



Content is available at: CRDEEP Journals
 Journal homepage: <http://www.crdeepjournal.org/category/journals/ijrem/>

**International Journal of Research in
 Engineering and Management (ISSN: 2456-1029)**
 A Peer Reviewed UGC Approved Quarterly Journal



SJIF: 3.39

Research Paper

A Study on Perceptual Difference on Green Marketing With Respect To the Gender

Dr E.M. Naresh Babu^{*1}, Dr Santosh Kumar. G² and Prof D Hemalatha³,

1-Professor, ABBS School of Management, Bangalore

2-Associate Professor, ABBS School of Management, Bangalore

3-Associate Professor, Oxbridge Business School, Bangalore

ARTICLE DETAILS

Corresponding Author:

Dr. E.M Naresh Babu

Key words:

Green Marketing,
 Hazardous material,
 Human needs,
 Substandard products
 and Sustainability

ABSTRACT

Need is the driving force of human existence, at every stage people are driven by some set of needs and to fulfil those needs, they do different activities. Products and services will fulfil the needs of human beings. In this context companies started taking advantage of this situation and produced products and standards without proper standards, also the companies started exploiting the nature. The activities such as harming the nature by cutting the trees, having no proper disposal of hazardous material, un-hygiene products, Substandard products, and improper package etc., To safeguard the climate and customers, some companies started the concept of Environmental Marketing and Green Marketing where healthy and safety products were produced by taking necessary precautions not to spoil the environment. This resulted not only in damaging the environment but also the health and trust of the customers. In addition to that earlier most of the companies focused mostly on profit making. To maintain some standards, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were framed which focused on 8 goals and financial growth has been given more importance. Later United Nations Organization (UNO) framed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with 17 goals where Environmental protection, Societal importance and Governance related activities have been given utmost priority. This has led to the concept of PPP-People, Profit and Planet, which has become the priorities on Green Marketing. The present research work focuses on the perceptions of 67 respondents on Green Marketing and found that in majority of the cases, both male and female have same perceptions with respect to the extra payment for eco-friendly products, information sources of sustainability, but in only one case i.e. the belief that Green Marketing will lead to sustainability differs with respect to gender at 0.05 significance level.

1. Introduction

Human needs are arranged in hierarchies of predominance and one set of needs will arouse after satisfaction of the other set of needs (Maslow,1958). In the process of fulfilling the needs, people started using the natural resources in multiple ways. As the resources are limited and the people’s needs/wants/expectations are unlimited, the resources started erosion which started damaging the environment. Then people started thinking of safeguarding the nature otherwise there would be danged to their existence. In 1960s, the consideration of certain aspects such as making of the products, usage of products and disposing of products have been done, till that time these aspects were assumed to be addressed by the governments because governments were collecting the taxes. Socio-environmental issues were considered very first time by the people. In 1970s, Production and consumption activities became recognised as marketing issues due to socio-environmental implications (Fisk 1974), which has led to the rise of societal marketing also the emergence of macro-marketing as aclear subject dealing with

^{*} Author can be contacted at: *Professor, ABBS School of Management, Bangalore*

Received: 11-02-2025; Sent for Review on: 16-02-2025; Draft sent to Author for corrections: 22-02-2025; Accepted on: 28-02-2025; Online Available from 03-03-2025

DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.2.28276.87682](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28276.87682)

IJREM-81223/© 2025 CRDEEP Journals. All Rights Reserved.

the collective consequences of marketing activity and the relationship between the discipline and society. This can be considered as starting points of evolution of Green Marketing agenda (Peattie, 2001). The concept of Ecological Marketing has emerged due to environmental incidents such as DDT issues and certain oils (Henion & Kinnear 1976). Green marketing refers to the promotion of environmentally friendly products, practices, and brand values. It emerged in the late 1980s in response to growing environmental concerns, with the first wave of interest linked to public awareness about environmental degradation and corporate responsibility (Polonsky, 1994). Now-a-days the companies are increasingly incorporating sustainability into product design. Eco-friendly materials, energy-efficient products, and biodegradable packaging are central elements (Ottman, 2011). Studies indicate that green branding enhances customer loyalty, provided the marketing claims are credible and transparent. However, the risk of greenwashing—where companies falsely claim eco-friendly practices—remains a concern (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). Consumers are becoming more environmentally conscious. In spite of that, often a gap between environmental concern and actual purchasing behaviour, known as the attitude-behaviour gap (Peattie, 2001). In a country like India, people use the eco-friendly products due to the below reasons such as Price Sensitivity and Social Influence.

