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Abstract

Background: The clothing industry is guilty of environmental destruction, at the same time consumers and more specifically Swedish millennials have shown increasing concern for the environment. Those favorable environmental attitudes and concerns has however in some green contexts shown to not affect the intention to buy green products which might suggest that there exists a so-called attitude-intention gap. There is a lot of uncertainty concerning why this attitude-intention gap may exist and what factors that may have an influence on the consumer’s green purchasing criteria.

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to first reveal if there exists an attitude-intention gap among Swedish millennials when it comes to purchasing green clothing products. Secondly, the study investigated the determinants that influence the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials.

Methodology: The study used a deductive and quantitative research approach by conducting an online survey which was distributed with a non-probability convenience sampling technique as well as with a snowball sampling technique towards Swedish millennials. The survey resulted in 150 valid responses which was quantitatively analyzed.

Findings: The findings revealed that there exist an attitude-intention gap among Swedish millennials when it comes to the context of green clothing products. The most influential determinants affecting the intention to buy green clothes were: Knowledge about green clothing products, followed by habits of buying traditional clothing products and then the subjective norm. Additionally, gender differences among majority of the determinants were identified.

Implications: The findings provide suggestions for decision makers marketing green clothing products to focus on increasing the knowledge among consumers as well as easing the process of changing old purchasing habits. Furthermore, it is of value for Swedish policymakers whom with this knowledge know where to concentrate their focus and resources in order to spur the green consumption.

Originality: This paper contributes to theory by applying the well-known TPB framework with the addition of personal and situational determinants on the context of green clothing products. Furthermore, new insights regarding what determinants that affects the intention to buy green clothing products when it comes to the context of Swedish millennials were found.
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1. Introduction

The authors will in this chapter present the reader with necessary background information followed by a problem discussion which emerges into the purpose and the research questions of the paper. Lastly delimitations of the paper will be presented.

1.1 Background

During recent decades, people have started to consume an ever-increasing amount of goods and services like for example cars, houses, appliances, computers, clothes, furniture, books, travel, and entertainment. The list of things and services we have come to depend upon is endless. The global market system is also designed in a way that depends on our continued and increased consumption, so it does its best to make us want more, desire more, buy more and also upgrade more (Lim, 2017). With increasing demand of goods and services comes naturally also an increase of production to meet the demand. This increased demand of products and it’s following increased production causes rapid environmental damage due to diminishing of natural resources (Chen & Chai, 2010). Consequences of this environmental damage are global warming, environmental pollution, land erosion, loss of biodiversity and decreased animal-welfare (Otmann, 1992). It is reported by a study of United Nations that the cost of pollution and other damage to the natural environment caused by the 3000 world's biggest companies equals more than one-third of their profits, if they were held financially accountable for their destruction. This estimated combined damage was as of 2008 estimated to be worth about 2,2 trillion dollars (Jowit, 2010). There are many industrial sectors contributing to the environmental destruction such as energy, transportation, petroleum, mining, clothing etc.

The clothing industry is particularly interesting to look at due to the unique characteristics that exist within this industry. The clothing industry uses a lot of natural resources in the production process. Cotton for example, is a very thirsty ingredient and it requires about 2700 liter of water to produce an average t-shirt, and about 20 % of the industrial water pollution is due to manufacturing of clothing products (Drew & Yehounme, 2017). The industry has recent years grown 5,5 % annually and was as of 2016 worth 2,4 trillion US dollars (McKinsey, 2016). The growth can be explained by an increase of demand of clothing products around the world. One reason for the increase in demand is mainly because of that there is an increase of people that enters the global middle class around the world. As of 2015 there are 3 billion people within the global middle-class span, and in 2030 it is projected to be 5,4 billion people in it. Fast-changing trends and low prices which is equal to the new apparel phenomenon “fast fashion”
have allowed people to consume more. The average consumer in the world is now purchasing 60% more items of clothing compared to in 2000 (Drew & Yehounme, 2017). An increase in consumer demand will automatically result in a larger supply of products which today equals even more impact and damage on our environment.

