

Comparative choices and emotions: Choosing the green option (not) always makes me feel pride

Autoria

Cecilia Souto Maior de Brito - cecilia.soutomaior@gmail.com
Centro de Pesq e Pós-Grad em Admin - CEPPAD/UFPR - Universidade Federal do Paraná

Danielle Mantovani - danielle@ufpr.br
Centro de Pesq e Pós-Grad em Admin - CEPPAD/UFPR - Universidade Federal do Paraná

Resumo

This study examined how consumers feelings of authentic and hubristic pride are impacted by chose a green (vs. premium) product in comparative decisions process. Results showed that green choice over a premium option positively (vs. negatively) impact authentic (vs. hubristic) pride (Studies 1 and 2). Study 3 investigates the role of choice justification. Results show that when participants were asked to justify the choice, the results replicate the ones of study 2. When participants are aware that their decision is private, the choice does not differently impact authentic or hubristic pride. The authors provide initial evidence that comparative decision for green choices are perceived as social approved, while premium choices are related to self-enhancement. Results contribute theoretically by showing that consumers' choices impact on pride only occurs in comparative decision process, and if choice can be scrutinized. These understandings allow marketers to better manage evaluations of green and premium products.

Comparative choices and emotions: Choosing the green option (not) always makes me feel pride

Abstract. This study examined how consumers feelings of authentic and hubristic pride are impacted by chose a green (vs. premium) product in comparative decisions process. Results showed that green choice over a premium option positively (vs. negatively) impact authentic (vs. hubristic) pride (Studies 1 and 2). Study 3 investigates the role of choice justification. Results show that when participants were asked to justify the choice, the results replicate the ones of study 2. When participants are aware that their decision is private, the choice does not differently impact authentic or hubristic pride. The authors provide initial evidence that comparative decision for green choices are perceived as social approved, while premium choices are related to self-enhancement. Results contribute theoretically by showing that consumers' choices impact on pride only occurs in comparative decision process, and if choice can be scrutinized. These understandings allow marketers to better manage evaluations of green and premium products.

Keywords: Green positioning, authentic pride, hubristic pride, choice justification

Introduction

Green positioning became an important market strategy. However, while research show pro-sustainable attitudes as the strongest in history time (Bennet & Williams, 2011; Mintel, 2016), several studies show that green attitudes still did not fully reflect in green behaviors, such as green consumption (Moser, 2015; Green & Peloza, 2014).

For instance, green products have been widely available. It is not uncommon that consumers face trade-offs between a green product (i.e., organic cookies) and other competing options (i.e. special cookies). In these comparative decisions process, premium products appear as a strong anchor that may influence choices, because their prices are similar to green options. As an illustration, AMMA Chocolates is a Brazilian green brand with chocolates bars priced around R\$20, same price of similar weighted and sized chocolates bars of the premium Suisse brand Lindt.

Comparative evaluations are process with unique aspects and influences consumers behaviors because it is cognitively challenging for than (Dhar, Nowlis & Sherman, 2000). In a green versus premium comparative decision process, the choice becomes even more complex, because these product's features usually involve trade-offs. While green positioning products claim social-environmental awareness, healthy lifestyle, fair trade certifications, organic inputs, recycled materials and renewable sources of raw materials. Premium positioning products explore quality, superior performance, seriousness, superiority, prestigious, exclusivity, symbols of progress and, also luxury (Quelch, 1987; Kapferer & Bastien, 2009; Dion & Arnould, 2011). In this study, we aim to investigate the affective consequence of the decision making in this comparative evaluation decision situation.

Recent studies have suggested that green consumption represents status (Griskevicius, Tybur & Van Den Bergh, 2010), and generates positive emotions (Van Vugt, Roberts & Hardy, 2007). Other studies present premium products as related to exclusivity, superiority, prestigious and highly selected consumption (i.e. Quelch, 1987; Dion & Arnould, 2011). However, it is still an open question how consumers feel when they are faced with a premium versus a green option. Therefore, this study provides initial evidence that in comparative decision process between green and premium alternatives, the green choice positively impacts authentic pride. Green preference also reduces hubristic pride, compared to premium choices.

