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Consumers voluntarily take action in socially responsibility behavior only if they perceive the firm’s efforts to conduct the activities toward corporate social responsibility (CSR). This study seeks to examine the direct influence of CSR on consumer socially sustainable consumption which has been neglected in prior studies. The findings indicate that the ethical and legal dimension of CSR is a stronger predictor of socially sustainable consumption than the philanthropic expectations dimension. Perceived value and brand loyalty also play significant mediating roles between CSR and socially sustainable consumption. Finally, some theoretical and managerial contributions in the field of marketing and management are discussed.
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1 Introduction

In the competitive consumer market, products’ quality and price are no longer core competitive advantages. Bussey (2006) mentioned that a driver for consumer choice tends to include a product’s innovation, ethical standpoint, and social behavior, but not quality and price. For example, Webb et al. (2008) indicated that a...
large number of consumers have the willingness to be activists and to not support companies that behave irresponsibly by switching brands. Consumers would avoid purchasing products linked to sweatshops, environmental pollution, natural species destruction, and immoral/illegal advertising practices; thus, such real or perceived practices adversely affecting consumer behavior could cause damage to sales revenues, as well as harm the companies’ long-term reputations (Brunk, 2010). Thus, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has attracted attention in the field of marketing ethics and consumer behavior research.

CSR has been aptly defined as a business need for responsibility to their employees and consumers, and to ecology and society, including production safety, occupational health, resource efficiency, environmental protection, etc. (Caruana and Chatzidakis, 2014). CSR is a popular element of corporate marketing strategies and is an influential factor that might drive consumers to act more socially responsible (Green and Peloza, 2011). It is possible that a poor ethical image of a firm might negatively impact consumers’ attitudes and perceived reputation, which in turn results in a lower level of ethical feedback (Dennis, 2007). Luo and Bhattacharya (2006) indicated that a store’s profits and its customer relationship retention are the ultimate goals for promoting CSR activities. Additionally, from the resource-based perspective, CSR could be viewed as social capital and then contribute intangible outcomes, including corporate reputation and customer value (Grohmann and Bodur, 2014; Orlitzky et al., 2003). While the consumer is a main participant in the commercial exchange process, corporations must consider consumers’ perspectives toward a firm’s CSR activities that would improve brand value; thus, positive relations and friendly consumption behaviors can be actualized in order to implement a complete, successful marketing strategy (Al-Khatib et al., 2005). Yet it is essential to evaluate the perceived CSR and consumer socially sustainable consumption, which refers to a consumer’s desire to minimize harmful effects on the environment or society (Jaiswal, 2012); exploration of these factors in concert is still limited in spite of its recent proliferation (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004).

In the field of consumer socially sustainable consumption, prior studies have centered on the identification of consumer motivations and the effects of cognitive/motive factors on consumer attitudes/behaviors (Liu et al., 2016). Most
research has stated that the influential factors of consumer socially sustainable consumption behaviors include demographic variables (Wang et al., 2014), consumer values, attitudes, consumption structure, and specific consumption culture (Liu et al., 2016). The impacts of environmental knowledge and environmental concern on consumer socially sustainable consumption have also been proven (Panzone et al., 2016). However, few studies examined how CSR activities influence consumers’ ethical behaviors with the willingness to buy the product involving social responsibility and environmental protection. Based on these, this study seeks to consider the impacts of different types of CSR activities on consumers’ behaviors, and the mediating effects of perceived value and brand loyalty.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Consumer Socially Sustainable Consumption

The context of socially sustainable consumption involves a broad and vast nature of forms and meanings. This area of inquiry can refer to the terminology of green marketing, environmental marketing, ecological marketing, or sustainable marketing. The concept of socially sustainable consumption is defined as involving consumers who are willing to buy ecologically friendly products whose contents and methods of production have a positive (or less negative) impact on the environment (Jaiswal, 2012) or who patronize businesses that attempt to effect positive social change (Roberts, 1993). Similarly, Mohr et al. (2001) used the societal marketing concept submitted by Kotler (2000) and defined sustainable consumer as “a person basing his or her acquisition, usage, and disposition of products on a desire to minimize or eliminate any harmful effects and maximize the long-run beneficial impact on society” (p. 47). Indeed, consumers’ post choice behaviors, including product usage, product life extension, and disposal, all have a significant impact on the sustainability of consumption (Pieters, 1991). Thus, purchasing products made by corporations considering CSR, recycling, and environmental factors in marketing practices (such as product and package design, green advertising, and marketing strategies) are all associated with the activities of
socially sustainable consumption (Webb et al., 2008).