As the environment continues to be damaged, this present issue has become a persistent public concern in the world today (Chen & Chai, 2010). Consumers are increasingly concerned about environmental deterioration and favorable attitudes towards preventing environmental damage has therefore emerged (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2001; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Ellen, Webb & Mohr, 2006; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Wagner, Bicen & Hall, 2008; Dastous & Legendre, 2009; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). More consumers today want to take responsibility to change personal consumption behaviors with the hope that their individual small efforts may collectively add together to have a notable impact on the environment (Mostafa, 2007). Due to the environmental concern, consumers, interest groups and governments are also increasingly demanding that companies act in a more environmentally responsible manner (Schweitzer & Lyons, 2010; Grimmer & Woolley, 2014). It is getting more common that companies are being expected to make decisions that are in the best interests of not only themselves, or their shareholders, but also the society as a whole (Woolverton and Dimitri, 2010). In today’s business world, creating customer satisfaction and building long-term profitable customer relationship are some of the primary objectives that companies try to achieve to sustain and succeed. Due to the demand of stakeholders such as consumers, organizations and governments and in line with trying to create value for their customers, many companies’ reactions have been to embrace green marketing strategies in order to gain competitive advantages (Chen & Chai, 2010). The American Marketing Association (2018) explains green marketing as the development and marketing of environmentally safe products and processes that minimize harm to or improve the physical environment. These processes include ecologically responsible production, promotion, packaging, and reclamation. This means that today, consumers have the possibility to prevent or decrease the environmental damage by purchasing green products.

A report by the European Commission (2011) shows that 88% of Europeans believe that protecting the environment is very important. Furthermore, another report by the European Commission in 2013 showed that 89% of the Europeans believe that purchasing green products can make a difference with respect to the environment, and 95% agree that purchasing green products is “the right thing to do” (European Commission, 2013). In a more recent report done
by the European commission is was shown that respondents in Sweden are the most likely in Europe to say that they have taken some form of action to protect the environment. The same report also found that the people in Sweden was the most concerned about the environmental issues and viewed it as one of the most serious problems (European Commission, 2014). Furthermore, in 2017 the Swedish millennials ranked what issues they believed was the most important to them. The results showed that the number one concern was climate change/protecting the environment with 54% (Deloitte, 2017). Despite the growing concern for sustainability and the environment, a report by Nielsen (2013) shows that the current market share of green products remains surprisingly low at about 1-6%. Consumers are not buying green products as much as their concern, attitude and beliefs are stating (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Gupta & Ogden, 2009; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Davari & Strutton, 2014; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Tan et al., 2016). It seems that “green” plays a relatively smaller part when it comes to consumer’s actual purchasing criteria (Mohr, Webb & Harris, 2001). Researchers have noted a big gap between consumer’s attitude and actual behavior when it comes to purchasing green products. This gap is commonly among researchers and practitioners referred to as the “attitude-behavior gap”. Within the green context which include green products, this gap is referred to as the “green gap” (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). This phenomenon limits the availability of green products in the market and subsequently neglect “greener” consumption behaviors in society (Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015).

Young consumers, born between 1980-2000 (Goldman Sachs, 2018) which are also called millennials, have a big relevance when it comes to the green gap. One reason for this is that their buying power surpass that of the generations before them. A news article written by Mak (2016) reveals that millennials “represent an estimated $2.45 trillion in spending power”. This is partly because they have a greater need, compared to for example baby boomers (Yasav, 2014). They do also expect the world around them to adapt quickly to their needs. Along with, about 80 million millennials have entered their peak consumption years only in America. This is equal to more than 27 % of the entire population (Yasav, 2014). In Sweden, more than 2,64 million people are considered being in the millennial age category (SCB, 2018a). This equals about 26 % of the entire population in Sweden (SCB, 2018a; SCB, 2018b). Millennials are considered to be ‘the driving power’ behind the increased attention to green products as well (Heaney, 2007). Though their green attitudes are extremely positive, these attitudes are not in
any case predictors of their behavior (McDougle, Greenspan & Handy, 2011; Paladino & Serena, 2012). Hume (2010) noted that there exists a clear pattern of contradiction between how millennials feels and acts in green purchasing. According to researchers Kolkailah, Aish & El-Bassiouny (2012), millennials are the ones who could and should be able to make a difference in green purchasing in the next decennia.