In three studies, we first show that for comparative choices, there is no predominance of preference for premium or green options. Second, for compared these choices, the

subsequent pride felt is not determined by high levels of socioenvironmental consciousness, or by moral elevations effects. Also, pride is the only emotion that emerges as a result of these comparative choices. Third, in compared decision process, since green behavior is perceived as positive and socially desirable (Bissing-Olson, Fielding & Iyer, 2016), by choosing a green product, and rejecting a similar premium option, consumers feelings of authentic pride are positively impacted by the decision, while the hubristic pride is negatively impacted. It happens because green choice benefits the collective, reinforcing feelings of altruism and achievement, related aspects of authentic pride, and distances the self from selfishness, arrogance and self-reliance that related to hubristic pride (Tracy & Robbins, 2007).

Fourth, given the connections between pride and self-regulation (Bissing-Olson et al., 2016) consumers evaluate their purchasing choices as a manifestation of their social and morals values. Then, consumers choices will be made as if they must justify they choices to other. Moreover, if consumers are aware that choice is a private decision, their choice in a comparative decision between a green or a premium option, will not impact authentic and hubristic pride levels.

These findings provide additional understanding about green consumption and pride literatures. First, by showing that this emotion facets only have different performances over green positioning in comparative decision process. Second, by demonstrate that choice justification is important. Moreover, while authentic pride is an important result of green choices, hubristic pride is to premium choices. Finally, for green choices made in need for accountability situations, the hubristic pride, a less social desirable is adapted and decreases. Managerial implications include aware marketers that, for compared decisions, in green choices the authentic pride remains stable. However, green choices should be manageable in order to be emphasized when purchasing will be evaluated by thirds parts, while premium choices should highlight individual aspects that are related to private decisions.

Conceptual Background

Pride as consequence of green over a premium choice.

Green brands and products are positioned by praising social, environmental and economical dimensions (Kumar & Christidoupolou, 2014). Empirical findings from several integrated models (Ng, Butt, Khong & Ong, 2014; Hartmann & Apaolaza-Ibáñez, 2012; Huang, Dong & Mukhopadhyay, 2014) support non-functional values as strong aspects of green positioning.

Although green attributes need to be integrated to standard market values to enhance acceptance (Ng et al., 2014; Hartmann & Apaolaza-Ibáñez, 2012), their market prices are higher than standard rivals and are similar to premium products (Juhl, Fener & Thorgeresen, 2017). For example, Patagonia is a green outfit brand also recognized for the high-quality of its products. In the same outfit category, its products, price, and quality can be compared to the premium brand TheNorthFace. However, while premium brands have the benefit of awareness and credibility, green brands are prejudiced by mistrust and focus on green benefits that will not directly affect the consumer. Moreover, the impact of these positionings on consumer's purchasing also acts in different ways.

Previous research has shown that by consuming green products, individuals can express behaviors that are seen as positive (White & Simpson, 2013) and of collective benefits (Griskevicius et al., 2010). On the other hand, purchasing premium products reveals a consumer seek for prestigious (Quelch, 1987). Given that in comparative process decisions, purchasing evolves evaluation as explicit trade-offs between alternatives (Dhar et al., 2000), in a self-conscious emotion perspective, has important consequences.

Self-conscious emotions conform with moral standards that will be positively judged by the collective (Tracy & Robins, 2007b). In this sense, then consumers perceptions of pride

are impacted by their purchase decisions. As examples, purchases involving pro-social conscious makes individual feels good about their choice (Cho, Gupta & Kim, 2015). More specifically, social participation and admiration seeking were found in green consumption (Gao & Mattila, 2015). Also, brands approach its premium products making then symbols of progress, prestigious, and luxury (Kapferer & Bastien, 2009), and benefits evolve prestigious and reinforce exclusivity feelings (Quelch, 1987). These characteristics are related to pride.

Pride is a self-conscious emotion resulting from the individual belief that something valuable was done (Bissing-Olson et al., 2016). Tracy and Robins (2007) proposed two facets of pride, hubristic and authentic. Authentic pride is related to positive behaviors, such achievement, altruism, and a sense of genuine self-esteem. Hubristic pride is associated with narcissism, selfish, smugness, and bragging. Pride can also function to maintain and promote social status and acceptance in a group because its expression communicates individual success (Tracy & Robins, 2007).

In comparative decision process, consumers evaluate, categorize and combine various aspects that impact on consequent emotions of choice. When a consumer chooses a green product rather than a premium option, the choice is emotionally processed as a noble, pro-social and altruistic act, which positively impact authentic pride perceptions. Also, by rejecting the premium option, consumers deviate from exclusivity, selfishness, power differentiation and self-enhancement feelings.

