



Online ISSN 2278-0165

Print ISSN 0975-7201

PMMR

PRAVARA MANAGEMENT REVIEW

Vol 13 No. 2

JUL-DEC 2014

Listed in Cabells International Directory
Indexed in Indian Citation Index (ICI)

A RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
DR. VIKHE PATIL FOUNDATION'S,
PRAVARA CENTRE FOR
MANAGEMENT RESEARCH &
DEVELOPMENT, PUNE

1. **Bancassurance-Insurer's Delight or Customer's Plight**
Pooja Chatley, Dr Liaqat Ali 2
2. **Women Empowerment through Self Help Group with
Special Reference to Shirol Taluka**
Dr. V. A. Patil 7
3. **Status of Indian Agriculture: Empirical Insights**
Dr. M.R. Patil 11
4. **A Comparison of Haryana's Development and Its
Neighbouring States**
Niyati Chaudhary 21
5. **Eco Friendly Products Attitude towards Pricing**
Dipti Shankar Barge, Dr. Dinkar Khashaba More, Dr. Sarang
Shankar Bhola 29
6. **Role of Perceived Fairness in Employee Trust Development**
Savita Kulkarni 36
7. **A Study of the Factors Impacting Choice of Shopping
Formats and Specific Stores in respect of specified Consumer
Durables in NOIDA**
Shrirang Altekar, Dr. Anil Keskar 44
8. **Roadmap to Quality Research**
Dr. Sarang Shankar Bhola 49
9. **Comparison of Financial Performance of Cooperative Banks
through Productivity and Profitability: An Analytical Study**
Dr. Shrikrishna S. Mahajan, Gauri Bhimrao Patil 54
10. **Marketers shifting from the Herd to the Swarm Fizz or
Fizz?**
Geetika Jain, Dr. Sapna Rakesh 60
11. **“Banking the unbanked” Through the collaboration of
banks and post offices**
Rati Chandra 70
12. **A Study of Learners' Perception response to AV based
teaching method**
Dr. Sanjay Kaptan, Rajkumari Tamphasana Devi 75

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. Puja Bhardwaj

Editor-PMR
Associate Professor, PCMRD, Pune

Dr. Manoj Narwade

Director,
PCMRD, Pune

Dr. Ashok Patil

Chairman
Dr. Vikhe Patil Foundation, Pune

Dr V. Sita

Professor & Dean
School of Management Studies
University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad

Dr. A. K. Vashisht

Dean & Professor
Faculty of Business Management &
Commerce
University Business School. Panjab
University, Chandigarh

Dr. Sanjay Kaptan

Head, Department of Commerce and
Research Centre, University of Pune
Pune

Dr. S. V. Kadvekar

Professor and Head,
Dr. D.S. Savkar Chair, University of Pune,
Pune

Dr. P.C. Shejwalkar

Professor Emeritus
Faculty of Management,
University of Pune
Pune

Dr. Anil Keskar

Advisor,
D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth,
Pune

Dr. Sarang Bhola

Associate Professor
Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management
Studies and Research, Satara.

Dr. Sugan Jain

Vice-President
Rajasthan Chambers of Commerce and Industry
Jaipur

GUIDELINES TO AUTHORS

PMR welcomes articles on all aspects of management, thought, research and practice. We publish empirical papers, review papers, executive experience-sharing, research notes, case studies and book-reviews. The official editorial address of PMR is:

“The Editor, PMR”

Dr. Vikhe Patil Foundation's
**Pravara Centre for Management
Research & Development,**
Near Patrakarnagar, Off Senapati Bapat
Road, Pune 411016. Maharashtra, India.
Tel: (91) (020) 25651104, 25651499
Fax: (91) (020) 25651550
E-mail: editor.pmr@pcmr.org
www.pcmrd.org

However, the authors may send soft copies of their submissions directly to the Editor. Manuscripts should be submitted as soft copies. They should be typed in Times New Roman font size 12, with 1.5 line spacing and with margins of one inch on all sides. The normal size of a paper is about 8,000-10,000 words

Cover Page: Manuscript of a paper should have a cover page providing the title of the paper, the name(s), address(es), phone, fax numbers and e-mail address(es) of all authors and acknowledgements if any. In order to facilitate anonymous review of the papers, please restrict the author-related information only to the cover page.

Abstract: Following the cover page, there should be an 'abstract' page, which should

contain the title of the paper, the subtitle 'Abstract' and a summary of the paper in single space, not exceeding 150 words. The text of the paper should not start on this page, but on a fresh page with the title of the paper repeated.