1.2 Problem discussion

One of the leading issues that the world nowadays faces is the environmental degradation caused by industries (Chen & Chai, 2010). The clothing industry in particular is no exception to this statement and has during recent times had much attention in media due to its destructive impact on the environment (Hoskins, 2014; Sweeny, 2015; Buchanan, 2017). This is a result of how consumers behave and their extensive consumption. According to studies, it is in most people’s interest to preserve and decrease the environmental damage in concern for further generations to come (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2001; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Ellen, Webb & Mohr, 2006; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Wagner, Bicen & Hall, 2008; Dastous & Legendre, 2009; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). As previously mentioned, it does exist a big gap between what consumers think and how they behave when it comes to environmental friendly products, the so-called attitude-behavior gap (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016) A closing of this gap would mean lesser impact on the environment due to more ethical consumption by the consumers (Tan, Johnstone & Yang 2016). Further information on the gap would be of value for decision makers and marketers within clothing companies since it would mean valuable information about where it might be room for improvements and in this way point in directions where to put their resources in order to meet the consumer’s request. For policymakers like governments it would mean valuable information to support the development of existing and new policies in order encourage further green consumption.

Research into ethical consumption has significantly increased in recent years (Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011). While researchers around the world like Carrigan & Attalla (2001), Tanner & Wölfing Kast, (2003), Picket-Baker & Ozaki (2008), Gupta & Ogden (2009), McDonald et al. (2012), Barbarossa & Pastore (2015); Zheng & Chi (2015), Nam, Dong & Lee (2017) has made significant contributions to understand what drives green consumption behavior, it remains blurry why consumers profess to have so pro-environmental attitudes but cannot translate this into actual green purchasing behavior (Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). There has been a lot of
research trying to bridge the gap between attitude and behavior when it comes to the green context (e.g. Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Zabkar & Hosta, 2013; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Davari & Strutton, 2014; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). Over the past few decades, numerous theoretical frameworks have been developed trying to explain this attitude - behavior consistency but no definitive explanation has yet been found (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). The attitude-behavior gap is a complex phenomenon since it can be looked at from many different dimensions, as well as it is in its nature very context based (Joshi & Rahman, 2015). Publications on the attitude-behavior gap has revealed that it could, depending on the context, be subdivided into one gap between the attitude and the intention, and another one between the intention and the actual behavior (Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010). The present study is looking at the attitude-intention relationship in the green context more thoroughly based on the reasoning that consumers intentions are of value for different stakeholders such as academia, marketing practitioners and different policy makers. The complexity of the green gap shows why scholars (Prothero et al., 2011), marketers (Nielsen, 2013) and policy makers (European Commission, 2011; European Commission, 2013; European Commission 2014) has called for further research within this topic (Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015).

Researchers like Tanner & Wölfing Kast (2003), Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011), Gleim et al. (2013), Gleim & Lawson, (2014), Johnstone & Tan (2015), Tan, Johnstone & Yang (2016), has studied situational and product-related factors/antecedents such as barriers impeding the green consumption in order to explain the green gap. Those studies have proven that there a long list of factors that can affect the green gap such as price, performance, lack of choice, lack of availability, subjective and personal norms, perception of quality, perception of efficiency, trustworthiness, environmental knowledge, environmental concern and so on. There have also been studies looking at the attitude-behavior in terms of different specific contexts such as eco-food (e.g. Smith & Paladino, 2010; Bredahl, 2011) and organic personal care products (e.g. Chung & Kim, 2011). A few studies have been carried out within the clothing context too (Joergens, 2006; Kang, Liu & Kim, 2013; Zheng & Chi, 2015; Perry & Chung, 2016; Han, 2017; Nam, Dong & Lee, 2017). These studies were carried out on consumers originating from the US, South Korea and China. These studies showed a few similarities but also quite a lot of differences when it came to the set of determinants affecting the intention to buy green clothing products. Since the Swedish population overall is shown to be very environmental conscious and seems to believe that environmental damage is an important issue (European Commission,
2014), along with millennials showing the biggest purchasing power and are considered being the “driving power” behind green initiatives (Heaney, 2007), this is an interesting and important population to further investigate. From what the authors know, there has not been any research carried out investigating the attitude-intention connection as well as highlighting important determinants influencing the intention to buy green clothing products among the Swedish population, and more specifically looking at the Swedish millennials.