Price Sensitivity: Green products often carry a premium price, which can deter consumers (D'Souza et al., 2007).

Social Influence: Peer pressure and cultural norms play significant roles in encouraging sustainable consumption (Jackson, 2005).

Objectives of the study

- ✘ To understand the perceptual difference between male and female respondents in terms of Green Marketing contribution to Sustainability
- ✘ To analyze how many customers are willing to pay extra for eco-friendly products
- ✘ To understand the sources of information regarding the sustainability to the consumers

2. Review of Literature

The inter-connected nature of any core business activities such as Marketing, Human Resources, Operations and Strategy are very important in sustainability management which affects the stakeholders (Cronin et al., 2011). Younger generations (Millennials and Gen Z) are more inclined towards sustainable products compared to older demographics (Smith, 2010). Several studies suggest that sustainable practices can lead to long-term profitability. Companies with robust CSR and green marketing strategies often outperform competitors financially due to enhanced brand loyalty and operational efficiencies (Orlitzky et al., 2003). Sustainability initiatives contribute significantly to corporate reputation, influencing investor decisions and stakeholder relationships (Porter & Kramer, 2011). A significant body of literature critiques companies for misleading marketing practices. Greenwashing can undermine consumer trust and the effectiveness of genuine sustainability efforts (TerraChoice, 2010). There is a need for stricter regulations and standardized eco-labeling to ensure consistency and authenticity in green claims (Chen & Chang, 2013). Emerging technologies, such as blockchain, could enhance transparency in sustainability claims. Digital platforms play an essential role in educating consumers and promoting sustainable choices (Kumar et al., 2021). Balancing profit, people, and the planet (Elkington, 1998). Companies must consider environmental and social stakeholders in decision-making (Freeman, 1984).

3. Methodology

To fulfill the needs of human beings, we should have natural resources, but there are some companies and practices which are harming the nature, if we don't avoid the practices which are harming the environment and nature, the survival of human beings will be in trouble. Hence there is a serious necessity to understand how of many of us are aware of Green Marketing concept, how many are concerned about eco-friendly products and also how many are willing to pay extra to safeguard the environment by purchasing eco-friendly products. The scope of the study is limited to respondents in Bangalore.

3.1 Sample and Data Collection

A structured questionnaire of 17 questions have been designed and shared among 70 respondents, out of which 67 responses were found to be valid as they have filled all the questions completely, remaining sample has been discarded as the respondents have not filled the questions completely. Convenience sampling has been used to collect the data. SPSS has been used to analyze the collected data, for the descriptive analysis, percentage analysis has been used and for inferential statistics, chi-square (χ^2) has been used. All the hypotheses have been tested at 0.05 significance level.

4. Results and Discussion

A Structured questionnaire with 17 questions has been created and shared among various customers and received 70 responses, wherein 3 responses have been discarded due to incompleteness of the responses, so finally 67 responses have been considered for the purpose of analysis. Table 1 shows the Reliability analysis of data

Data Reliability

Table 1: Reliability Analysis with Cronbach’s Alpha

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.872	7

In terms of Reliability, Cronbach’s Alpha is found to be 0.872, which shows the data collected satisfies the requirement measure of Reliability and the number of items considered for the test of reliability is 7 which are trying to check the perception of male and female responses with respect to the Green Marketing and Sustainability.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the respondents

	Responses	Percentage
Age of respondents		
15-24 years	58	86.6
25-34 years	7	10.4
35-44 years	1	1.5
45-54 years	1	1.5
Gender		
Male	54	80.6
Female	13	19.4
Education completed		
Intermediate/PUC	1	1.5
Post Graduate	52	77.6
Under Graduation	13	19.4
Others	1	1.5
Occupation		
Employee	2	3.0
Students	65	97.0
Which aspect refers to Green Marketing		
Corporate Social Responsibility	2	3.0
Energy Efficiency	2	3.0
Environmental Friendly	58	86.6
Ethical sourcing	3	4.5
Sustainable packaging	2	3.0
Information source of Green Marketing		
Company Websites	6	9.0
Friends/Family	4	6.0
Newspapers/Magazines	7	10.4
Social Media	50	74.6
How often you check eco-friendly nature while making purchase		
Never	1	1.5
Rarely	12	17.9
Sometimes	35	52.2
Often	15	22.4
Always	4	6.0
Will you pay more for eco-friendly products		
No	9	13.4
May be	41	61.2
Yes	17	25.4
Belief over Green Marketing contributes to Sustainability		
Strongly disagree	1	1.5
Neutral	14	20.9
Agree	33	49.3
Strongly Agree	19	28.4

Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant difference on paying extra for ecofriendly products with respect to gender

H_{a1}: There is a significant difference on paying extra for ecofriendly products with respect to gender

- H₀₂: There is no significant difference on paying extra for ecofriendly products with respect to age
- H_{a2}: There is a significant difference on paying extra for ecofriendly products with respect to age
- H₀₃: There is no significant difference on perception related to Green marketing contribution to Sustainability with respect to gender
- H_{a3}: There is a significant difference on perception related to Green marketing contribution to Sustainability with respect to gender
- H₀₄: There is no significant difference on checking of eco-friendly nature of products with respect to gender
- H_{a4}: There is a significant difference on checking of eco-friendly nature of products with respect to gender
- H₀₅: There is no significant difference on information source of sustainability with respect to gender
- H_{a5}: There is a significant difference on information source of sustainability with respect to gender

Table 3: Observations for Hypothesis testing

	Case Processing Summary					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Gender * Will you pay more for eco friendly products	67	100%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%
Age * Will you pay more for eco friendly products	67	100%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%
Gender * Do you believe Green Marketing contributes to Sustainability	67	100%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%
Gender * How often you check eco friendly products while purchasing	67	100%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%
Gender * Will you check every time for eco-friendly products before making a purchase	67	100%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%
Gender * From Where you usually hear about Green Marketing	67	100%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%

Table 4: χ^2 table showing Gender wise willingness to pay more for eco-friendly products

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.599 ^a	2	.741
Likelihood Ratio	.651	2	.722
N of Valid Cases	67		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.75.

Table 4 contains the gender-wise data and analysis to check is there any difference in opinion of respondents for making extra payment for eco-friendly and sustainable products with respect to the gender, and it is found that there is no significant difference in the opinion at 5% significant level as the significance has come at 0.741. Here we fail to reject the Null Hypothesis H₀₁

Table 5: χ^2 table showing Age wise willingness to pay more for eco-friendly products Interpretation:

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.393 ^a	6	.381
Likelihood Ratio	6.055	6	.417
N of Valid Cases	67		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .13.

Table 5 shows the responses related to age-wise responses related to more payment for the eco-friendly products, and it is found that there is no significant difference in the opinion of male and female with this regard at 0.05 significance level as the χ^2 Statistic is found to be 6.393 which is less than the χ^2 Critical value 12.59, so we fail to reject the Null Hypothesis H₀₂ at 0.05 significance level which means there is no significant difference in the opinion of male and female in terms of extra payment for the eco-friendly products.

Table 6: χ^2 table showing Gender wise belief on Green Marketing contribution towards Sustainability

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.764 ^a	3	.048**

Likelihood Ratio	7.265	3	.064
N of Valid Cases	67		
a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.			

Table 6 shows the responses related to gender-wise belief on Green Marketing contribution towards sustainability and as the significance value is 0.048, we reject the Null Hypothesis H_{03} at 0.05 significance level which means there is a significant difference in the opinion of male and female in terms of that belief.

Table 7: χ^2 table showing Gender wise opinion on checking the products for eco-friendly nature before purchasing

	Chi-Square Tests		
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.237 ^a	4	.519
Likelihood Ratio	3.382	4	.496
N of Valid Cases	67		
a. 6 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.			

Table 7 shows the responses related to gender-wise opinion on checking the products for the eco-friendly nature before making the purchase and the results shows that at 0.05 significance level, as the value is found to be 0.519, we fail to reject the Null Hypothesis H_{04} , which shows that there is no significance difference in the opinion on checking the products for eco-friendly nature before the customers make a purchase decision.

Table 8: χ^2 table showing Gender wise opinion on source of information about Green Marketing

	Chi-Square Tests		
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.941 ^a	3	.401
Likelihood Ratio	2.497	3	.476
N of Valid Cases	67		
a. 5 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .78.			