2.2 Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

CSR is a vital corporate obligation that refers to “policies and practices of corporations that reflect business responsibility for some of the wider societal good” (Matten and Moon, 2008, p. 405). Companies must enter into a social agreement that obligates them to consider social benefits before making a business decision. Many researchers have stated that numerous different conceptualizations of CSR range from a narrow viewpoint to a wide multi-dimensional perspective. A limited viewpoint, the perspective of stakeholder obligation, suggests that the businesses are just responsible for those who are directly or indirectly influenced by the firm’s activities, but not toward society as a whole (Clarkson, 1995). Based on the stakeholder management theory, CSR is considered the recognition of generating profit for the shareholders (including customers, employees, community, etc.) while firms make efforts to protect the environment and to improve the quality of life for those the firm is interacting with (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004; Maignan et al., 2005). That is, maximum profit (i.e., financial performance) is the most important element over others in the perspective of stakeholder obligation. On the other hand, a number of scholars do not agree with this conception and consider ethics as a foundation of CSR (Maignan and Ferrell, 2004). Ethics determines what values and norms should apply in management or marketing issues and decisions. Businesses should maintain appropriate ethical standards in making the related business decisions for satisfying the obligation of CSR.

A multi-dimensional structure which views CSR as a social obligation focused on reaching the maximum of the objectives and benefits for society is adapted by many authors. Carroll (1979, 1991) suggested that a firm’s social responsibility can be distinguished into the following four dimensions: economics, legal, ethical, and philanthropic expectations. The economic dimension refers to the obligation to be productive, profitable, and maintain economic wealth, while the legal dimension focuses on corporate activities remaining within the confines of legal stipulations. Considering ethical codes and social norms beyond mere legal conditions as well as being honest with a firm’s customers and employees belongs to the dimension of
ethical responsibility. In addition, the dimension of discretionary expectations refers to aiming to proactively giving back to the well-being and development of society (de los Salmones et al., 2005).

2.3 Perceived Value

As defined by Zeithaml (1988), perceived value represents consumers overall assessment of the utility of a product based upon their perceptions of what is received and what is given. In brief, it is a trade-off between what customers receive and what they sacrifice (Gounaris et al., 2007). The former refers to the benefits which buyers acquire from a seller’s offering, such as products or services (Zeithaml, 1988). The later translates to the costs that buyers pay for acquiring the offering, including monetary (i.e., the advertised sale price, the advertised reference price, and the price of shipping and handling) and nonmonetary costs (i.e., the time, effort, and actual costs involved in the search, evaluation of products, or purchase decision making) (Zeithaml, 1988). Thence, perceived value can be enhanced by either adding benefits to the product/service or by reducing the outlays associated with the purchase and use of the product/service.

Based on the means-end theory, individuals with different values, needs, preferences, and financial abilities hold different perceptions of what a product offers (Gutman, 1991). As such, Woodruff (1997) defined customer value as the customer’s preference for the product attributes, performance, and consequences that satisfy his/her own goals and purposes. Therefore, value is always conceived as an abstraction (Chiou, 2004) and a subjective notion (Gounaris et al., 2007).

Following the above, perceived value suggests the perceived net gains associated with the products or services acquired by consumers’ subjective perceptions (Gounaris et al., 2007; Zeithaml, 1988). In literature, four dimensions of perceived value, acquisition value, transaction value, in-use value, and redemption value have been identified (Parasuraman and Grewal, 2000). Acquisition value is associated with the benefits gained by acquiring a product or service, while transaction value is the pleasure of getting a good deal. In-use value means the utility experienced from the actual use of the product. Redemption value involves other benefits at the moment of trade-in or end-of-life (Parasuraman and
Grewal, 2000). However, the current study focuses specifically on the transaction value because the ability to conduct price comparisons is regarded as the most significant advantage among socially sustainable consumption buyers (Vitell, 2015).