Then, as hubristic proud consumers justify their choice in personal tract (Huang et al., 2014), this feeling is associated to consumption of products that value self-progress and superiority, as the premium positioning strategies. Green positioning reinforces justice, collective benefits, and fairness, so it will negatively impacts hubristic pride. As self-conscious emotions are regulated by individuals' consideration about social values, choose the premium option will have opposite effects. That is, **(H1) Green preference, over a premium option, will (a) positively impact authentic pride and (b) negatively impact hubristic pride.**

The role of the need for choice justification

In comparative decision process, choice implies a cognitive explicit rejection of the other option, which can lead consumers to be concern about justifying their decision (Bazerman et al., 1998). When consumers are aware that their choice will need justification to others, they deliberately act to comply with group expectations (Huh, Vosgerau & Morewedge, 2014). Increasing accountability creates pressure for decision-makers to provide a compelling justification for their choice (Huh et al., 2014).

For these reasons, we propose that choice justification moderates the relation between green (vs. premium) choice and the two pride facets. Seeking inclusion and approbation potentializes authentic pride by a green choice, over the premium option. Moreover, green (vs. premium) choice, strengthens personal factors of self-healing (Huang et al., 2014), negatively impacting hubristic pride.

Therefore, H2 proposes that green (vs. premium) choice is in conformity with moral standards and behavior toward collective good (Ratner & Kahn, 2012). In other words, authentic pride is related to effort and situations in which collective contexts are involved, as in situations that justification choice to others is needed. Then, we expect that **H2(a) in need for choice justification situations, green choice (vs. premium) positively influences authentic pride, while, negatively influences hubristic pride.** These results will be a consequence of the potentialization of differences or similarities to the group to facilitates expression (Chan, Berger & Van Boven, 2012) and to self-regulate emotions.

However, given that consumers reveal different preferences between private decisions and under pressure of others judgment (Tedeschi, 1986). Private decisions decline self-monitoring and social anxious (Huh et al., 2014). Then, private decisions are made according to own beliefs and values, and there are no motivations to the choice impact the feeling of authentic or hubristic pride. Based on these arguments, we propose that **(H2b) In private decision situations, there will not be different impact of the comparative choice (green vs. premium) over authentic and hubristic pride.**

Moreover, in the absence of the need to justify the choice to others, consumers act according to their own moral and behavioral standards (Lerner & Tetlock, 1999). It might also produce a favorably impact on the green choice as an counterintuitive consequence of consumer comparative decision process. That is, the need to justify the green choice to others leads to less hubristic pride than a private decision choice. However, the hubristic pride is the facet of pride more associated to status. But, when compared to private decisions impacts, green choice can be negatively impact hubristic pride. The perception that the green choice will be approved by others allow consumers to don't feel the purchasing a in bragging self-accomplishment way.

Overview of studies. We tested the above hypotheses in a series of three studies. Study 1, using real products, we demonstrated that the proposed pride occurs only when the choice is made in a comparison decision process between green versus premium positionings. Study 2, using fictitious brands, confirms H1. Finally, study 3 tested H2a and H2b. The three studies are described below.

Study 1

The main goal of this study was to show that different perceptions of pride will emerge only when the choice is made in a comparison between green versus premium positioning options. The second goal was to rule out other emotions that could be affected by this choice situation. Finally, we aim to falsify some alternative explanations of our results.

Participants, Design, and Procedure. A total of 223 undergraduate students participated in the study in exchange for course credit. Twelve participants were eliminated based on our general screening criteria, rendering a final sample of 211 (57.5% male, $M_{age} = 24$). The study involved the comparative choice between two options of similar products. Participants were exposed to one of the three conditions of choice (Green₁-Green₂ vs. Green-Premium vs. Premium₁-Premium₂) in a between-subjects design experiment.

Each condition presented two equivalent real branded products disposed in fictional positioning ads (adapted from Griskevicius et al., 2010; Naderi & Struton, 2013), framed in four green or premium features, product image, and brand logo. Quality and price were the same between each comparison pair. For each comparison condition, participants were randomly exposed to one of three products (chocolate/ sneakers/ backpack). Overall, twelve different products in three categories were presented to demonstrate that effects remain equal no mattering the categories. To do so, analyses were performed together within conditions.