References: References should be cited in the style prescribed in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (4th ed.). Indicate the position of the reference in the text within brackets by the author's last name and the year of publication; e.g.: '(Porter, 1980)' or incorporate it into a sentence, eg: 'as pointed out by Hannan and Freeman (1977)'. At the end of the text, references should be listed in the alphabetical order of the last names of the authors, with a title REFERENCES. Examples of how the references are to be listed at the end of the paper are given below.

- **(If it is a book):** Porter, M.E. (1980) *Competitive Strategy*, New York: Free Press.
- **(If it is an article in a journal):** Hannan, M.T. and Freeman, J. (1977) The Population Ecology of Organizations, *American journal of Sociology*, 82 (5): 929-964
- **(If it is an article in an edited book):** Kanter, R.M. (1988) When a Thousand Flowers Bloom. In B. Staw and L. Cummings (eds), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, pp.169-211, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- **(If it is an article in periodical or news paper):** Business standard 2004. Telcos world leaders in profitability. July 23: 1.

- **(For Electronic documents):** Financial Express. ICI yet to respond to Asian Paints offer.

<http://www.expressindia.com/fe/daily/1998/0295.html> Accessed on July 16, 2003.

Figures and Tables: Each Figure/Table should be printed on a separate sheet. Figures and tables are to be separately numbered, titled and attached at the end of the text serially. The position of the figure or table should be indicated in the text on a separate line with the words "Table 1 about here".

Revised manuscripts: At the end of the blind review process, the editor informs the author about the acceptance or rejection of the manuscript. On acceptance, the author is expected to incorporate the modifications suggested by the reviewers, if any, and submit a soft copy of the final revised manuscript.

Policy against simultaneous submission: Authors should ensure that the manuscript submitted to PMR is not simultaneously submitted to any other journal or publisher. Similarly, it should not be submitted anywhere else during the pendency of the review process which will take about 3-6 months. Once a manuscript is accepted by or published in PMR, it becomes the property of PCMRD, whose permission is required for any operations covered by the Copyright Act.

ABOUT Pravara Management Review (PMR)

The Philosophy:

Pravara Management Review (PMR) invites innovative and preferably research-based articles in any area of management.

Practicing managers are welcome to submit data-based case studies for publication. All authors should aim at advancing existing thought and/or practices in the relevant field and hence should endeavour to be original and insightful.

Submissions should indicate an understanding of the relevant literature and the contribution of the submissions to this body of research. Empirical articles should have an appropriate methodology and be able to relate their findings to the existing literature.

Methodological articles must attempt to show how they further existing theory.

The review process: The review process followed by PMR is systematic and thorough. Articles submitted to the journal are initially screened by the editor for relevance and overall quality as judged by the presentation of concepts, methodology and findings. Inappropriate or weak submissions are not forwarded for a formal review. Those considered appropriate are submitted to a double blind review process.

Potential Contributors: Every research-oriented individual and institution, and every research student, faculty working anywhere in the world is invited to explore fruitful connections with PMR.

Contents

1. **Bancassurance-Insurer's Delight or Customer's Plight**
Pooja Chatley, Dr Liaqat Ali 2
2. **Women Empowerment through Self Help Group with
Special Reference to Shirol Taluka**
Dr. V. A. Patil. 7
3. **Status of Indian Agriculture: Empirical Insights**
Dr. M.R. Patil 11
4. **A Comparison of Haryana's Development and Its
Neighbouring States**
Niyati Chaudhary. 21
5. **Eco Friendly Products Attitude towards Pricing**
Dipti Shankar Barge, Dr. Dinkar Khashaba More, Dr. Sarang
Shankar Bhola 29
6. **Role of Perceived Fairness in Employee Trust Development**
Savita Kulkarni 36
7. **A Study of the Factors Impacting Choice of Shopping
Formats and Specific Stores in respect of specified Consumer
Durables in NOIDA**
Shrirang Altekar, Dr. Anil Keskar 44
8. **Roadmap to Quality Research**
Dr. Sarang Shankar Bhola 49
9. **Comparison of Financial Performance of Cooperative Banks
through Productivity and Profitability: An Analytical Study**
Dr. Shrikrishna S. Mahajan, Gauri Bhimrao Patil 54
10. **Marketers shifting from the Herd to the Swarm Fizz or
Fizz?**
Geetika Jain, Dr. Sapna Rakesh. 60
11. **“Banking the unbanked” Through the collaboration of
banks and post offices**
Rati Chandra 70
12. **A Study of Learners' Perception response to AV based
teaching method**
Dr. Sanjay Kaptan, Rajkumari Tamphasana Devi 75