1.3 Purpose & Research Question
The purpose of this study is to first reveal if there exists an attitude-intention gap among Swedish millennials when it comes to buying green clothing products. This would be done in order to gain valuable insights to if the gap exists in the Swedish millennial context, and to reveal how favorably green attitudes stands in relation to actual intentions in the green context. Secondly, the study further investigates the determinants that influence the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials in order to gain knowledge that can be of value to various stakeholders in order to potentially close the gap that generally according to academia seems to exist between consumer’s belief and purchasing behavior of green products. This is done by answering the two following research questions:

RQ1: What is the relationship between attitude and intention among Swedish millennials when it comes to green clothing products?

RQ2: What are the most influential determinants affecting the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish Millennials?

1.4 Delimitations
One purpose of the study is to investigate the determinants that influence the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials. There is however a long list of determinants that can affect the intention to buy green clothing products and an investigation of all of them is not feasible to perform. The authors of this research study have therefore chosen to investigate the determinants that has been shown to be of most relevance and frequency in previous studies on the subject.
2. Theory

The authors will in this chapter present the reader with a literature review on theories and concepts that is essential to understand in order to answer the mentioned research questions.

2.1 Disposition and justification of theory

The theory chapter starts with a glance into the topic of green marketing where the reader is presented with necessary information regarding what green marketing is, what activities companies perform and what is considered a green clothing product in the present study. It is followed with a section covering how consumers behave when it comes to the green context. This section starts by briefly explaining the consumer’s purchasing process and ends with explaining the current green consumption situation and “the green gap”. After this, a brief review of the characteristics and attributes of the millennials is portrayed since this is the population target of the research study. Following that, the theory of planned behavior is presented since that is a previously used and proven model when it comes to investigating the attitude-behavior gap in the green context. Lastly, the authors present the reader with limitations of the theory of planned behavior theory and based on this, extend their study by diving into additional determinants that has been proven to have an influence on the intention to buy green clothing products.

2.2 Green Marketing

Green marketing is considered one of the major trends in modern business (D’Souza, Taghian & Khosla, 2007). As the environment continues to be damaged, this issue has become a persistent public concern in the world today (Chen & Chai, 2010). Consumers are increasingly concerned about environmental deterioration and favorable attitudes towards preventing environmental damage has therefore emerged (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2001; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). It has become more important for companies to make decisions that are not just in interest of themselves or their shareholders, but also for the society as a whole (Woolverton & Dimitri, 2010). There has over the years been several attempts on defining green marketing and since green marketing has been developed in the modern market, the concept still remains ambiguous (Sandu, 2014).

The concept can be dated back to the 1980s, when ecological problems such as global warming, greenhouse effect, pollution and climate change started to be more recognized in a wider context (Durmaz & Zengin, 2011). Back in 1986 Stanton explained the term as:
"Green marketing, which seeks to bring the activities of firms into a new and more harmonious relation with the environment” (Stanton, 1986, p. 3).

Over the years the concept has changed and have been adapting to the environmental concerns that has been emerging. One major focus during the 1990s was the clean technology that highlighted the importance of designing innovative new products that considered pollution and waste issues. However, during the late 1990s and early 2000 the focus shifted and the term "Sustainable green marketing” emerged and the focus was not solely on waste issues but rather on the whole process of activities that companies interact within (Sandu, 2014). A recent definition was set by the prominent community focused on marketing, The American Marketing Association. They defined green marketing in their dictionary as:

“The development and marketing of environmentally safe products and processes that minimize harm to or improve the physical environment. These processes include ecologically responsible production, promotion, packaging, and reclamation” (American Marketing Association, 2018). According to them, the definition of green marketing can today also be divided into three aspects; the retailing definition, the social marketing definition and the environmental definition. The retailing definition means the marketing of products that are presumed to be environmentally safe, the social marketing definition means the marketing of products that are designed to minimize negative effects on the physical environment or to improve its quality and the environment definition means the activities done my organizations to produce, promote, package and reclaim precepts in a manner that is sensitive to ecological concerns (American Marketing Association, 2018).