Respondents choose one of the products based on the question "If you were buying a chocolate/sneakers/backpack, which of these two options would you choose?". Previous brand knowledge was controlled. Next, participants' feelings of pride were assessed using an adaption of Soscia (2007) in a six emotions single items scale (pride, shame, guilt, satisfaction, regret, pleasure) with the preface "Thinking about your choice, indicate how much you feel" (anchored by 1= Not at all, 7= A lot). Then, participants responded two positioning manipulation check items for green and two for premium positioning (i.e. "How much your choice is sustainable/ environmental friendly?" (both anchored by 1= Strongly disagree, 7= Strongly agree). Socio-environmental conscious, using a ten items scale (adapted

from Cho et al., 2015) and moral elevation, using a three items scale (adapted from Romani & Grappi, 2014) were also measured in order to test possible moderation and mediation effects, respectively. Finally, a few demographic measures were obtained.

Manipulations Checks. First, we encoded the choice selection of participants in a binary choice according to each condition. Chi-square analyses found that participants were not more likely to choose any product positioning option. Within Green-Premium condition, 52,9 % ($n=45$) chose the green option ($\chi^2(1) = .294, p = .588$), within the Green₁-Green₂, there was no choice preference ($\chi^2(1) = .258, p = .611$), and within the Premium₁-Premium₂, there was effect of choice over options ($\chi^2(1) = 4, p = .049$). However, in the last case, logistic regression showed that the previous brand knowledge influenced choice ($\beta = -1.242$, Wald test(1)= 5.285, $p = .022$), (i.e. The North Face could be more known than Eagle Creek in the compared evaluation decision).

Next, confirming the efficacy of positioning manipulation, between Green₁-Green₂ and Premium₁-Premium₂ conditions, participants on the Green₁-Green₂ condition indicated their choice as highly sustainable and environmentally friendly ($\alpha = .945$) than those on the Premium₁-Premium₂ ($F(1, 124) = 10.163, p = .002$). Same results were found within the Green-Premium condition ($F(1, 83) = 72.938, p = .000$). As expected, no significant differences were found on each of the other conditions, Green₁-Green₂ ($F(1, 60) = 2.094, p = .153$), and Premium₁-Premium₂ ($F(1, 62) = 2.474, p = .121$).

Pride and other emotions results. To check our prediction that pride is effected by choice only in a compared evaluation decisions between a green or a premium positioning products option, we first perform a One-Way ANOVA with the Green₁-Green₂ and Premium₁-Premium₂ conditions as factor group, and pride as the dependent variable. Results show that there was no significant effect of a green or a premium choice on pride perceptions levels ($F(1, 124) < 1$). Others three One-Way ANOVAs were performed, and as expected, only in the Green-Premium condition, participants showed positive impact of choice on pride levels for choosing the green, compared to premium ($M_{\text{Green}} = 4.04$; $SD = 1.98$; $M_{\text{Premium}} = 3.23$; $SD = 1.76$; $F(1, 83) = 3.002, p = .049$). That is, there was no impact of positioning choice on pride for the Green₁-Green₂ condition ($F(1, 60) < 1$), nor for the Premium₁-Premium₂ ($F(1, 62) < 1$). No significant effects were found for guilt ($F(1, 83) = 2.472, p = .12$), shame, satisfaction, regret, and pleasure ($F < 1$, for all).

Also, considering that ones can discuss that the socio-environmental conscious level could be a determinant condition pride perceptions level, or moral elevation could be an underlying mechanism of the results found on the green versus premium positioning choice, we perform a moderation analyses for the first using process macro model 1 (Hayes, 2017), in which positioning choice was the independent variable, and pride as dependent variable, and the model 4 for the second, using the same independent and dependent variables. No significant effects were found (C.I = -.7770 to .3489; C.I = -.0060 to .6316, respectively).

Discussion. The results of study 1 show that pride might be a positive consequence of green choice only for the comparative evaluation decision between a green or a premium positioning options of similar products. Using several real brands in three product categories, we show that between two premiums options and two green options, consumers do not feel pride in different ways. This supports the proposition that in comparative decision process, consumers who choose green over a premium product feel good about their choice and this feeling is expressed in pride. This study also ruled out other emotions in which similar or inverted results could be questioned. The socio-environmental concern, an important influencer of green behaviors (Naderi & Strutton) is not a determinant of the pride felt as a consequence of green choice over a premium option. Moral elevation was also excluded as a possible underlying mechanism of these results. However, this study has some limitations. First, brand familiarity could have impacted the results, since real brands and product were

used in the scenarios. Second, pride was measured as a unique construct, which does not permit to test our main hypothesis. Then, study 2 aims to overcome these limitations testing H1 using fictitious brand.

