the topics you have an opportunity to study if you choose to do an independent study. You will also have a better understanding of consumer social responsibility. In addition, at the end of the experiment, I will provide an explanation of the experiment and its hypothesis.

Confidentiality:

Your participation in this research will remain confidential. The surveys are anonymous, and will be analyzed only by the principal investigator of this project.

Participation and withdrawal:

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable answering any questions during the survey, you may skip them. Also, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If you decide to withdraw, inform the experimenter that you no longer wish to participate (no questions will be asked).

Contact:

If you have questions about this study, please contact Ricardo Morales at rgmoralesvivero@noctrl.edu. If you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this experiment, please contact the faculty supervisor of the study Dr. William Muck at wjmuck@noctrl.edu.

Agreement:

The purpose and nature of this research have been sufficiently explained and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time without incurring any penalty. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name (print):

Appendix D

Debriefing

Thank you for participating in my study! This project is being conducted as part of the research for a College Scholars Honor Thesis.

This study is concerned with the promotion of social responsibility in individual behavior, particularly consumer choices. Previous studies have identified a method of promoting ethical consumer behavior, the PACT routine.

In this study, you were presented with materials that replicate variables extracted from the PACT routine, 1) personalization and 2) authorization, to gauge if either variable alters your behavior. Personalization is the connection between an individual's behavior and the social issue. Authorization is the professional evidence used to legitimize this claim.

Based on previous research, I expect personalization and authorization together to have the greatest impact on respondents, but personalization by itself to have a greater impact than authorization alone. I expect this outcome because of the connection that exists between compassion and social responsibility. I expect personalization to connect to a greater degree with the sense of compassion in individuals than authorization alone, which in turn would make them more likely to adopt socially responsible behaviors.

If you know of any friends or acquaintances that are eligible to participate in this study, we request that you not discuss it with them until after they have had the opportunity to participate. Prior knowledge of questions asked during the study can invalidate the results. We greatly appreciate your cooperation.

If you would like to receive a summary of the results at the end of the term, please contact Ricardo Morales at rgmoralesvivero@noctrl.edu. If you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this experiment, please contact the faculty supervisor of the study Dr. William Muck at wjmuck@noctrl.edu.

If you are interested in learning more about methods of individual responsabilization you may want to consult:

Giesler, M., Veresiu, E. (October 2014). Creating the Responsible Consumer: Moralistic Governance Regimes and Consumer Subjectivity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41, 840-857.

Thank you for your participation!

Responsible Consumption

1. Look at where products are manufactured
2. Buy sustainably, locally, or DIY
3. Know the supply chain policy of brands
4. Campaign for worker's rights
5. Consume less



Source: Global Citizen

<https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/how-to-be-a-responsible-consumer/>



“But the truth is that factories generally don’t abuse workers because they don’t know better, or because they are immune to human suffering. Factories generally abuse workers because they feel they have no choice. Because they feel pressure from buyers, who in turn complain of pressure from consumers. Or because they live in a world of insecurities, a world with no rule of law or respect for human rights.” (325)

—Rachel Louise Snyder, author of *Fugitive Denim*

Abbott, Ryan Stevens, Carl (2014). Redefining Medical Necessity: A Consumer-Driven Solution To The U.S. Health Care Crisis, 47 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 943-965

- Abbott and Stevens argue that a consumer-driven approach can decrease unnecessary costs and medical waste in the U.S health care system.
- Shamir, Ronen (February 2008). The age of responsabilization: on market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society*, Vol 37(1), 1-19.
- The idea of social responsibility as a business asset is important because it provides an incentive of self-interest for corporations to pursue socio-moral obligations.

Appendix F – Question 15 Data:

Group	Disposition	Gender	Studied Abroad	Intl. Travel	Race
P & A (Personalization and authorization)	Positive 23%	Female 57% Male 43%	43%	72%	White 72% Asian 14% Hispanic 14%
	Neutral/ Negative 77%	Female 43% Male 57%	4%	52%	White 82% Black 9% Hispanic 9%
Personalization	Positive 39%	Female 80% Male 20%	20%	100%	White 83% Asian 17%
	Neutral or Negative 61%	Female 62% Male 38% (Including 1 Transgender male)	25%	50%	White 60% Black 20% Hispanic 10% Race not listed 10%
Authorization	Positive 33%	Female 67% Male 33%	17%	67%	White 100%
	Neutral/ Negative 67%	Female 75% Male 25%	17%	50%	White 83% Black 17%
Control Group	Positive 31%	Female 50% Male 50%	25%	100%	White 63% Asian 12% Hispanic 25%
	Neutral/ Negative 69%	Female 67% Male 33%	28%	94%	White 80% Black 10% Asian 5% Hispanic 5%
Overall	Positive 30%	Female 62% Male 38%	27%	85%	White 78% Asian 11% Hispanic 11%
	Neutral/ Negative 70%	Female 59% Male 41%	16%	64%	White 78% Black 12% Asian 2% Hispanic 6% Race not listed 2%