2.4 Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty is a concept of consumer behaviors for a particular brand which influences their buying choice and preference. The higher the brand loyalty, the more the behavioral intentions to purchase or repurchase the products of the brand (Dawes, 2014). Aaker (1991) divided brand loyalty into five levels of a pyramid. First of all is the switcher, a category of customers who are sensitive to price and are only concerned about discounts or sales. Such customers in this first level have no loyalty toward the brand (Aaker, 1991). The second level is the habitual buyer. Customers in this level get used to purchasing the particular brand and feel uneasy about buying the other brand products (Aaker, 1991). The third level is the satisfied buyer. In this case, customers really like the brand they bought and consider switching to another brand as an increase to their cost (Aaker, 1991). Finally, the fourth level states that customers are satisfied with the brand they bought and develop a positive affection to the brand. Buyers in the last level are the most valuable to businesses because they are proud of the specific brand’s product as well as voluntarily recommend this brand to their family and friends (Aaker, 1991). Brand loyalty therefore refers to those consumers with a favorable attitude toward the brand that are brand loyal and voluntarily behave positively such as by word-of-mouth and recommendation to others (Kwon et al., 2016). In addition, while this study seeks to examine the effect of consumer perception of CSR, the fourth level of how to improve consumer purchasing behaviors seems to be a suitable measurement.

3 Research Hypotheses

Creyer and Ross (1997) in the theory of social expectations suggest that consumers expect that a firm should maintain a specific ethical level. Consumers have positive
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and strong attitudes toward the specific product while they receive some benefits or values developed by the business. That is to say, consumers’ responses would be influenced by the specific enterprise’s efforts (such as CSR) (Deng, 2012). The idea that CSR is an ethical market practice and that it brings positive consequences to the business is proven (de los Salmones et al., 2005; Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006).

In previous studies, scholars indicated that there is a positive relationship between CSR and consumer response. Lacey and Kennett-Hensel (2010) suggested that CSR is one kind of aspect of a firm’s efforts to display its shared values that are consistent with goals, policies, and beliefs held by the exchange parties. Customers as potential various stakeholders not only care about the economic value (such as financial benefits), but also consider the overall standing of the company (such as social performance) (Maignan et al., 2005). Based on these, Dennis (2007) suggested that consumers’ attitudes toward CSR produce a halo effect in the sense that a firm’s social and ethical practices would affect consumers’ judgment of another related area. Valenzuela et al. (2010) stated that corporations with consumers perceiving them as employing ethical and social responsibility would have better customer relations. Therefore, if consumers perceive fairness in the actions of a firm, they would generate a positive value and reputation of a firm, which in turn influences their consumption (Fukukawa, 2002). Additionally, CSR enhancing consumers’ perceptions of the company (Lichtenstein et al., 2004; Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001) is proven. Social responsibility associations would be useful in strengthening the consumers’ union with the firm, which in turn increases the valuation of a firm (de los Salmones et al., 2005), overall quality (Brown and Dacin, 1997), brand identification (He and Li, 2011; Marin et al., 2009), brand loyalty (Singh et al., 2012), brand equity (Grohmann and Bodur, 2014; Hsu, 2012; Hur and Woo, 2014; Lai et al., 2010), company evaluation (Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001; Öberseder et al., 2014), customer-company identification (Grohmann and Bodur, 2014; Pérez and del Bosque, 2015), consumer trust (Deng, 2012; Lacey and Kennett-Hensel, 2010; Singh et al., 2012), satisfaction (Deng, 2012; He and Li, 2011; Pérez et al., 2013), commitment (Lacey and Kennett-Hensel, 2010), purchasing intention (Sen et al., 2006), and loyalty (de los Salmones et al., 2005; Marin et al., 2009). Therefore, if companies want to build true relationships with consumers for long-run performance, they must focus on legal and/or moral
activities and adopt them as a strategic element to define and promote their products/services.