Study 2

The goal this study is to test the prediction that in a compared decision process, the preference for a green over a premium option will positively impact authentic pride and negatively impact hubristic pride.

Participants, Design, and Procedure. 89 undergraduate students (55% female, $M_{age} = 22$) participated in this survey study in exchange for course credit. Participation involved choosing between a green (Kokoa) or a premium (Thierry) fictitious chocolate brand options. Positioning fictitious brand and products were disposed similarly to study 1. Participants were presented with four features for each positioning. However, the product image, the quality, and the price were the same between options. The images of the two advertising products appeared side by side for the respondents and we randomly assigned the order of presentation. Similar to study 1, participants indicated which of the two options they would choose. Next, they answered authentic and hubristic measures of pride, adapted from Tracy & Robbins (2007), with two items for each pride facet (previously used by Wubben, De Cremer, & Van Dijk, 2012). Participants' inferences about pride were assessed with the preface "Thinking about your choice, indicate how much you feel" (anchored by 1= Not at all, 7= A lot). Further, manipulations checks and demographics data measures were similar to study 1.

Manipulations Checks. We coded participants' choice into a binary choice as performed in study 1. Overall, 50.6 % of participants ($n = 45$) chose the green option, no preference was found ($\chi^2(1) = .011, p = .916$). Confirming the efficacy of the positioning manipulation, those who chose the green option indicated higher green check index ($\alpha = .984$), ($F(1, 87) = 98.225, p = .000$).

Authentic and hubristic pride results. To test H1, we conducted two One Way ANOVAs with participant binary positioning choice (green or premium) as factor group. First, we use authentic pride as the dependent variable. Second, we use the hubristic pride. Results confirm the hypothesis that green (vs. premium) choice leads to positive impact on authentic pride perceptions ($M_{Green} = 5.08$; $SD = 1.09$; $M_{Premium} = 4.43$; $SD = 1.40$; $F(1, 87) = 5.862, p = .018$) and opposite patterns to hubristic pride perceptions ($M_{Green} = 2.13$; $SD = 1.04$; $M_{Premium} = 2.89$; $SD = 1.43$; $F(1, 87) = 8.286, p = .005$).

Discussion. The results confirm H1. Consumers who choose the green option, compared to those who chose the premium option, experience more authentic pride, a social desirable form of pride expressed by a feeling of accomplishment, altruism, and satisfaction. However, hubristic pride, a less social desirable form of pride is positively experienced only by those who chose the premium option. The green choice is in conformity with standard positive values (Ratner & Kahn, 2012; Cho et al., 2015) and it highlights their authentic pride while negatively impact their hubristic pride perceptions. However, the premium choice acts a manifestation of self-importance, which negatively impacts authentic pride levels, while expressing more snobbish, selfish, conceited, arrogant and smug feelings. In study 3 we test a boundary condition of these effects, the need of choice justification.

Study 3

In our third study has the goal to test H2a and H2b. We test for the moderating role of the choice justification choice and do so by testing the need to justify the choice to others.

Participants, Design, and Procedure. A total of 134 undergraduate students participated in the study in exchange for course credit and a small participation reward. Twenty-six participants were eliminated based on our general screening criteria, rendering a

final sample of 108 (53.2% male, $M_{age} = 22$ years). Participation involved choosing between a green or a premium fictitious branded jacket in a single factor between-subjects design with two conditions of choice justification (justify to others vs. private decision).

Participants were invited out of the classroom and were sent to the laboratory. Once there, each one chose a computer to perform the study. Manipulation was embedded in a text inserted before participants compare and choose between the jackets options. In the justify choice to others condition, they were informed that when they would back to the classroom, a discussion would occur, and they would be asked to provide reasons for their choices. In the private decision of choice condition, they were reminded that their decisions were private (adapted from Huh et al., 2014).