Appendix G – Question 16 Data:

Group	Disposition	Gender	Studied Abroad	Intl. Travel	Race
P & A (Personalization and authorization)	Positive 76%	Female 57% Male 43%	21%	47%	White 85% Asian 5% Hispanic 10%
	Neutral/ Negative 24%	Female 13% Male 87%	0%	57%	White 75% Black 12.5% Hispanic 12.5%
Personalization	Positive 69%	Female 78% Male 22%	22%	78%	White 67% Black 17% Asian 8% Race not listed 8%
	Neutral/ Negative 31%	Female 50% Male 50% (Including 1 Transgender male)	25%	75%	White 75% Hispanic 25%
Authorization	Positive 76%	Female 69% Male 31%	8%	38%	White 92% Black 8%
	Neutral/ Negative 24%	Female 75% Male 25%	25%	100%	White 75% Black 25%
Control Group	Positive 77%	Female 65% Male 35%	35%	100%	White 80% Black 5% Asian 5% Hispanic 10%
	Neutral/ Negative 23%	Female 33% Male 67%	0%	83%	White 57% Black 14.3% Asian 14.3% Hispanic 14.3%
Overall	Positive 74%	Female 65% Male 35%	30%	68%	White 82% Black 6% Asian 4% Hispanic 6% Race not listed 2%
	Neutral/ Negative 26%	Female 36% Male 64%	9%	72%	White 70% Black 13% Asian 4% Hispanic 13%

Appendix H – Change in percentages from questions 15 to 16:

Group	Disposition	Gender	Studied Abroad	Intl. Travel	Race
P & A (Personalization and authorization)	Positive +53%	Female 0% Male 0%	-22%	-25%	White +13% Asian -9% Hispanic -4%
	Neutral/ Negative -53%	Female -30% Male +30%	-4%	+5%	White -7% Black +3.5% Hispanic +3.5%
Personalization	Positive +30%	Female -2% Male +2%	+2%	-22%	White -16% Black +17% Asian -9% Race not listed +8%
	Neutral/ Negative -30%	Female -12% Male +12% (Including 1 Transgender male)	0%	+25%	White +15% Black -20% Hispanic +15% Race not listed -10%
Authorization	Positive 43%	Female +2% Male -2%	-9%	-29%	White -8% Black +8%
	Neutral/ Negative -43%	Female 0% Male 0%	+8%	+50%	White -8% Black +8%
Control Group	Positive +46%	Female +15% Male -15%	+10%	0%	White +17% Black +5% Asian -5% Hispanic -15%
	Neutral/ Negative -46%	Female -34% Male +34%	-28%	-9%	White -23% Black +4.3% Asian +9.3% Hispanic +9.3%
Overall	Positive +44%	Female +3% Male -3%	+3%	-17%	White +4% Black +6% Asian -7% Hispanic -5% Race not listed +2%
	Neutral/ Negative -44%	Female -23% Male +23%	-7%	+8%	White -8% Black +1% Asian +2% Hispanic +7%

Appendix I – Positive and Neutral/Negative responses for questions 9, 10 and 11:

Group	Disposition Q9	Disposition Q10	Disposition Q11
P & A (Personalization and authorization)	Positive 90%	Positive 93%	Positive 87%
	Neutral/Negative 10%	Neutral/Negative 7%	Neutral/Negative 13%
Personalization	Positive 92%	Positive 92%	Positive 100%
	Neutral/Negative 8%	Neutral/Negative 8%	Neutral/Negative 0%
Authorization	Positive 100%	Positive 95%	Positive 95%
	Neutral/Negative 0%	Neutral/Negative 5%	Neutral/Negative 5%
Control Group	Positive 81%	Positive 90%	Positive 91%
	Neutral/Negative 19%	Neutral/Negative 10%	Neutral/Negative 9%
Overall	Positive 94%	Positive 93%	Positive 92%
	Neutral/Negative 6%	Neutral/Negative 7%	Neutral/Negative 8%