As the definitions of green marketing above implies one part of green marketing is the marketing of green products. The term "green product” can also be defined in more than one way. Mebratu (2001) proposes that green products are acquired with the environment in mind; meaning that companies build environmental consideration in the day-to day procurement decision-making and operations. Albino, Balice & Dangelico (2009) means that a product is green when the entire life-cycle of a product is designed to minimize harm on the environment and that this should be done by using renewable resources and that toxic materials should be avoided. What is considered to be a green product by consumers can depend on the claims made by different companies promoting products they claim to be green. According to Kim, Lee & Hur (2012) all types of environmental claims may be effective at influencing consumer behavior. Carlson, Grove & Kangun (1993) argues that environmental marketing claims can be divided into five types: product orientation claims; process orientation claims; image
orientation claims; environmental fact claims; and a combination of these claims. It can be further argued that retailers act as gatekeepers since their role has become more and more important to consumers. Today, many retailers are not only a distributor but also the seller of products. Researchers mean that modern retailers respond to consumers demands and can therefore also influence their preferences and behavior. Retailers can encourage consumption of green products and discourage consumption of non-green products through green retailing (Lai, Cheng & Tang, 2010).

There are several ways of defining what is meant by a green clothing product. Fletcher (2014) proposed the definition that it is clothes that are made with environmental friendly fiber or recycled materials, clothes designed for long-time use, clothes which causes little environmental impact and clothes that are produced by eco-conscious companies. Henninger (2015) proposes that green clothing products can be defined as clothes using environmentally friendly materials, clothes decreasing the use of pesticides, and promoting recycling and upcycling collections. For this research paper, the definition of Henninger (2015) will be used since it is more recent and has proven to be suitable in prior research papers. After having established that, it is now suitable to dive into the “green” consumer behavior.

2.3 Green consumer behavior

It is in the today's highly competitive business landscape of highest importance to understand how your consumer behave in order to prosper. Solomon et al. (2006, p. 6) defined consumer behavior as “the processes involved when individuals or groups select, purchase, use, or dispose products, services, ideas or experiences to satisfy needs and desires”. Kotler, Armstrong & Parment (2011) further note that learning about consumers’ behavior is not as easy and simple as it may sound since it is embedded inside the consumer’s mind. Solomon et al. (2006) explain that consumer behavior has a big part to play in all of stages of consumer’s decision-making process.

With the emerging interest and concern for the environmental the last decades, the term “green consumer behavior” has emerged. As Peattie (2010) says in his research, green consumption behavior is a problematic concept since “green” implies the conservation of natural resources while consumption generally is a process of their destruction. Additionally, as already noted, green consumption behavior intervenes with other similar concepts such as ethical, sustainable and responsible consumption behaviors (Peattie, 2010). There are however several definitions
found in the academic literature on this term (Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). Most of them (e.g. Tanner & Wölfing-Kast, 2003; Wagner, 2003) associated the term with environmental protection meanwhile some has related it to consumption reduction (e.g. Huttunen & Autio, 2010). A definition that has been widely used by researchers is the definition defined by Wagner as of 2003 which said that green consumer behavior is the “standard” consumer behavior with the addition of: “behavior that reflects concern about the effects of manufacturing and consumption on the natural environment” (Wagner, 2003, p. 1). This is with other words how individuals or groups think and behave within a green context. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the green consumer behavior, it is of importance to examine the consumers purchasing process, the green consumption situation as well as a dive into the “green gap”.

2.3.1 The consumers purchasing process

Consumers make buying decisions every day and these decisions are the central point of the consumer behavior. The fact that consumption can have a negative impact on the environment has gained much attention during recent years, which has affected consumers in their attitudes and their corresponding purchasing behavior (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2001; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Ellen, Webb & Mohr, 2006; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Wagner, Bicen & Hall, 2008; Dastous & Legendre, 2009; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). When a consumer makes a purchase, the individual consumer goes through what is called by Belz & Peattie (2012) “the consumption process” and by Kotler, Armstrong & Parment (2011) “the consumers purchase process”. Solomon et al. (2016) mention that the decisions making process might however take different routes depending on what kind of product that is being purchased. They do furthermore describe that the decision-making process can vary widely depending on different dimensions such as situational factors, personal factors, degree of novelty and perceived risk. Every situation does however involve some of the different steps in the consumer decision-making process. Belz & Peattie (2012) explained the consumption process with the addition of a green context in their publication. The different parts that constitute of this consumption process can be seen below in figure 1 and will be briefly described in chronological order.
Identification of need: The process starts with an identification of a want or need based on a problem or a desire (Belz & Peattie, 2012). Acquiring of clothing products is usually seen as fundamental need as a human being. Other needs can be of different sort such as emotional benefits. Those needs will then transform into wants which results in us as consumers wanting certain specific products. The needs and wants can be both in harmony as well as contradictory. In our case, a consumer might want to buy a green clothing product in order to save the environment due to his environmental concern, but that does not necessarily deem the product being of value enough due to different constraints such as price or availability in order to at this point buy the product (Belz & Peattie, 2012).