Participants choose between a green (Ecolife) or a premium (Inlive) fictitious brands of jackets. Positioning product manipulation and compared choice question followed the same predictions of study 2. Also similar to study 2, next, participants indicated authentic and hubristic pride. To check the choice justification manipulation, respondents answered the item "My choice will be evaluated by me and others" (anchored by 1= Not at all, 7= A lot). Positioning manipulations check remained the same of previous studies. Finally, demographic data were collected.

Manipulations Checks. We coded participants' selection of choice into a binary choice. Overall, 60.7 % of participants ($n = 65$) chose a green option. As shown in the previous studies, no choice preference was found ($\chi^2(1) = 1.386, p = .239$),

Confirming the efficacy of choice justification manipulation, a two-way ANOVA with choice justification and positioning choice as independent variables, and the choice justification check item as the dependent variable resulted only in a main effect of choice justification ($F(1, 103) = 4.685, p = .033$). That is, no main effect of positioning choice ($F(1, 103) = 1.23, p = .319$), or interaction effect ($F(1, 103) = 1.230, p = .270$) were found.

Confirming the efficacy of positioning options another two two-way ANOVA was performed. First, with choice justification and positioning choice as independent variables, and the green positioning check index ($\alpha = .992$) as the dependent variable. As predicted, only the main effect of positioning choice ($F(1, 103) = 243.15, p = .000$) was found, choice justification and interaction ($F < 1$, for both). Then, using premium positioning check index ($\alpha = .943$) as the dependent variable, only the main effect of positioning choice ($F(1, 103) = 14.1, p = .000$) was found. Choice justification ($F(1, 103) = 1.68, p = .198$) and interaction ($F < 1$) were no significant.

Authentic pride results. To test our predictions, we conducted a two-way ANOVA with choice justification and positioning choice as independent variables, and authentic pride as the dependent variable. Both the interaction effect ($F(1, 103) = 4.92, p = .029, \eta^2 = .046$) and the main effect of choice justification ($F(1, 103) = 6.23, p = .014, \eta^2 = .057$) and were significant. No main effect of positioning choice ($F(1, 103) = 2.47, p = .119$) was found.

As predicted, within the justify choice to others condition, participants who chose a green positioning jacket ($M = 5.38, S.D. = .20$) indicate positive impact on authentic pride levels than those who chose the premium option ($M = 4.59, S.D. = .22; F(1, 103) = 6.57, p = .012, \eta^2 = .060$). Moreover, within the private decision condition, no significant impacts were found over the green or premium positioning choices ($F < 1$).

Pairwise comparisons also showed that those who chose the green positioning jacket indicated the same authentic pride levels between choice justification conditions ($F < 1$), while those who chose the premium positioning jacket show a negative impact on levels of authentic pride in the justify to others condition ($M = 4.59$) than in the private decision condition ($M = 5.57; F(1, 103) = 9.35, p = .003, \eta^2 = .083$).

Hubristic pride results. A two-way ANOVA with need justification and positioning choice as independent variables, and hubristic pride as the dependent variable was performed.

Both the interaction effect ($F(1,103) = 4.92, p = .029, \eta^2 = .046$) and the main effect of need justification condition ($F(1, 103) = 6.23, p = .014, \eta^2 = .057$) were significant. No main effect of positioning choice ($F(1, 103) = 2.47, p = .119$) was found.

As predicted, within the justify to others condition, participants who chose a green positioning jackets ($M = 2.10, S.D. = .84$) showed a negative impact on hubristic pride levels than those who chose the premium positioning option ($M = 3.09, S.D. = 1.07; F(1, 103) = 7.43, p = .008, \eta^2 = .067$). Moreover, within the private decision condition, no significant impacts were found on choices ($F < 1$). Also, those who chose the green option showed a negative impact on levels of hubristic pride in the justify to others condition ($M = 2.10$) than those who chose it in the private decision condition ($M = 2.72; F(1, 103) = 3.95, p = .050, \eta^2 = .037$), while those who chose the premium indicate the same levels of hubristic pride between the need justification conditions ($F < 1$).

Discussion. Confirming H2a and H2b, study 3 provides further evidence that, in a compared decision process, the choice of a green or a premium positioning is unique and have different impacts over authentic and hubristic pride in specific choice justification situations. First, important to note that the results of the justify to others condition are consistent with the results of study 2. Thus, in the absence of a justification to others, or a reinforcement that choice is private, authentic and hubristic pride are impacted by choice as if it would need to be justified to others. In a socially oriented perspective, these results are found because green choice complies with group expectations.