Eco Friendly Products Attitude towards Pricing

Dipti Shankar Barge*

Dr. Dinkar Khashaba More**

Dr. Sarang Shankar Bhola***

ABSTRACT:

A common thread has been observed through rigorous review of literature about high price of eco friendly products. Researchers attempted to study attitude of customers towards pricing of eco friendly products and similar aspects of pricing of eco-friendly products. Effort has been made to study attitude of the users of eco-friendly products and non-users of eco-friendly products, towards pricing of eco-friendly products. It has observed that, users of eco-friendly products have shown favorable attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products. However non-users of eco-friendly products have unfavorable attitude towards pricing of eco friendly products, as samples believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products. This unfavorable attitude about pricing is one of reason that these samples do not buy eco friendly products despite being aware of.

Keywords: Eco Friendly, Price, Attitude, Socio Economic Class.

Introduction

Last two decades the environmental issues are the most discussed matters in all the summits and conferences. The end result is increased awareness of buying of environment friendly products popularly known as 'Eco- friendly Products'. The research in eco-friendly products has gained tremendous attention. But the major cause of concern for majority consumers is the price of the eco-friendly products. It has observed that, the eco-friendly products are highly priced. Customers though attracted towards these products don't get converted as the money factor is crucial. An attempt has been made to study the price effect on buying the eco-friendly product.

Review of Literature

With the zest of ascertaining the attitudes of buyers towards pricing of eco-friendly products, researchers have studied articles across the globe that focused on studying the buyer behavior of customers with respect to price of eco-friendly products.

(Hae Jin Gam, 2010), the results showed that consumers are less likely to purchase organic cotton clothing (OCC) when it has a 60% higher price so it can be assumed that the consumers consider the available organic cotton clothing (OCC) too expensive. Similar results were observed in a research (Afzaal Ali, 2012), where consumers will purchase green products more often, if businesses offer competitive green products in terms of price and quality as compared to traditional products to those customers who are willing to give preference to environment friendly businesses. (Christopher Gan, 2008) Observed that, the higher price has a negative effect on the probability of consumers purchasing green products. Consumers are less likely to purchase

green products if the products are more expensive. (Durif, 2012) Also found that, consumers feel that they are getting less for their money (financial loss) since they perceive that green products cost more than traditional products.

Contradictory results were observed in a research of (Dr.H.C. Purohit, 2011), it has observed that an overwhelming majority (92%) of the respondents are agreeing with the statement that 'I am ready to pay more prices of eco-friendly products'. Parallel results were observed in a research of (K. P. V. Ramanakumar, 2012), where, a majority (81%) of the respondents agree to the statement that 'I would like to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution'. In a research of (Magali Morel, 2012), it was found that, the majority of sample was willing to pay extra for green products' price (in a study: +10%). However (Bjork, 1998), observed that the respondents were on average willing to pay a 6.5 percent higher price for a detergent marked with a green label and 20 percent more for a more environmentally friendly refrigerator. But there is also a large group of consumers who are not willing to pay a higher price. In a research of (Jurate Banyte, 2010), it was found that, when the respondents were asked about the amount of money (in percent) they are ready to spend for eco-friendly food product in comparison to an identical conventional product, it emerged that 15 percent of respondents are ready to pay an amount higher by 50 percent, and another 20 percent would pay the amount higher by 25 to 50 percent; 24 percent of respondents would pay from 5 to 10 percent more for an eco-friendly product and only 3 percent would not pay more for it. Besides, cross analysis of results show that the consumers who are more likely to contribute to environmental conservation and are more sensitive to environmental issues tend to pay more for eco-

*Assistant Professor, Gourishankar Institute of Management Sciences, Limb, Satara.

** Associate Professor, Arts and Commerce College, Ashta, Sangli.

*** Associate Professor, Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Satara.

friendly products.