Information Search: An interested consumer will then start to search for information regarding the product in order to fulfill the want or need. The information about the product can be gathered from sources such as family, friends, marketing channels, guides, public sources and labelling. In the green context, the consumer does also find information about the effect that different products have on the environment and where to obtain environmental friendly products through those same information sources. Today, there exist an extensive amount of information for consumers considering different products. This may be one reason as to why consumers might go through the consumption process faster by relying on something “simple” which constitute of lesser information to process such as choosing a distinctive brand.
or going with the usual habits that may or may not support green consumption (Belz & Peattie, 2012).

**Assessment of alternatives:** Before the purchase decision, an assessment of the alternatives is usually made. It can include careful consideration as well as little consideration. The assessment of the alternatives is made by the individual and can be influenced by other external individuals (Kotler, Armstrong & Parment, 2011). In the green context, this is also where consumer’s green criteria appear, in terms of what “green products” that exist and how those are seen in comparison to the “regular” products (Belz & Peattie, 2012). This points in directions to facilitators and barriers that comes with the particular green product when it comes to the assessment of it. Researchers have for example found that the lack information as well as the poor availability of green clothing products may be reasons as to why the green consumption in the clothing industry is rather low (Perry & Chung, 2016).

**Purchase decision:** After assessing the alternatives, the consumer moves on to forming an intention to buy which most likely will lead to the actual purchase. Kotler, Armstrong & Parment (2011) point out that there are two factors that may intervene between the intention and the actual purchase. The first one is the attitude of other people and the second one is unexpected situational factors like for example economy and time. The actual purchase decision is the central part of the purchase decision process (Belz & Peattie, 2012).

**Product use:** For some products, the actual use of the product may be more harmful and environmental destructive then the actual production and acquiring of it. When looking at the clothing context in particular, this may not be the case since the use of clothes is not environmental destructive in an immediate way. What is most discussed when it comes to the product use in the clothing context is the actual length of usage of the clothing product. Recent trends show that a faster and more disposable fashion is emphasized (Belz & Peattie, 2012).

**Post-use:** The final phase of the process is the behavior that the consumer will engage in after the actual purchase behavior. This do generally include consumer behavior depending on if the consumer is satisfied or dissatisfied with the product. This results in purchase of the particular product again or in contrast not buying it again. In a green context it does also contain consumer behavior related to the disposal of the product. Some retailers have by own will or through legislation implemented programs through which the consumers can give back or dispose the products. There do today exist several ways of disposing the products in order to be “green” such as selling it, trading it, modify it for another purpose or by recycling it (Belz & Peattie, 2012).
2.3.2 The current green consumption situation and the “green gap”