Following the theme of customer-company identification (C-C identification, Bhattacharya and Sen, 2003), CSR composes a key element of corporate identity that can induce customers’ identification with the company. Identified customers are more likely to be satisfied with a firm’s offerings and then contribute benefits to the firm (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006). When consumers perceive companies to be socially responsible, they will be more likely to support that firm or store with which they associate by the C-C identification (Lichtenstein et al., 2004). Whereas a poor ethical image of a firm might negatively impact consumer perceived reputation, which in turn results in a lower level of ethical feedback (Dennis, 2007).

These suggestions are consistent with Vitell (2015) who indicated that consumers may engage in ethical consumption or socially responsible behaviors only if the effort of CSR is perceived. Fukukawa (2002) also built upon a general theory of consumer ethics to suggest the impact of the importance of consumer’s perceived unfairness toward the action or reputation of a firm on consumer ethical decision making. Becker-Olsen et al. (2006) considered that the firm’s proactive CSR activity can significantly increase consumers’ purchase intentions, including socially responsibility consumption. Therefore, this study suggests that if consumers perceive CSR for brand or corporation, they would have a positive response or feedback. Also, this study expects that CSR may indirectly influence consumer socially sustainable consumption mediated by perceived value and brand loyalty. Based on these discussions, the following hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are submitted:

**H1:** CSR has a positive direct effect on perceived value.

**H2:** CSR has a positive (a) direct effect on brand loyalty, and (b) indirect effect on brand loyalty via perceived value

**H3:** CSR has a positive (a) direct effect on consumer socially sustainable consumption, (b) indirect effect on consumer socially sustainable consumption via perceived value and brand loyalty.

Per Aaker (1991), consumers’ perceptions toward the product/service value would enhance a brand gain. Consumer value increases through gaining more
favorable associations and feelings, as well as receiving greater benefit than total sacrifices (Lam et al., 2004). Additionally, Keller (1993) indicated that if a consumer reacts more favorably to the specific product’s brand equity (such as the willingness to buy) than to an identical yet unbranded product, the brand value among target customers is positive. Han and Sung (2008) stated that the higher the perceived customer value, the more the brand loyalty and relationship quality. Lam et al. (2004) also mentioned that there is a positive relationship between customer value and customer loyalty. Therefore, consumers who receive superior value delivered by a brand or a corporation would be more satisfied, which in turn, improves the brand loyalty (Yoo et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2015). This study proposes that perceived value positively impacts brand loyalty per the following hypothesis:

**H4: Perceived value has a positive direct effect on brand loyalty.**

Based on the theory of equity, only if the value of product or service is met or exceeds consumer expectations, a satisfied perception will be generated. If one party perceives another party benefiting unfairly, the disadvantaged party would attempt to regain balance via negative activities (Ingram et al., 2005). This assumption is close to the mention of Morgan and Hunt (1994), whereby if consumers perceive relational value and are involved in a strong relationship with the specific retailer, they will be more likely develop loyal orientations that contribute to the corporation’s profits (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006). Additionally, Liu et al. (2009) also found that consumers with strong relationship commitment or loyalty are more likely to overcome potential obstacles existing in the buyer-seller relationship, thereby resulting in positive behaviors. Therefore, this study suggests that if consumers perceive the value of or possesses brand loyalty for the specific product, they would have a positive response or feedback and thus, would be likely to engage in socially sustainable consumption.