On similar lines, (Bryunina Daria, 2011) revealed that, most of the respondents (56 people) answered that they may buy organic products despite the higher price. Twice less (26) answered that they are not inclined to overpay for organic products. The rest of respondents (18 respondents) did not think about this question. (Michel Laroche, 2001), observed that, Individuals who are married (56 percent) and have children living at home (57 percent) are more willing to pay a higher price for green products. It may be suggested that these individuals are more inclined to think of how a ruined environment may negatively impact not only on their partner, but on their children's future. Interestingly, (Khandoker Mahmudur Rahman, 2011), discovered that, while consumers are willing to pay a price premium for a green brand, this willingness to pay has a price ceiling. Price elasticity of demand is no more inelastic beyond this price ceiling.

Researchers have observed from above review that, customers have contradictory attitudes towards price of eco-friendly products. Customers are unanimous on a fact that, eco-friendly products are expensive than its non-eco-friendly counterpart products. However, it has noticed that, the customers are ready to pay the higher price for these products, for various reasons, like, environment consciousness, health reasons, status and so on. Even though, this willingness to pay premium has observed price ceiling that ranges from, 5 to 50 percent. On the contrary, researchers observed that, customers are not ready to pay premium for eco-friendly products. A common attitude observed that, eco-friendly products should be available at competitive prices, without compromising its quality. These contradictory attitudes towards pricing of eco-friendly products, posed few questions in the mind of researchers, as whether customers from various socio-economic classes exhibit different attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products? Whether environment conscious customers are willing to pay more for eco-friendly products? What is the attitude of customers that are non-buyers of eco-friendly products, towards pricing of customers? With these questions in mind, researcher framed following objectives of the study.

Research Methodology

Present study has used diagnostic research design put to test the hypothesis i.e. customers are not indifferent of price while purchasing eco-friendly product. The prime objective of the study is to know the attitude of customers towards pricing of eco-friendly products.

Quota sampling technique was used for selecting the samples. Quota was decided on the basis of 12 Socio-Economic Classes, A1 to E12. From these socio economic classes 160 samples were identified as users of eco-friendly products, while 151 were identified as non-users of eco-friendly products. Structured questions seeking attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products has been asked to both the groups. Attitudes of users of eco-friendly products were measured on five point likert scale (1- Strongly Agree to 5 - Strongly Disagree). These variables were, I accept paying extra price for EFPs to preserve our environment, I

am ready to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies, I purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution,(K. P. V. Ramankumar, 2012)I purchase recycled products even they are more expensive, the benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved, Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment. For non-users these statements were modified as I would accept paying extra price for environmentally-friendly products to preserve our environment, I would be willing to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies, I believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products, I would like to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution, I will purchase recycled products even they are more expensive, the benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved and Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment. The variable "I believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products" has been added, as these samples are aware about eco-friendly products, but do not use it assuming the perceived high price of a eco-friendly products.

Responses and analysis has been presented below.

Data analysis

Data was analyzed using various statistical tools of SPSS software.

Mean, Standard deviations were used to study the attitude of samples towards pricing of eco-friendly products. For studying the differences if any, between socio economic classes about pricing of eco-friendly products Analysis of Variance has brought in use. For testing the hypothesis Kolmogorov Smirnov test has been used.

1. Attitude about Pricing of Eco friendly Products -Users of eco-friendly products

Samples have asked to express their attitude about pricing of eco-friendly products. Samples have provided with following statements. Mean, S.D. and rank of statements have presented below.

Table.1 Attitude about Pricing of Eco friendly Products(users of eco-friendly products) (n=160)

Sr.	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1	I accept paying extra price for EFPs to preserve our environment	3.94	1.36	2
2	I am ready to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies	3.31	1.61	5
3	I purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution	4.12	1.1	1
4	I purchase recycled products even they are more expensive	3.85	1.34	3
5	The benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved	3.65	1.5	4
6	Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment	3.06	1.03	6

(Source: Field Data)

Table 1 presented above indicates the attitudes of samples about pricing of eco-friendly products. Samples have given 1st rank to the statement of readiness of purchasing those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution, with 4.12 mean and 1.1 S.D. For the statement of “accepting paying extra price for eco-friendly products to preserve our environment” samples gave 2nd rank with 3.94 mean and 1.36 S.D. Samples have given 3rd rank to a statement “purchasing recycling products even they are more expensive.” With 3.85 mean and 1.34 S.D. Samples opine that, the benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved with mean value of 3.65 and 1.5 S.D. with 4th rank. This signifies that samples feel that even though the prices of eco-friendly products are more, the benefits that they are going to get by unpolluted environment are more. These benefits are incomparable. In the contrary, samples are not ready to pay more taxes to support government in implementing eco-friendly policies, with 3.31 mean and 1.61 S.D. This attitude secured 5th rank. At last samples gave 6th rank to a statement which says, personal economic concern is more important than preserving the environment with 3.06 mean values and 1.03 S.D.

