Consumer Citizenship Outside the Consumption Domain: Conceptualizing Motivation from a Self-Determination Perspective

Received 09 October 2021
Revised 20 May 2022
Accepted 27 May 2022

Eranjana Kathriarachchi
Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management and Finance,
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka
eranjanak@mkt.cmb.ac.lk

Dinuka Wijetunga
Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management and Finance,
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

Abstract

Consumer citizenship has attracted significant attention from researchers over time. Recent discussions in this domain indicate that some of the citizenship behaviors that consumers engage in have spilled over to non-consumption arenas as well (i.e., outside the spheres of choice, purchase and use, and behaviors closely related to them). Such behaviors are evident in consumer involvement in organized movements related to an organic farming and consumption, such as Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) and Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS). Though consumer citizenship has been studied from many perspectives, theorizing what motivates consumers to engage in such behavior has received scant attention. Such theorization is particularly important in the context of consumer citizenship behavior outside the domain of consumption because such behaviors require relatively greater effort and commitment compared to citizenship behaviors executed within consumption. Guided by concepts of the Self-Determination Theory and current literature on consumer citizenship, this paper presents three propositions on how consumers may be motivated to engage in citizenship behaviors outside the domain of consumption, such as volunteering to act as evaluators in PGS.

Keywords: Consumer citizenship, Self-determination theory, Autonomous motivation, Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, Basic psychological needs.

SLJMS
Sri Lanka Journal of Management Studies
Vol. 3 – Issue II, 2021
pp, 84 – 97
ISSN (Online): 2792-1093
http://doi.org/10.4038/sljms.v3i2.74

Introduction

Investigating the citizen-consumer has become a popular subject of inquiry due to the considerable currency it has gained in society (Johnston, 2008). The two concepts combined in the term consumer citizenship are seemingly incompatible: Citizenship generally emphasizes the importance of civil society in channeling rights and responsibilities of citizens for the benefit of society as whole, while consumption focuses on choice and shopping pleasure of individuals (Johnston, 2008). However, Fontenelle and Pozzebon (2018) argue that a citizen consumer is a person who obtains his/her citizenship, or, more precisely his/her sense of citizenship, through consumption. In other words, citizen consumers exercise their citizenship rights and responsibilities through consumption (McGregor, 2002).

Early references to consumer citizenship have focused on actions such as product boycotts (Jubas, 2007) and mobilization of consumers for such activity; however, apart from these overtly political forms of actions, consumers consciously or unconsciously leave an indelible mark on the larger social system through their everyday practices (Trentmann, 2007). Consumption activities, as simple as making purchasing choices, that people routinely perform in their everyday life can be forms of civic engagement (Cho et al., 2015). Whilst these are forms of civic behaviors that are possible within the private domain of consumption, there are also instances when people engage in consumption related citizenship behaviors outside the sphere of consumption (i.e., choosing, purchasing and using, and activities closely related to them such as engaging in word-of-mouth recommendations). From a food consumption perspective, Slow Food Movement (SFM) is such an initiative where the participants engage in shared citizenship practices such as growing own food, encouraging others to alter their shared practices related to food habits, and diffusion of knowledge on sustainable food/food practices (Chaudhury & Albinsson, 2015), all of which are outside the direct domain of consumption although related to it.

An examination of the literature reveals that although consumer citizenship is an area that has received significant attention, what motivates such behaviors has been somewhat neglected, with the exception of a few studies (e.g., Fowler, 2013; Schrank & Running, 2018). Fowler (2013) has pointed out the significance of gaining insight into reasons for consumer citizenship behavior which could provide researchers and proponents of consumer citizenship with a fuller grasp of its nature and the means of fostering it. A theoretical understanding about consumers' motivation to engage in citizenship behavior becomes especially important when such behaviors take place outside the consumption domain, which requires consumers to spend extra time and effort (International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM, 2018), and possibly other resources as well.

In this conceptual paper, we contribute to knowledge on consumer citizenship by attempting to conceptualize the motivation for engaging in consumer citizenship behavior outside the consumption domain, using the Self-determination Theory (SDT) as a theoretical lens. This is a suitable theoretical lens as it has been successfully used in previous research for explaining civic (Wray-Lake et al., 2017) and prosocial behaviour (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010), which are both closely aligned with consumer citizenship. Moreover, SDT is a theory that foregrounds "human autonomy" (Moller et al., 2006, p. 104) in explicating motivation. This is of

special relevance to the study of consumer citizenship outside the consumption domain, which, as can be seen in the example of Slow Food Movement mentioned earlier, is an entirely voluntary activity.