Table 8 contains the gender-wise data on information source of Green Marketing and the results have shown that there is no significant difference in the information sources with respect to the male and female. At 5% significant level for the Hypothesis H_{05} , as the significance value is 0.401, we fail to reject the Null Hypothesis H_{05}

Table 9: χ^2 table showing Hypotheses testing results

	DOF	χ^2 Statistic	Pearson χ^2 Significance	χ^2 Critical	Cramer's V	Decision
Gender wise willingness to pay more for eco-friendly products	2	0.599	0.741	5.99	0.741	Fail to Reject the Null Hypothesis
Age wise willingness to pay more for eco-friendly products	6	6.393	0.381	12.59	0.381	Fail to reject the Null Hypothesis
Gender wise belief on Green Marketing contribution towards Sustainability	3	7.764	0.048**	7.52	0.048**	Reject the Null Hypothesis
Gender wise opinion on checking the products for eco-friendly nature before purchasing	4	3.237	0.519	9.49	0.519	Fail to reject the Null Hypothesis
Gender wise opinion on source of information about Green Marketing	3	2.941	0.401	7.52	0.401	Fail to reject the Null Hypothesis

5. Conclusion

From the analysis, it is found that majority of respondents are concerned about the Environment, Society and Sustainability. But few respondents have shown willingness to spend extra for purchasing eco-friendly products. A good amount of respondents is feeling that Green Marketing will contribute significantly to Sustainability. It is also found that very few

customers are checking every time the eco-friendly nature of products before they make a purchase. In spite of education and awareness, people are not spending considerable time while making the purchase choices especially related to eco-friendly in nature. Majority of respondents are getting the information related to sustainability from social media. If every customer and company considers the concept "Live and Let Live", then we can live in a better world. Protecting the nature is in the hands of present generation, then only the future generation can have healthy and pleasant life.

Limitations and Future scope of the study

The sample considered for the study is very small, and the geographic location is also very small. There is a wide scope to enhance the sample size and geographic location to collect more data which makes not only good research but also promotes the concept of sustainability to all sections of the people.

References

- Baker, M. J., & Hart, S. J. (Eds.). (2003). *The marketing book* (Vol. 195). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Chang, C. H., & Chen, Y. S. (2013). Green organizational identity and green innovation. *Management Decision*, 51(5), 1056-1070.
- Cronin, J. J., Smith, J. S., Gleim, M. R., Ramirez, E., & Martinez, J. D. (2011). Green marketing strategies: an examination of stakeholders and the opportunities they present. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39, 158-174.
- Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The Drivers of Greenwashing. *California Management Review*.
- D'Souza, C., Taghian, M., Lamb, P., & Peretiatko, R. (2007). Green decisions: demographics and consumer understanding of environmental labels. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(4), 371-376.
- Elkington, J. (1998). *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*.
- Elkington, J., & Fennell, S. (1998). Partners for sustainability. *Greener Management International*, (24).
- Fisk, G. (1974), *Marketing and the Ecological Crisis*, New York: Harper & Row
- Freeman, R. B. (1984). Longitudinal analyses of the effects of trade unions. *Journal of labor Economics*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Henion, K. E. and Kinnear, T. C. (1976), *Ecological Marketing*, Chicago, IL: AMA.
- Jackson, T. (2005). Live better by consuming less?: is there a "double dividend" in sustainable consumption?. *Journal of industrial ecology*, 9(1-2), 19-36.
- Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. (2011). *Creating shared value* (Vol. 17). Boston, MA, USA: FSG.
- Kumar, A., & Nayar, K. R. (2021). COVID 19 and its mental health consequences. *Journal of Mental Health*, 30(1), 1-2.
- Maslow, A. H. (1958). *A Dynamic Theory of Human Motivation*.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization studies*, 24(3), 403-441.
- Peattie, K. (2001). Golden Goose or Wild Goose? The Hunt for the Green Consumer. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Peattie, K. (2001), 'Towards sustainability: The third age of green marketing', *The Marketing Review*, 2(2): 129-146.
- Polonsky, M. J. (1994). An Introduction to Green Marketing. *Electronic Green Journal*.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). *Creating Shared Value*. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Peattie, K. (2016). Green marketing. In *The marketing book* (pp. 573-597). Routledge.
- Wahba, M. A., & Bridwell, L. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 15(2), 212-240.