**H5: Perceived value has a positive direct effect on consumer socially sustainable consumption.**

**H6: Brand loyalty has a positive direct effect on consumer socially sustainable consumption.**
Webb et al.’s (2008) scale of Socially Responsible Purchase and Disposal was used to measure socially sustainable consumption. This scale contains four dimensions with high reliability and validity, including CSR performance, consumer recycling behavior, traditional purchase criteria, and environmental impact purchase and use criteria. The four dimensions of CSR submitted by de los Salmones et al. (2005) were adapted as measurements. Because the economic dimension is the obligation of production, where maximized profit and economic wealth are difficult to evaluate by consumers, this study selected the other three dimensions as variables, including the dimensions of ethical responsibility, legal responsibility, and philanthropic responsibility. Further, the measurement for brand loyalty was taken by Yoo and Donth (2001) and the measurement scale with a high reliability developed by Dodds et al. (1991) was used to measure perceived value in this study. Participants indicate the extent to which each statement describes them on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

This study conducted an on-line survey by using convenience sampling to collect data and posted the web link regarding the online survey platform on social networking platforms (BBS, Blog, FB, or other virtual communities) in Taiwan. E-mail or internet surveys are both seen as an effective tool to reach a large
percentage of the population (Pirsch et al., 2007) and to provide more detailed information than traditional mail surveys (Schaefer and Dillman, 1998). Participants were asked to write down the brand name they usually consume first, and then to answer the selected questions by scale based on their actual attitudes toward and activities associated with brand they choose. Finally, 409 valid questionnaires remained. The respondents were primarily female (55%), and 19-35 years old (52.3%). Approximately 88.5% were well educated and had a bachelor’s degree or higher education level. Occupations included the commerce sector (38.6%) and students (20%) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Sample Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>High school graduate or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Doctor’s Degree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current occupation</td>
<td>Public servants</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming/fishery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Results

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to establish uni-dimensionality for each construct in this study. All items resulted in an acceptable level of internal consistency, while the composite reliability (CR) of each variable exceeded the recommended level of 0.7 (Hair et al., 2009). Convergent and discriminant validity were also tested, where all of the indices and conditions met the recommendations by Bagozzi and Yi (1988), Fornell and Larcker (1981), and Jöreskog and Sörbom (1992) (see Table 2).

Table 2. Reliability and Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consumer sustainable consumption behavior</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>Ethical</th>
<th>Philanthropic expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSR preference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recycling behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional purchase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical expectations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philanthropic expectations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | Scale composite reliability is reported in bold along the diagonal. Correlations are reported in the lower half of the matrix. Shared variances are reported in the upper half of the matrix. All correlations are significant at p<0.05. \( \chi^2(566) = 2073.81; \) GFI = 0.80; CFI = 0.97; NFI = 0.96; NNFI = 0.96; RFI = 0.95; and RMSEA = 0.079 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After ensuring this model’s reliability and validity, a structural equation model (SEM) was adopted to test the hypotheses. Hair et al. (2009) supported that SEM, “provides a straightforward method of dealing with multiple relationships simultaneously while providing statistical efficiency” (p. 578). This study thus
applied SEM by a structural equation technique, LISREL, to examine whether or not there were direct or indirect relationships between CSR and sustainable consumption behaviors. The results of causal relationship are shown in Table 3. Perceived value was significantly influenced by the ethical and legal dimension (β=0.36*) and the philanthropic expectations dimension (β=0.36*); H1 was supported. The dimension of philanthropic expectations had a direct (β=0.56*) and indirect (β=0.09*) impact on brand loyalty. Although the ethical and legal dimension did not directly influence brand loyalty, there was an indirect effect between these two constructs via perceived value (β=0.08*). H2 was thus partly supported. Additionally, whether direct or indirect, the ethical and legal dimension of CSR was a significant prediction construct of consumer behavior regarding CSR performance, recycling, traditional purchase, and environmental impact dimensions. This study also found that while philanthropic expectations did not directly influence consumer socially sustainable consumption, the indirectly effects mediated by perceived value and brand loyalty existed. The total effects between philanthropic expectations and CSR performance (β=0.28*) and environmental impact (β=0.15*) dimensions were significant. H3 was thus partly supported. Finally, this study found that perceived value significantly and directly affected brand loyalty (β=0.23*), CSR preference (β=0.26*), traditional purchase (β=0.30*), and environmental impact (β=0.31*). Brand loyalty only influenced the dimension of CSR preference (β=0.37*) and traditional purchase (β=0.23*), but not the recycling behavior and environmental impact dimensions. Therefore, H4 was fully supported, and H5 and H6 were partly supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal path</th>
<th>Standardized structural coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Legal → Perceived value</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic expectations → Perceived value</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Legal → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic expectations → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Legal → CSR preference</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Legal → Recycling behavior</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Legal → Traditional purchase</td>
<td>-0.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Legal → Environmental impact</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic expectations → CSR preference</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic expectations → Recycling behavior</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic expectations → Traditional purchase</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic expectations → Environmental impact</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value → CSR preference</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value → Recycling behavior</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value → Traditional purchase</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value → Environmental impact</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty → CSR preference</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty → Recycling behavior</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty → Traditional purchase</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty → Environmental impact</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-value is significant at p<0.05  \( \chi^2 (572) = 2134.88; \) GFI = 0.80; CFI = 0.97; NFI = 0.96; NNFI = 0.96; RFI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.080
6 Discussion