For explanatory purposes, the paper utilizes Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) in organic produce cultivation (and to a lesser extent, Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)) as an example. PGS are locally focused quality assurance systems designed as an alternative to mainstream (commercial) organic certification for small/medium scale organic food producers. In PGS, committees comprising consumers, producers and technicians certify organic producers. As stated on the IFOAM Policy Brief (2018) on PGS, it is a system "based on the active participation of stakeholders and is built on trust, social networks and knowledge exchange" (p. 4). PGS encompasses a significant citizenship involvement of consumers as independent, voluntary evaluators in the process (IFOAM, 2018).

In the next section, the paper presents an overview of prevailing discussions in the consumer citizenship literature to highlight the knowledge gap briefly discussed above. Then, guided by current literature and based on SDT, three theoretical propositions are developed to explain the motivation for engaging in consumer citizenship outside the domain of consumption.

Citizen Consumer

The citizen consumer has been studied extensively in the field of marketing, which is evident in the number of terms that have been used to refer to this phenomenon. For example, Fontenelle and Pozzebon (2018) have identified several terms in the literature such as citizen-consumer, citizen consumer and consumer-citizen, whereas Numerato and Giulianotti (2018) have used the term citimer to refer to consumers engaging in citizenship behaviors.

In conceptualizing citizen consumers, researchers have examined the fusion of the two concepts citizenship and consumption (see, for example, McGregor, 2002). Johnston (2008) identifies the culmination of the fusion of citizenship and consumption as "an idea that seems to indicate the presence of moral regulation in the marketplace" (p. 240). As previously noted, consumption is an individual act of choice and shopping pleasure belonging to the private realm, while citizenship emphasizes the importance of civil society and the greater public good that focuses on the public realm (Johnston, 2008; Trentmann, 2007). Therefore, the notion of a citizen consumer challenges the view that private and public domains of life are separate. Research on history and sociology has questioned the idea of a straightforward division between the behaviors related to public citizenship and private consumption; similarly, Soper (as cited in Trentmann, 2007) points out the fallacy of contrasting self-interest of consumers with the civic-mindedness of citizens. "A civic concern with freedom and sustainability, …, is not a separate island, …, but part and parcel of changing consumer practices" (Trentmann, 2007, p. 154). In a similar vein, McGregor (2002) argues "if there is no civic virtue among people, but only personal and private virtue (Parker, 1989), then consumption may never take on a global perspective wherein people are sensitive to the impact of their decisions on others and the environment" (p. 6).

With reference to several previous studies, Trentmann (2007) notes that consumption has, for a long time, provided an alternative platform for political action for groups that have been excluded from the formal body politic, such as women (Jubas, 2007). In addition to overtly political forms of actions (such as boycotts and mobilization), consumers leave their mark on larger social systems, sometimes without even consciously realizing it (Trentmann, 2007). Several consumer researchers have identified such everyday practices of citizenship in the private domain of consumption. Shaw et al. (2006), for example, describe participants in their study as acting in the marketplace as consumers, citizens, and activists at the same time to fight injustice within the current market system. Cho et al. (2015) assert civic engagement could manifest in routine consumption related activity that people perform in their day-to-day life, citing examples such as "making a purchasing choice, engaging in a consumer event, joining a consumer club/organization, conversing over a product/service with family and friends, etc." (p. 174). They further suggest that civic organizations and community groups could capitalize on this link between civic behaviors and consumption by "strategically planning and cooperating with local business and consumer sectors" (p. 174).

Consumer Citizenship outside the Consumption Domain (CCOCD): The Example of Organized Organic Food Consumption Movements

Organized behavior in relation to the choice and consumption of food has featured prominently in consumer citizenship studies. For example, in a study of Alternative Food Movements (AFM), Dubuisson-Quellier et al. (2011) have identified how these food movements get consumers actively involved in the negotiation of economic regulation by providing them with various tools to make the right choice.