Additionally, for those who chose the green option, authentic pride was not affected by the choice justification at all. These results suggest that green choice, besides to be highly related to authentic pride not mattering the choice justification situation, it is also related to status. As predicted in a signal cost perspective, the green choice can act as a self-sacrifice, in exchange for a group's benefit, which enhance the status and reputation of the sacrificing actor (Griskevicius et al., 2010). Thus, justify the choice to others reinforce the conspicuous consumption, and pride and status consumption are also strongly related.

However, for those who chose a green option, when is necessary justify the choice to others, hubristic pride levels were significantly lower than in the private decision condition. Considering that green purchasing lead to the enhanced self-image (Griskevicius et al., 2010), the results of this study point to a new understanding of the interaction between choice justification and green purchasing in compared decision situations. While premium positioning choice reveals that the individual value individualistic behaviors, those who chose the green positioning option seems to feel forgiven of hubristic pride effects.

Counterintuitively, the findings show that while the choice of a green option is always strongly associated to the authentic pride, in a conspicuous consumption situation the perception of hubristic pride is negatively impacted by choice, compared to when the green choice is made as a private decision. In other words, hubristic pride is known as strongly associated with status and to the need for self-enhancement in front of others. However, it is not true when individuals chose green positioning products in a comparative decision process between a green or a premium option. That is, making an effort in favor of the collective dismissed feelings of selfishness and self-enactment.

Finally, our results support our argument that when individuals know that their choice is private, the compared evaluation decision choice does not threaten one's authentic pride, as well as one's hubristic pride. The choice does not involve implicitly public judgment of their action delivered from others. In other words, self-monitoring is low (Huh et al., 2014) and doesn't matter the positioning chose, the levels of authentic and hubristic pride are not impacted by the option chose.

General Discussion

Contributions. This study showed that, in comparative decision process situations, a green (vs. premium) choice positively (vs. negatively) impact authentic (vs. hubristic) pride. Furthermore, authentic pride effect derived from green (vs. premium) choice is stronger (vs. weaker) in the public justification condition, while in the private choice condition, preferences do not impact any of the two tales of pride. These results contribute to green consumption research by showing that comparative decisions process is an important issue to the impact of green choice, over a premium option, on authentic and hubristic pride. While impacts are only applicable to conspicuous consumptions products, make consumers feel pride in specific ways for those products that are purchased in private decisions (i.e. shampoo, tooth-paste, deodorant, and body lotion) remains as a challenge to practitioners and researchers

Managerial Implications and Future Research. Marketers should position green products highlighting comparisons with premium alternatives, knowing that green choice can take pride in a social desirable set. Also, is necessary to be aware that green choice will be perceive as status symbols even without explicitly call for status seeking. The positive impact of authentic pride triggered from the green choice can be use in advertising campaigns.

Future research can explore other self-regulation challenges that could impact pride perceptions of choice (i.e. public vs. private; self-construal). Also, cues of pride facets can be tested in order to verify if in comparative choice between green vs. premium option, authentic pride cue can influence the consumer to choose the green option. Finally, future research can explore how the prides affect sequential comparative choices.

References

- Bazerman, M. H., Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Wade-Benzoni, K. (1998). "Negotiating With Yourself and Losing: Making Decisions With Competing internal Preferences." *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 225-241.
- Bennett, G., & Williams, F. (2011) *Mainstream Green: Moving Sustainability From Niche To Normal*. New York: Ogilvy & Mather. Available in [http:// www.assets.ogilvy.com](http://www.assets.ogilvy.com)
- Bissing-Olson, M. J., Fielding, K. S., & Iyer, A. (2016). "Experiences of Pride, Not Guilt, Predict Pro-Environmental Behavior When Pro-Environmental Descriptive Norms Are More Positive." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 45, 145-153.
- Chan, C., Berger, J., & Van Boven, L. (2012). Identifiable but not identical: Combining social identity and uniqueness motives in choice. *Journal of Consumer research*, 39(3), 561-573.
- Cho, E., Gupta, S., & Kim, Y. (2015) "Style Consumption: Its Drivers and Role in Sustainable Apparel Consumption." *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 39(6), 661-669.
- Dion, D., & Arnould, E. (2011). Retail luxury strategy: assembling charisma through art and magic. *Journal of Retailing*, 87(4), 502-520.
- Dhar, R., Nowlis, S. M., & Sherman, S. J. (2000). Trying hard or hardly trying: An analysis of context effects in choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(4), 189-200.
- Gao, Y. L., & Mattila, A. S. (2015) "The Impact of Option Popularity, Social inclusion/Exclusion, and Self-Affirmation on Consumers' Propensity To Choose Green Hotels." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(3), 1-11.
- Green, T., & Peloza, J. (2014) "Finding The Right Shade of Green: The Effect of Advertising Appeal Type on Environmentally Friendly Consumption." *Journal of Advertising*, V. 43, N. 2, P. 128-141.
- Griskevicius, V., Tybur, J. M., & Van Den Bergh, B. (2010) "Going Green To Be Seen: Status, Reputation, and Conspicuous Conservation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(3), 392-404.