In order to verify the research model for the goals of this study, this study uses the structure equation model to test hypotheses. Our findings indicate that the two dimensions of CSR directly and indirectly affect consumers’ attitudes and behaviors. That is to say, the more the consumers perceived CSR activities regarding the dimensions of ethical, legal, and philanthropic responsibility, the higher the consumers’ perceived values and loyalty intentions toward the specific brand as well as their socially sustainable consumption. These findings are consistent with prior researches (e.g., He and Li, 2011). Moreover, the influence of the ethical and legal dimensions seems to be stronger than that of the philanthropic responsibility dimension to improve consumers’ socially sustainable consumption directly. Consumers with positive perspectives toward the firm’s CSR activities conform to the confines of legal stipulations, social norms, and ethical codes; such individuals wish to purchase products made by corporations with CSR, act voluntarily in their recycling behaviors, and consider environmental factors in their buying decision processes. Therefore, this study proves the idea that consumers will generate a positive value and loyalty intention, which in turn builds positive and friendly relationships with a firm (such as socially sustainable consumption) when they perceive a high ethical image of a firm (Deng, 2012; Dennis, 2007; Valenzuela et al., 2010). These statements are consistent with Vitell’s (2015) mention that consumers may engage in ethical consumption or socially responsible behaviors only if the effort of CSR is perceived.

This study also finds that perceived value and brand loyalty play vital mediating roles to improve the effect of CSR on socially sustainable consumption. In this study’s results, CSR inspires consumers to provide positive feedback, such as activities regarding the dimensions of CSR preference and environmental impact, which is indirectly mediated by perceived value and brand loyalty. These findings are consistent with prior research which indicates that consumers with a high perception of product value or brand loyalty would tend to build a positive relationship with sellers, and thus result in positive behaviors (such as socially responsible consumption behaviors) (Liu et al., 2009). On the other hand, this study suggests that consumers’ perceived value and brand loyalty could be built and
maintained through the strategies of product quality and price, and further, can be improved using CSR activities. Therefore, the statements of C-C identification (Lichtenstein et al., 2004) have been proven in this study, such as that when consumers consider companies to be socially responsible, they will more likely to support the firm with which they identify.

Based on the above discussion, this study submits some insights for further theoretical contribution. Although consumers’ perceptions toward CSR activities are already revealed in related literature, the linking of the dimensions of CSR with consumer socially sustainable consumption is lacking. This study helps to fill this gap where prior studies merely investigated and suggested useful and interesting findings. Additionally, this study finds that CSR activities perceived by consumers can inspire them to engage in socially sustainable purchasing behaviors through perceived value and brand loyalty; this had been not examined in prior studies. These insights can bring some new and fresh findings into the field of marketing and management.