In addition to scholarship on general food networks, there is a constellation of research that has explored organized consumer citizenship movements focusing on the organic food sector. Consuming organic food itself could be, in a sense, a form of citizenship behavior since it could be "an act of promoting different aspects of social and ecological responsibility and the integration of ethical considerations into daily practices such as eating" (Grosglik, 2017, p. 732). Organized movements take this a step forward. Studies on these organized efforts have focused on movements such as CSA (Grosglik, 2017; Thompson & Coskuner-Balli, 2007; Schrank & Running 2018). CSA movements organize consumers around local agricultural activity to facilitate other consumers and producers of organic food. The functioning of CSA is consistent with the view of Cho et al. (2015), who propose the possibility of strategically linking consumption with behaviors that promote civic life. For example, Thompson and Coskuner-Balli (2007) have explored how CSA farmers and consumers have created networks of market relationships, consumption practices and experiences. Consumers who participate in CSA movements are benefited in ways such as a reliable supply of quality food in return for their financial investment in the community (Thompson & Coskuner-Balli, 2007; Grosglik, 2017).

Notions such as co-creation of market relationships between consumers and producers in CSA and making financial investments in businesses within the community suggest that some of the consumer citizenship behaviors exhibited though these movements have spilled over from consumption into related non-consumption arenas. The Slow Food Movement (SFM) provides further evidence for CCOCD. " SFM's primary objectives are to educate people about nuances of

taste; create and sustain ways to protect diversity of natural foods without depleting natural resources or harming the environment; revive and preserve traditional methods of food preparation; and to build communal relationships between various stakeholders" (Chaudhury & Albinsson, 2015, p. 4), most of which are outside the domain of consumption even though a closely related few, such as educating people about taste and reviving traditional food preparation methods, could be considered as belonging to the consumption domain (or perhaps behaviors overlapping the consumption domain and those outside it).

CCOCD, such as those exemplified in SFM objectives, have recently gained traction among researchers. Southerton and Evans (2017, as cited in Närvänen et al., 2019) highlight the need to recognize the complexity of the behavior of consumers in all its aspects instead of viewing consumers simply as choice-makers. This suggests the relevance of studying citizenship engagements of consumers that does not involve consumption. For instance, as previously noted, Chaudhury and Albinsson (2015) have identified that SFM consumers engage in myriad behaviors in addition to consumption in fostering sustainable food practices. These activities include growing own food, encouraging others to alter their food-related shared practices, and diffusion of knowledge on sustainable food/food practices. Once again, there are some overlapping behaviors, such as encouraging others to alter food practices and others that are outside consumption, such as growing food. These different civic engagements elucidate the extension of the domain of the citizen consumer and suggest that these different engagements manifest fluid transitions between consumption and citizenship actions depending on the situation (Chaudhury & Albinsson, 2015).

Unlike involvement in CSA and SFM, which include both consumption and non-consumption related behaviors, volunteering as evaluators of Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) in organic food production involves behaviors that are completely outside of the consumption domain. A key concern in organic food consumption is the authenticity of food available in the market. Organic consumption requires consumers to consider whether the food they buy has been produced in an acceptable manner, and access to information contributes to translating consumers' intention of making sustainable food choices into actual behavior (Thøgersen, 2010). Certification of producers is one way in which such information is made available to consumers. Although commercial third-party certification services are available, not all producers can afford the assistance of such service providers; PGS is a solution for such small/medium scale producers (Källander, 2008; Nelson et al., 2010; Nelson et al., 2016). In PGS, consumer volunteers, along with producers and agronomists/technicians, are members of evaluation committees engaged in the certification process (Källander, 2008; Nelson et al., 2016). PGS contributes to sustainability in both social and environmental terms "as a consequence of empowerment of the people involved and the organic perspective that underlines the whole process of production and distribution" (Cuéllar-Padilla & Calle-Collado, 2011, p. 382). Consumers' voluntary involvement in PGS supports small/medium scale producers as well as other consumers. For producers, consumer involvement is crucial for the sustainability of this affordable organic certification. At the other end, the information made available via PGS certification enables other consumers to make informed decisions regarding the organic food they buy. Thus, there is a strong citizenship element in the voluntary participation in a PGS; however, the activities of these volunteer consumers are not related to consumption in any way

but to the process of production and distribution (Cuéllar-Padilla & Calle-Collado, 2011). Hence it can be argued that PGS is a prominent platform where consumers engage in citizenship behavior outside the consumption domain.