Samples have shown favorable attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products. Samples have found ready to spend more amounts for products that cause less environment pollution and products that are recycled with 4.12, 3.85 mean and 1.1, 1.34 S.D. respectively. But samples have shown unfavorable attitude towards paying more tax to support government for developing environment friendly policy (mean 3.31 and S.D. 1.61).

Table.2 Attitude of samples about pricing according to Socio Economic Class

ANOVA					
Price					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	245.431	11	22.312	22.973	0.000
Within Groups	58.274	60	0.971		
Total	303.705	71			

Table.3 Attitude of samples about pricing according to SEC a test of significance

Tukey HSD

(n=160)

SEC	SEC	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
A1	A2	-0.033	0.569	1	-1.97	1.9
	A3	-0.118	0.569	1	-2.05	1.82
	B1	-0.023	0.569	1	-1.96	1.91
	B2	-0.097	0.569	1	-2.03	1.84
	C1	-0.143	0.569	1	-2.08	1.79
	C2	-0.43	0.569	1	-2.36	1.5
	D1	1.403	0.569	0.38	-0.53	3.34
	D2	0.237	0.569	1	-1.7	2.17
	E1	4.237*	0.569	0	2.3	6.17
	E2	4.237*	0.569	0	2.3	6.17
A2	E3	4.237*	0.569	0	2.3	6.17
	A3	-0.085	0.569	1	-2.02	1.85
	B1	0.01	0.569	1	-1.92	1.94
	B2	-0.063	0.569	1	-2	1.87
	C1	-0.11	0.569	1	-2.04	1.82
	C2	-0.397	0.569	1	-2.33	1.54
	D1	1.437	0.569	0.345	-0.5	3.37
	D2	0.27	0.569	1	-1.66	2.2
	E1	4.270*	0.569	0	2.34	6.2
	E2	4.270*	0.569	0	2.34	6.2
	E3	4.270*	0.569	0	2.34	6.2

A3	B1	0.095	0.569	1	-1.84	2.03
	B2	0.022	0.569	1	-1.91	1.96
	C1	-0.025	0.569	1	-1.96	1.91
	C2	-0.312	0.569	1	-2.25	1.62
	D1	1.522	0.569	0.264	-0.41	3.46
	D2	0.355	0.569	1	-1.58	2.29
	E1	4.355*	0.569	0	2.42	6.29
	E2	4.355*	0.569	0	2.42	6.29
	E3	4.355*	0.569	0	2.42	6.29
B1	B2	-0.073	0.569	1	-2.01	1.86
	C1	-0.12	0.569	1	-2.05	1.81
	C2	-0.407	0.569	1	-2.34	1.53
	D1	1.427	0.569	0.356	-0.51	3.36
	D2	0.26	0.569	1	-1.67	2.19
	E1	4.260*	0.569	0	2.33	6.19
	E2	4.260*	0.569	0	2.33	6.19
	E3	4.260*	0.569	0	2.33	6.19
B2	C1	-0.047	0.569	1	-1.98	1.89
	C2	-0.333	0.569	1	-2.27	1.6
	D1	1.5	0.569	0.284	-0.43	3.43
	D2	0.333	0.569	1	-1.6	2.27
	E1	4.333*	0.569	0	2.4	6.27
	E2	4.333*	0.569	0	2.4	6.27
	E3	4.333*	0.569	0	2.4	6.27
C1	C2	-0.287	0.569	1	-2.22	1.65
	D1	1.547	0.569	0.243	-0.39	3.48
	D2	0.38	0.569	1	-1.55	2.31
	E1	4.380*	0.569	0	2.45	6.31
	E2	4.380*	0.569	0	2.45	6.31
	E3	4.380*	0.569	0	2.45	6.31
C2	D1	1.833	0.569	0.079	-0.1	3.77
	D2	0.667	0.569	0.989	-1.27	2.6
	E1	4.667*	0.569	0	2.73	6.6
	E2	4.667*	0.569	0	2.73	6.6
	E3	4.667*	0.569	0	2.73	6.6
D1	D2	-1.167	0.569	0.658	-3.1	0.77
	E1	2.833*	0.569	0	0.9	4.77
	E2	2.833*	0.569	0	0.9	4.77
	E3	2.833*	0.569	0	0.9	4.77
D2	E1	4.000*	0.569	0	2.07	5.93
	E2	4.000*	0.569	0	2.07	5.93
	E3	4.000*	0.569	0	2.07	5.93
E1	E2	0	0.569	1	-1.93	1.93
	E3	0	0.569	1	-1.93	1.93
E2	E3	0	0.569	1	-1.93	1.93
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

It can be concluded from the table 3, mentioned above that, there is no significant difference in attitude about pricing among all socio economic classes.