- Hartmann, P., & Apaolaza-Ibañez, V. (2012) "Consumer Attitude and Purchase intention Toward Green Energy Brands: The Roles of Psychological Benefits and Environmental Concern." *Journal of Business Research*, 65 (9), 1254-1263.
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications.
- Huang, X, Dong, P., & Mukhopadhyay, A. (2014) "Proud To Belong Or Proudly Different? Lay Theories Determine Contrasting Effects of incidental Pride on Uniqueness Seeking." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(3), 697-712.
- Huh, Y. E., Vosgerau, J., & Morewedge, C. K. (2014). "Social Defaults: Observed Choices Become Choice Defaults." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(3), 746-760.
- Juhl, H. J., Fenger, M. H., & Thøgersen, J. (2017). Will the consistent organic food consumer step forward? an empirical analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44(3), 519-535.
- Kapferer, J. N., & Bastien, V. (2009). *The luxury strategy*. Kogan Page, London.
- Kumar, V., and Christodouloupoulou, A. (2014) "Sustainability and Branding: An integrated Perspective." *Industrial Marketing Managment*. 43(1), p 6-15.
- Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). "Accounting for the effects of accountability". *Psychological bulletin*, 125(2), 255-274.
- Mintel. (2016). *Europe 2017 Consumer Trends 2017* – Mintel. Available in <http://www.mintel.com/>
- Moser, A. K. (2015) "Thinking Green, Buying Green? Drivers of Pro-Environmental Purchasing Behavior." *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 32(3), 167-175.
- Naderi, I., & Strutton, D. (2-15) "I Support Sustainability But Only When Doing So Reflects Fabulously On Me Can Green Narcissists Be Cultivated?" *Journal of Macromarketing*, 35(1), 70-85.
- Ng, P. F., Butt, M. M., Khong, K. W., & Ong, F. S. (2014) "Antecedents of Green Brand Equity: An integrated Approach." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121 (2), 203-215.
- Quelch, J. A. (1987). Marketing the premium product. *Business Horizons*, 30(3), 38-45.
- Ratner, R. K., & Kahn, B. E. (2002). "The impact of private versus public consumption on variety-seeking behavior." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(2), 246-257.
- Romani, S., & Grappi, S. (2014). How companies' good deeds encourage consumers to adopt pro-social behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(5/6), 943-963.
- Soscia, I. (2007) "Gratitude, Delight, Or Guilt: The Role of Consumers' Emotions in Predicting Postconsumption Behaviours." *Psychology & Marketing*, 24(10), 871-894.
- Tedeschi, J. T. (1986). "Private and public experiences and the self." In *Public self and private self*. New York: Springer, 1-20.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007) "The Psychological Structure of Pride: A Tale of Two Facets." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(3), 506-525.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007b). The Self in Self-Conscious Emotions: A Cognitive Appraisal Approach. in J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The Selfconscious Emotions: Theory and Research*, 3-20. New York: The Guilford Press
- Van Vugt, M., Roberts, G., & Hardy, C. (2007) "Competitive Altruism: Development of Reputation-Based Cooperation in Groups." In Dunbar, R., & Barrett, L. (Ed), *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*. Oxford: University Press Oxford, 531-540
- White, K., & Simpson, B. (2013) "When Do (and Don't) Normative Appeals influence Sustainable Consumer Behaviors?" *Journal of Marketing*, 77(2), 78-95.
- Wubben, M. J., De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (2012). Is pride a prosocial emotion? Interpersonal effects of authentic and hubristic pride. *Cognition & emotion*, 26(6), 1084-1097.