Motivations of Consumer Citizenship outside the Consumption Domain

As mentioned at the beginning of the paper, although consumer citizenship has been investigated thoroughly, the reasons why consumers engage in such behavior have not received much attention. Fowler (2013) has attempted to shed light on the motivations behind citizenship behavior; however, the study does not employ any particular theoretical perspective in exploring the motivation for such behaviors. Schrank and Running (2018) have also attempted to identify the individual and collective motives of consumers engaging in citizenship behavior; however, their focus is primarily in understanding the individualist and collectivist concerns in relation to the consumption of local organic food. In this backdrop, Fowler (2013) also points out the importance of getting a deeper understanding of reasons for customer citizenship behavior from both theoretical and practical standpoints. Theorizing consumers' motivations is even more important when the behaviors that take place outside of the consumption domain since they require consumers to engage in tasks outside of their day-to-day activity, and therefore, demand extra time and effort. The remainder of this paper attempts to do this by examining current knowledge of CCOCD (particularly on CSA and PGS) through concepts of the Self-determination theory and presenting three propositions related to the motivations for engaging in CCOCD.

Self-determination Theory (SDT) as a Theoretical Approach

SDT is a theoretical approach that has been applied in understanding motivation in the domains of civic behavior (Wray-Lake et al., 2017) and prosocial behavior (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010), and the volunteering activity of individuals has been identified as a sub domain of both these areas of study. Hence, it provides an apt theoretical perspective for conceptualizing consumers' CCOCD behaviors through voluntary participation in movements such as PGS.

SDT, which originated with the work of Deci and Ryan (1985), "is a macro theory of human motivation in which issues related to choice, or more precisely, to human autonomy are in the forefront" (Moller et al., 2006, p. 104). It is a theory comprising six mini theories that are continuously refined based on empirical foundations, where"each mini-theory representing an extension of an existing body of knowledge that was already been established within SDT" (Ryan & Deci, 2019, p. 116). In attempting to theorize motivation for CCOCD behavior, this paper does not engage in an exhaustive discussion of SDT, but draws on some of its key principles, with reference to the relevant mini-theories where appropriate.

Volition in Consumer Citizenship

Given the key focus of SDT on human autonomy, a central proposition of the theory is the distinction between autonomous motivation and controlled motivation. According to SDT, motivation processes could differ, depending on the degree to which they involve autonomy or control (Moller et al., 2006). Autonomous motivation is where "people have identified an

activity's value and ideally have integrated it to their self" (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 182). For example, a person might consume organic food because he or she feels it is good for health and for the environment; for some, it may also be one behavior among others related to an environmentally friendly self. "In contrast, controlled motivation consists of external regulation (one's behavior is a function of external contingencies – reward or punishment) and introjected regulation (the regulation of action has been partially internalized and is energized by factors such as an approval motive and avoidance of shame)" (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 182). An example is when a child would eat organic food because he or she is afraid of being scolded by the mother for not eating it, or because the child feels guilty to go against the wishes of the mother. Controlled action results because there is pressure to do so, whereas when individuals display autonomous behavior, they act with a true sense of choice and volition (Moller et al., 2006).

Some consumer citizenship behaviors, such as resistance through product boycotts (Jubas, 2007) that are ad hoc and might not require much effort or commitment, could conceivably result from controlled motivation. For example, one might engage in such activity due to the insistence of a friend or family member. However, most consumer citizenship behaviors that involve activities outside the consumption domain, such as joining movements like CSA or PGS, requires commitment and sustained involvement (Källander, 2008; Nelson et al., 2010; Zepeda et al., 2013). Such behaviors are unlikely to result from pressure to participate, and therefore, essentially encompass a form of autonomous behavior. Further, in other domains of citizenship behavior (unrelated to consumption), it has been identified that controlled motivation undermines prosocial behavior such as volunteering and that a high degree of autonomy results in a higher level of helpful behaviors (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Therefore, we present our first proposition as,

P1: Consumers are (primarily) autonomously motivated to engage in citizenship behavior outside the consumption domain

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in Consumer Citizenship

The concepts of autonomous and controlled motivation descend from a prior SDT categorization of motivation, namely, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Moller et al., 2006). The first two mini-theories of SDT – Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) and Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) – are devoted, respectively, to the discussion of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). This categorization helps to further understand the nature of different types of autonomous and controlled motivations.