4. Attitude about Pricing of Eco friendly Products Non Users of eco-friendly products

Researcher wanted to study attitudes of samples about pricing of eco-friendly products. Even though the samples from this category do not purchase any eco-friendly product, they are aware of eco-friendly products. Hence, researcher felt it important to know their attitudes about pricing.

Table.4
Attitude about Pricing of Eco friendly Products (Non users of eco-friendly products)
(n=145)

Sr.	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1	I would accept paying extra price for environmentally-friendly products to preserve our environment	4.46	0.5	3
2	I would be willing to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies	4.31	0.521	4
3	I believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products	4.6	0.492	1
4	I would like to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution	4.22	0.416	5
5	I will purchase recycled products even they are more expensive	4.17	0.373	6
6	The benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved	4.49	0.502	2
7	Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment	1.57	0.685	7

(Source: Field Data)

Table 4 presented above depicts the attitude of samples about pricing of Eco friendly products. It is clear from the table that, samples believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products, with 4.6 mean value and 0.492 S.D. This attitude secured 1st rank. The 1st rank secured by this statement is consistent with the reason statement “It seems a costly product” given by samples. As samples gave 1st rank to this reason statement as one of the major reason for not buying eco-friendly products, they really believe that the price of eco-friendly product is really more.

The attitude of “Benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expenses involved” received 2nd rank with mean value 4.49 and S.D. 0.502. The attitude statement of “I would accept paying extra price for environmentally-friendly products to preserve our environment” received 3rd rank with 4.46 mean value and 0.5 S.D. “I would be willing to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies” secured 4th rank with 4.31 mean and 0.521 S.D. “I would like to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution” secured 5th rank with 4.22 mean and 0.416 S.D. This indicates that, samples are not ready to purchase costlier product that reduce environment pollution. Similarly, “I will purchase recycled products even they are more expensive.” This statement too secured lower rank of 6th with mean value of 4.17 and S.D. 0.373. The last rank 7th was received by a statement “Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment” with mean value 1.57 and S.D.0.685. So it can be concluded that, even though samples are not ready to pay more price for eco-friendly products, they really concern more for the environment preservation than personal economic concerns.

As compared to users of eco-friendly products, it has observed that, non-users have unfavorable attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products, as samples believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products, with 4.6 mean and 0.492 S.D. They are not ready to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution (mean 4.22, S.D.0.416) as well as samples do not show readiness to purchase recycled products even they are more expensive (mean 4.17, S.D.0.373). This unfavorable attitude about pricing is one of reason that these samples do not buy eco-friendly products despite being aware of.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis

H₀: customers are not indifferent of price while purchasing eco-friendly product.

H_a: Customers are indifferent of price while purchasing Eco Friendly Products.

For testing the hypothesis presented above Kolmogorov Smirnov test has been used. Data of attitude about pricings of users of eco-friendly products has been used, hence n=160

The test is executed independently for variables under test.

Table.5 Test of significance for attitude statements about pricing of eco friendly products

Sr.	Statements	KS Max Absolute Difference (D)	Critical Value at 5% Level (D _c)	Decision regarding Null Hypothesis
1	I accept paying extra price for EFPs to preserve our environment	0.38	0.10	Rejected
2	I am ready to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies	0.11	0.10	Rejected
3	I purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution	0.46	0.10	Rejected
4	I purchase recycled products even they are more expensive	0.34	0.10	Rejected
5	The benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved	0.26	0.10	Rejected
6	Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment	0.20	0.10	Rejected

Findings and Discussion:

- Users of eco-friendly products have shown favorable attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products. Samples have given 1st rank to the statement of readiness of purchasing those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution, with 4.12 mean and 1.1 S.D. In a research by (K. P. V. Ramankumar, 2012), it has observed that an overwhelming majority (81%) of the respondents agree to the statement that I would like to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution. Samples have found ready to purchase products that are recycled, with 3.85 mean and 1.34 S.D. These findings are consistent with the research findings of (H.C.Purohit, 2011). But samples have shown unfavorable attitude towards paying more tax to support government for developing environment friendly policy (mean 3.31 and S.D. 1.61) (Table.1)
- No substantial difference has been observed, in attitudes about pricing of eco-friendly products among all socio economic classes, as significant values are greater than 0.05. Samples belonging to all the socioeconomic classes have a similar attitude towards Eco friendly products (Table.2 and Table.3)
- As compared to, users of eco-friendly products, it has observed that, non-users of eco-friendly products have unfavorable attitude towards pricing of Eco friendly products, as samples believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products, with 4.6 mean and 0.492 S.D. They are not ready to purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution (mean 4.22, S.D.0.416) as well as samples do not show readiness to purchase recycled products even they are more expensive (mean 4.17, S.D.0.373). This unfavorable attitude about pricing is one of reason that these samples do not buy Eco friendly products despite being aware of. (Table.4)
- Samples are ready to extra price for EFPs to preserve our environment. (Table.5)
- Samples are ready to pay more taxes to support government implement eco-friendly policies. (Table.5)
- Samples purchase those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution (Table.5)
- Samples purchase recycled products even they are more expensive. (Table.5)
- Samples feel that the benefits of protecting the environment do not justify the expense involved. (Table.5)
- Samples feel that, "Personally, I have economic concerns which I consider more important than preserving the environment". (Table.5)

Similar findings were observed in a study (K. P. V. Ramankumar, 2012) shows that consumers are ready to pay more prices for the products which are causing less environmental pollution. This result contradicts the findings of previous research of (Afzaal Ali, 2012), which states that the price and quality are still the most important ones that are considered by consumers while making purchasing decision. The effect of competitive product price & quality in influencing the purchase of a green product is very strong for respondents from environment friendly businesses having a positive image toward the protection of the environment. Findings of (Christopher Gan, 2008) reveals that, the higher Price has a negative impact on the consumers' likelihood to buy green products. According to research findings of (Bhardwaj, 2012), price factor is key issues people and lots of people are not willing to pay more for carbon label product that's why they opt other product. Research done by (Khandoker Mahmudur Rahman, 2011) observed that consumers are willing to pay a price premium for a green brand; this willingness to pay has a price ceiling. Green price and green purchasing behavior, a positive significant relation was found, in a research of (Boztepe, 2012)

Conclusion:

Users of eco-friendly products exhibited favorable attitude towards pricing of eco-friendly products. Users have expressed readiness of purchasing those products which are costlier but causing less environmental pollution. As against this, non-users of eco-friendly products have unfavorable attitude towards pricing of Eco friendly products, as samples believe that the price of environmentally safe product is usually more than the other products. This unfavorable attitude about pricing is one of reason that these samples do not buy eco-friendly products despite being aware of.

References:

- Afzaal Ali, I. A. (2012). Environment Friendly Products: Factors that Influence the Green Purchase Intentions of Pakistani Consumers. *Pak Journal of Eng. Technol. Sci.*, 2(1), 84-117.
- Bhardwaj, N. I. (2012, October). Consumer Buying Behaviour Toward Carbon Labelling (FMCG) in Tesco Supermarket. *International Journal of Data & Network Security*, 1(2), 1-11.
- Bjork, P. (1998). The Value of Green Labels a Consumer Perspective. *LTA*, 3, 273-287.
- Bryunina Daria, K. S. (2011). *The Influence of Eco-Labeled Products on Consumer Buying Behavior by Focusing on Eco-Labeled Bread*. Department of Sustainable Development of Society and Technology.
- Hae Jin Gam, H. C. (2010). Quest for the eco-apparel market: a study of mothers willingness to purchase organic cotton clothing for their children. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 648-656.
- Jurate Banyte, L. B. (2010). Investigation Of Green Consumer Profile: A Case of Lithuanian Market of Eco-Friendly Food Products. *Economics And Management*, 374-383.
- K. P. V. Ramankumar, M. C. (2012, Feb). Consumer Attitude Towards Green Products of FMCG Sector: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, 3(2), 34-38.
- Khandoker Mahmudur Rahman, M. H. (2011, May). Exploring Price Sensitivity of a Green Brand: A Consumers' Perspective. *World Review of Business Research*, 1(2), 84 - 97.