Marketing managers should also consider how to employ CSR activities into their brand image and brand loyalty strategies. If consumers have a positive image of a firm’s CSR, in turn, such can improve their perceived values, purchasing intentions, and socially sustainable consumption behaviors; therefore, businesses should put forth efforts devoted to the certain CSR activities. In addition, CSR is a multi-dimension concept. Which dimension(s) of CSR do consumers prefer and which can significantly influence consumers’ willingness to pay or respond with positive feedback? This study’s results may provide a useful suggestion. While businesses’ marketing activities involve CSR activity that consumers’ desire, their socially-driven buying intentions can be further improved. The ethical and legal dimension can have significant total impacts on perceived value, brand loyalty, and the four dimensions of socially sustainable consumption. Marketers can apply greater efforts to engage in activities which demonstrate legal, ethical, and social norms. Moreover, this study’s findings also find that perceived value and brand loyal are two vital mediating roles between CSR activities and consumer behaviors. Marketers or strategy makers should also pay attention to these findings when corporations want their consumers to buy products involving CSR performance and environmental concerns.
There are some limitations in this study. First, this study uses convenient sampling by online survey although many researchers have adopted this sampling technique to examine consumer behavior (e.g., Pirsch et al., 2007). Further research can select simple random sampling to collect data for improving the representative sample. Second, some relationships between constructs in this study’s research model are not significant. The other personal traits or situational factors should be included to examine consumers’ socially sustainable consumption behaviors in future research. For example, individualism/collectivism, religious orientation, and human values maybe have significant impact on consumer ethical consumption behaviors; further, situational factors, including relationship benefits received from the sellers and social norms could influence socially-driven purchasing behaviors. Finally, future research can consider how cultural or national factors play a role in the research model of this study in order to provide some other findings that are useful for theoretical and practical implications.

Appendix: The Measurement Items of Constructs

**CSR (de los Salmones et al., 2005)**

*Ethical and legal dimension*

1. Always respects the norms defined in the law when carrying out its activities.
2. Is concerned to fulfill its obligations vis-à-vis its agents with whom it deals.
3. Behaves ethically/honestly with its customers.
4. Respecting ethical principles in its relationships has priority over achieving superior economic performance.

*Philanthropic expectations dimension*

1. Is concerned to respect and protect natural environment.
2. Actively sponsors or finances social events (sport, music…).
3. Directs part of its budget to donations and social works favouring the disadvantaged.
4. Is concerned to improve general well-being of society.

**Perceived value (Dodds et al., 1991)**

1. This brand’s product is a good value for the money.
2. At the price shown this brand’s product is economical.
3. This brand’s product is considered to be a good buy.
4. The price shown for this brand’s product is acceptable.

**Brand loyalty (Yoo and Donth, 2001)**
1. I consider myself to be loyal to this brand.
2. This brand would be my first choice.
3. I will not buy other brands if this brand is available at the store.

**Sustainable consumption behaviors (Webb et al., 2008)**

**CSR preference dimension**
1. I try to buy from this brand that helps the needy.
2. I try to buy from this brand that hires people with disabilities.
3. When given a chance to switch to this brand that supports local schools, I take it.
4. I try to buy from this brand that makes donations to medical research.
5. I make an effort to buy from this brand that sponsor food drives.
6. When given a chance to switch to this brand that gives back to the community, I take it.
7. When given a chance, I switch to this brand where a portion of the price is donated to charity.
8. I avoid buying products or services from this brand that discriminate against women.*
9. When I am shopping, I try to buy from this brand that is working to improve conditions for employees in its factory.
10. I try to buy from this brand that support victims of natural disasters.

**Recycling behavior dimension**
1. I recycle the materials that I did not need.
2. I give the materials that I did not need to the other person.

**Traditional purchase dimension**
1. When I am shopping, I buy the lowest priced product regardless of the working conditions in the factory.*
2. I buy the highest quality product, regardless of its impact on the environment.*
3. When I am shopping, I buy the highest quality product regardless of the working conditions in the factory.*
4. I buy the lowest priced product, regardless of its impact on the environment.*
**Environmental impact dimension**

1. I avoid using products that pollute the air.
2. I avoid buying products that pollute the water.
3. I avoid buying from companies that harm endangered plants or animals.
4. I make an effort to avoid products or services that cause environmental damage.
5. I avoid buying products that are made from endangered animals.

Note: * denotes negative wording.
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