"An intrinsically motivated activity is performed for its own sake – that is, the behavior is experienced as inherently satisfying" (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010, p. 106). These behaviors are not carried out for any reinforcements or rewards, but for the positive experiences associated with the exercising and extending of one's capacities (Ryan & Deci, 2000). For example, someone might eat organic food because he or she enjoys the taste and perhaps even the process of preparing it. The enjoyment of a behavior is at the center of intrinsic motivation (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). However, this does not mean that people who are intrinsically motivated to do something are "enjoyment seekers" pursuing enjoyment as a reason for engaging in the behavior; "rather, enjoyment is a by-product of a full immersion in an activity" (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010,

p. 107). Behaviors that are motivated in this manner are entirely volitional, and therefore, considered as the "prototype of autonomous motivation" (Moller et al., 2006, p. 106).

All, or even the majority, of activities that people engage in, are not inherently enjoyable. People are motivated to engage in many activities that are not enjoyable by themselves. For example, someone might not find organic food tasty or enjoyable but consume it because he or she feels it is good for the environment. Extrinsic motivation addresses these kind of behaviors. Within SDT, extrinsic motivation is defined as instrumental motivation, encompassing all behaviors that are executed for achieving some outcome that is separable from the behavior (Ryan & Deci, 2019). Extrinsically motivated behaviors can vary in the degree of autonomy associated with them (Moller et al. 2006) which is contingent on how much the reasons for such behaviors have been internalized (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Internalization refers to "endorsing the value of extrinsically motivated behaviors" (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010, p. 113). If people accept the value of and the reason for a behavior and feel ownership about it, even an extrinsically motivated behavior could be experienced as autonomous (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010).

The mini-theory OIT posits extrinsic motivations could be arranged on a continuum based on the level of their internalization (Ryan & Deci, 2000). At the lowest end of the autonomy/internalization continuum is external regulation – when behavior is executed to gain a reward or avoid punishment; the next level is introjected regulation – where the behavior is partially internalized due to feelings such as guilt or pride; the third level is identified regulation – where a person understands and accepts the value of a behavior ; and the final level is integrated regulation – where a person synthesizes various behaviors he or she identifies with into a unified and coherent sense of self (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). In the previous example of consuming organic food, a child might eat organic food to avoid mother's scolding (external regulation); because he or she feels guilty to go against the mother's wishes (introjected regulation); through accepting that organic food is good for the body and the environment (identification); or as one of a group of behaviors, such as recycling and low use of polyethene, associated with an 'environmentally friendly' self (integration). Of the four categories, external regulation and introjected regulation are considered controlled forms of motivation by SDT (Moller et al. 2006; Vansteenkiste et al., 2010), whereas identified regulation and integrated regulation are considered autonomous forms (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). As explained by Ryan and Deci (2000), the more one internalizes the reasons for an action to the self, the more one's externally motivated actions become self-determined.

Literature suggests that prosocial behaviors can stem from both personal values and initiatives (intrinsic motivation) or external pressures or rewards (extrinsic motivation) (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). This has also been identified in relation to participation in CCOCD such as CSA (Zepeda et al., 2013). However, it appears that what effectively motivates people towards such behaviors is higher levels of internalization. For example, in the CSA study, motivated individuals have identified extrinsic motivations such as enhanced environmental awareness (Zepeda et al., 2013). A similar situation is reported in an action research involving the establishment of PGS. In this study, Cuéllar-Padilla and Calle-Collado (2011) explain how participants who had initially been skeptical had later embraced the system through identified regulation, which had, in turn, led to the success of the project:

"You want to organize a "self-managed" group and you want that group to work independently; well, that doesn't happen in a month and a half'. These were the views expressed at the start of the project. After one and a half years' of work … the situation at local level had changed … there was clearly a sense of a process of alignment and communication between people, through which participants recognized that they shared the same problems, and faced the same daily obstacles in their work. This mutual recognition laid the foundations for a satisfactory approach built around shared problems." (p. 379)

These findings demonstrate how the internalization of extrinsic motivation at the level of identified regulation leads to adopting a behavior more readily. They are also consistent with the discussions within SDT literature. For example, Cook and Artino Jr. (2016) note that through identification and integration, individuals can be externally motivated and still be committed and authentic. Vansteenkiste et al. (2010) state that socially responsible behaviors could be fostered through the internalization of socio-cultural values so that they are executed even in the absence of socialization agents. They claim that this notion "is at the heart of organismic integration theory" (p. 113). Although the previously discussed examples relate to the identification, it should also be remembered that SDT posits integrated regulation that encompasses the highest level of autonomous motivation among extrinsic motivations (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). Given that we have proposed CCOCD to be an autonomously motivated behavior, it can be expected that integrated regulation would be an even stronger motivation than identified regulation in this context. Based on these observations, in our second proposition, we extend the first one as follows:

P2: Engaging in consumer citizenship behavior outside the consumption domain is autonomously motivated through intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation internalized at the levels of identified regulation and integrated regulation

Basic Psychological Needs, Motivation and Consumer Citizenship

A central notion that pervades SDT and links many of its concepts is that humans possess a set of basic psychological needs (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). Basic needs proposed in SDT are conceptually distinct from motives as the former represent specifications imperative for integrative, truly self-regulated functioning (Ryan & Deci, 2019). In other words, people will be autonomously motivated to engage in given behaviors to the extent that the behaviors satisfy these basic psychological needs. This idea is discussed in the mini theory named the Basic Psychological Needs Theory (BPNT). "The core of BPNT is the proposal that there are (at least) three fundamental psychological needs, namely those for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, the satisfaction of which fosters psychological wellness, and the frustration of which conduces to ill-being". (Ryan & Deci, 2019, p. 123). Although this statement implies the existence of more than the three named needs, BPNT proposes these three as the minimal number of needs that can "account for a maximal number of phenomena across ages, genders, and cultures" (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010, p. 131). SDT defines these needs as follows. Need for autonomy "involves perceiving that one's activities are endorsed by or congruent with the self" (Reis et al., 2000, p. 420); in other words, the satisfaction of this need is the "experience of choice and ownership of behavior" (Vansteenkiste et al. 2010, p. 131). The need for competence is satisfied by "the experience that one can effectively bring about desired effects and outcomes", and the

need for relatedness "pertains to the feeling that one is close and connected to significant others" (Reis et al., 2000, p. 420). Although BPNT acknowledges that "these basic needs vary in the degree to which they are valued, voiced, and expressed in different cultures and social groups" (Ryan & Deci, 2019, p. 125), the theory claims that irrespective of socio-cultural differences, the satisfaction of these needs would enhance personal growth and thriving, and their frustration would compromise wellness.

A central premise that arises from the above ideas of the BPNT is that socio-cultural conditions that foster an individual's experience of autonomy, competence and relatedness would result in volitional motivation to engage in activities contextualized in such conditions (Center for Self-Determination Theory, 2021). Further, the different mini theories of SDT discuss how these basic psychological needs are related to different types of motivation. Initial work based on CET (Ryan & Deci, 2000) has identified that for high level of intrinsic motivation, individuals must experience the satisfaction of the needs for competence and autonomy. However, subsequent studies (Cook & Artino Jr, 2016) have identified that fulfilment of all three basic psychosocial needs is required to foster intrinsic motivation. Conditions that satisfy the basic needs are also said to facilitate the internalization of extrinsic motivation. When people feel they have a choice (autonomy), and are effective in performing a task (competence), they are more likely to adopt it even if it is not intrinsically enjoyable (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). Further, with respect to the need for relatedness, "social norms and values are more likely to be adopted and internalized when introduced by socializing agents to whom people feel close, rather than distant" (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010, p. 120).

Given that the satisfaction of these basic needs is imperative for autonomous motivation, in general, and specifically for inducing the different types of autonomous motivation (i.e., intrinsic motivation and internalized and integrated extrinsic motivation), it is worth examining whether CCOCD contexts (i.e., the two contexts used as an example in this paper) provide conditions for the satisfaction of these needs. In the context of CSA, it has been identified that conditions that enhance participants' sense of autonomy, competence and relatedness could reduce attrition and increase the likelihood of adopting the behavior in the long term (Zepeda et al, 2013). In the context of PGS too, there is much evidence to suggest that conditions satisfying these needs would be present. First, in the IFOAM policy brief (2018), voluntary effort and voluntary adherence to PGS standards are identified as crucial elements of PGS, indicating conditions that encourage autonomy. Second, providing training, using trained organic inspectors, to enhance the knowledge of member farmers and consumers on organic standards is a highlighting feature of PGS (Nelson et al., 2010; IFOAM, 2018). Here, there are two aspects that could increase the satisfaction of the need for competence: Training increases one's ability to perform any task more competently. Also, 'policy briefs' point to a structured approach to PGS programmes, and structured contexts are said to be more conducive to satisfying the need for competence than unstructured ones (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). Third, Studies in Mexico (Nelson et al., 2010) and Andalusia (Cuéllar-Padilla & Calle-Collado, 2011) have identified that close relationships form between participants of PGS. For example, Cuéllar-Padilla and Calle-Collado (2011) note that the mutual recognition that they shared common problems and daily issues led participants to feel increased confidence in the group and a greater ability to communicate. They quote one participant in the study saying, "It brings us together, the issue of promotion and

consumption of organic products" (p. 380). These suggest that PGS appears to provide conditions that satisfy the need for relatedness. The above discussion bears evidence to the notion that CCOCD contexts could provide conditions that could potentially satisfy the three basic psychological needs. Thus, one could argue that these conditions facilitating autonomy, competence and relatedness would lead to autonomous motivation of consumers to participate in such initiatives. Based on these observations, our third proposition is,

P3: Conditions that facilitate the basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness in the contexts of CCOCD would lead to enhanced autonomous motivation for consumers to engage in these behaviors through fostering intrinsic motivation and high internalization of extrinsic motivation.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have contributed to knowledge on consumer citizenship by proposing a theoretical explanation for consumer motivation to engage in citizenship behavior, particularly in domains outside of the direct sphere of consumption (i.e., choice, purchase and use, and behaviors closely related to them). Drawing on concepts of the Self-determination Theory, we proposed that (1) engaging in CCOCD would mostly be motivated autonomously; (2) the autonomous motivation to engage in CCOCD will comprise intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivations internalized at the levels of identified regulation and integrated regulation; and (3) the above motivations would be fostered by contexts of CCOCD that provide conditions for satisfying the basic needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. A key theoretical implication of the three propositions is that consumer citizenship could result from varied forms of motivation. Another is the role played by basic psychological needs in giving rise to such motivation. These propositions were developed with the support of current literature on consumer citizenship. However, they should be further verified empirically in future research. In addition to verifying the propositions, an empirical investigation will also enable researchers to identify how they apply and play out in different contexts of consumer citizenship, outside, and possibly even within the domain of consumption.

The propositions provide one clear guideline for business, voluntary, or government organizations: implement practical initiatives aimed at persuading consumers to participate in CCOCD. The propositions indicate that such initiatives should be designed in a manner that facilitates the satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. Given that a unifying principle (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010) linking most concepts of SDT is that these three provide the nutriments of growth, optimal functioning, and psychological and social wellbeing of individuals (Center for Self-determination Theory, 2021; Vansteenkiste et al., 2010), facilitating the satisfaction of these needs will reward the participants with enhanced personal growth and wellbeing, which will result in motivating people to engage in initiatives that call for consumer citizenship outside the domain of consumption. .

References

Center for Self-Determination Theory. (2021). *The Theory*. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/the-theory/

Chaudhury, S. R., & Albinsson, P. A. (2015). Citizen-consumer oriented practices in naturalistic foodways: The case of the slow food movement. *Journal of Macromarketing, 35*(1), 36-52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146714534264

Cho, J., Keum, H., & Shah, D. V. (2015). News consumers, opinion leaders, and citizen consumers: Moderators of the consumption–participation link. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 92*(1), 161-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699014554766

Cook, D. A., & Artino Jr, A. R. (2016). Motivation to learn: an overview of contemporary theories. *Medical Education*, *50*(10), 997-1014. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13074

Cuéllar-Padilla, M., & Calle-Collado, Á. (2011). Can we find solutions with people? Participatory action research with small organic producers in Andalusia. *Journal of Rural Studies, 27*(4), 372-383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.08.004

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology [Psychologie Canadienne]*, *49*(3), 182-185. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012801

Dubuisson-Quellier, S., Lamine, C., & Le Velly, R. (2011). Citizenship and consumption: Mobilization in alternative food systems in France. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *51*(3), 304-323. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00540.x

Fontenelle, I. A., & Pozzebon, M. (2018). A dialectical reflection on the emergence of the 'citizen as consumer'as neoliberal citizenship: The 2013 Brazilian protests. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *21*(3), 501-518. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540518806939

Fowler, J. G. (2013). Customer citizenship behavior: An expanded theoretical understanding. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 4*(5), 1-8.

Grosglik, R. (2017). Citizen-consumer revisited: The cultural meanings of organic food consumption in Israel. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 17*(3), 732-751. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540515623609

IFOAM – Organics International. (2018). *IFOAM policy brief on how governments can recognize and support participatory guarantee systems (PGS)*. https://www.ifoam.bio/sites/default/files/2020-03/policybrief_how_governments_can_support_pgs.pdf

Johnston, J. (2008). The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market. *Theory and Society, 37*(3), 229-270. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-007-9058-5

Jubas, K. (2007). Conceptual con/fusion in democratic societies: Understandings and limitations of consumer-citizenship. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 7*(2), 231-254. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540507077683

Källander, I. (2008). *Participatory guarantee systems–PGS*. Swedish Society for Nature Conservation

McGregor, S. (2002, April). *Consumer citizenship: A pathway to sustainable development* [Keynote Address]. International Conference on Developing Consumer Citizenship. Halifax, Canada.

Moller, A. C., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-determination theory and public policy: Improving the quality of consumer decisions without using coercion. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *25*(1), 104-116. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.25.1.104

Närvänen, E., Mattila, M., & Mesiranta, N. (2019). Consumer-citizens as leaders of change: Case food waste. In A. Kangas (Ed.), *Leading change in a complex world: Transdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 263-280). Tampere University Press

Nelson, E., Tovar, L. G., Gueguen, E., Humphries, S., Landman, K., & Rindermann, R. S. (2016). Participatory guarantee systems and the re-imagining of Mexico's organic sector. *Agriculture and Human Values, 33*(2), 373-388. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-015-9615-x

Nelson, E., Tovar, L. G., Rindermann, R. S., & Cruz, M. Á. G. (2010). Participatory organic certification in Mexico: An alternative approach to maintaining the integrity of the organic label. *Agriculture and Human Values, 27*(2), 227-237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-009-9205-x

Numerato, D., & Giulianotti, R. (2018). Citizen, consumer, citimer: The interplay of market and political identities within contemporary football fan cultures. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 18*(2), 336-355. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540517744692

Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily wellbeing: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(4), 419-435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200266002

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54-67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2019). Brick by brick: The origins, development, and future of self-determination theory. *Advances in Motivation Science, 6*, 111-156. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2019.01.001

Schrank, Z., & Running, K. (2018). Individualist and collectivist consumer motivations in local organic food markets. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 18*(1), 184-201. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540516659127

Shaw, D., Newholm, T., & Dickinson, R. (2006). Consumption as voting: An exploration of consumer empowerment. *European Journal of Marketing, 40*(9-10), 1049-1067. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560610681005

Thøgersen, J. (2010). Country differences in sustainable consumption: The case of organic food. *Journal of Macromarketing, 30*(2), 171-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146710361926

Thompson, C. J., & Coskuner-Balli, G. (2007). Enchanting ethical consumerism: The case of community supported agriculture. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 7*(3), 275-303. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540507081631

Trentmann, F. (2007). Citizenship and consumption. *The Journal of Consumer Culture, 7*(2), 147-158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540507077667

Vansteenkiste, M., Niemiec, C. P., & Soenens, B. (2010). The development of the five mini-theories of self-determination theory: An historical overview, emerging trends, and future directions. In T.C. Urdan & S. A. Karabenick (Eds.), *The decade ahead: Theoretical perspectives on motivation and achievement* (pp. 105-165). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on wellbeing for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(2), 222-244. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016984

Wray-Lake, L., DeHaan, C. R., Shubert, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Examining links from civic engagement to daily wellbeing from a self-determination theory perspective. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 14*(2), 166-177. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1388432

Zepeda, L., Reznickova, A., & Russell, W. S. (2013). CSA membership and psychological needs fulfillment: an application of self-determination theory. *Agriculture and Human Values, 30*(4), 605-614. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-013-9432-z