First of all, it has been shown since a long time by researchers that consumption values explain consumer choice behavior (i.e. why consumer buy or do not buy a particular service or product). These values are attached to a criterion in individuals’ decision making. This criterion includes different functional, emotional, cognitive, social and conditional consumption values (Sheth, Newman & Gross, 1991). It is found through research that there are a lot of drivers and barriers that affect the green consumption behavior (Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). The drivers may be motivational factors such as emotional bond and thoughts towards nature (e.g. Kals, Schumaker & Montada, 1999; Chan, 2001), personal situation (e.g. Solér, 1996), values (e.g. Young et al., 2010; Schuitema & de Groot, 2015), ethical thoughts and beliefs (e.g. Newholm & Shaw, 2007; McDonald et al., 2012) and personal norms (e.g. Moser, 2015). Environmental knowledge and environmental attitude is also something that is seen as a driver for green consumption. Researchers has previously found out that people who have more environmental knowledge and environmental awareness may be more likely to display green consumption behaviors (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002; Zheng & Chi, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). Dobson (2007) elaborate on this by saying that green behavior changes which is driven by environmental citizenship and engagement is more likely to last than behavior driven by financial incentives. However, certain researchers agree on upon all those drivers of green consumption are multifaceted. This can be illustrated by the argument of Zheng & Chi (2015) who said that a high degree of environmental knowledge and awareness may lead to a green consumption purchase intention, but at the same time a low degree of environmental knowledge and awareness will most likely not lead to a green consumption purchase. Perry & Chung (2016) agree on this by saying that consumers decision making process involves different types of benefits such as cost benefits (e.g. convenience, search/effort, time, energy), product benefits (e.g. price, style, fit, fabric, quality, availability, brand name, store) and emotional benefits (e.g. feel of well-being, personal satisfaction, happiness). They further mention that the eco-friendly attribute is usually not the most important one among those when it comes to purchasing clothes in particular. They say that it is difficult to convince consumers to give up personal cost, product or emotional benefits in order to be “greener” (Perry & Chung, 2016).

Researchers have also found that attitudes of different forms have an impact on the green consumption process (e.g. Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002; Chen & Chai, 2010; Smith & Paladino,
2010; Chung & Kim, 2011; Zheng & Chi, 2015; Perry & Chung, 2016). Recent reports show that people all over the world have become very environmentally conscious and possess positive attitudes towards preserving the environment. A report by the European Commission (2011) shows that 88% of Europeans believe that protecting the environment is very important. Furthermore, another report by the European Commission in 2013 showed that 89% of the Europeans believe that purchasing green products can make a difference with respect to the environment, and 95% agree that purchasing green products is “the right thing to do” (European Commission, 2013). In a more recent report done by the European commission it was shown that respondents in Sweden are the most likely to say that they have taken some form of action to protect the environment. The same report also found that the people in Sweden was the most concerned about the environmental issues and viewed it as one of the most serious problems (European Commission, 2014). Despite the growing concern for sustainability and the environment, a report by Nielsen (2013) shows that the current market share of green products remains surprisingly low at about 1-6%. A large-scale study in the UK (similarities between UK millennials and Swedish millennials can be drawn) conducted by Cowe & Williams (2000) found out that more than one third of the British population considered themselves as “ethical purchasers”, yet ethically accredited products only achieved a market share of 1-3% (Cowe & Williams, 2000). Those numbers confirm what many researchers have concluded in their research studies within the green consumption field that consumers are not buying green products as much as their concern, attitude and beliefs are stating (e.g. Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Gupta & Ogden, 2009; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Davari & Strutton, 2014; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). It seems that “green” plays a relatively smaller part when it comes to consumer’s actual purchasing criteria (Mohr, Webb & Harris, 2001). Many researchers have identified a big gap between consumer’s attitude and actual behavior when it comes to purchasing green products. This gap is commonly among researchers and practitioners referred to as the “attitude-behavior gap” or the “green gap” (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). In order to investigate this gap in the green context, social and environmental researchers have looked at it from different angles and perspectives in order to gain new insights. This is something that Kollmuss and Agyeman (2002) said is understandable by saying that there is much complexity surrounding green consumption behavior and that it is hard exploring it using only one single framework.
Due to the appearance of the green gap, researchers have started to look at the barriers that is attached to the green consumption process as well. This has primarily been done in psychographic ways based on consumer personality (e.g. Shrum, McCarty & Lowrey, 1995; Lu, Chang & Chang, 2015) and with socio-demographic parameters (e.g. Kinnear, Taylor & Ahmed, 1974; Robert & James, 1999; Laroche, Bergeron & Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). Those approaches have however very often generated inconsistent and inconclusive results. This shows that there exists a limitation of using socio-demographic characteristics when trying to understand green consumption behavior since characteristics of the consumer alone do not determine the green consumption behavior (Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). Many researchers have also studied barriers such as situational and product-related factors that may impede the green consumption in order to explain the green gap (e.g. Bredahl, 2001; Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Joshi & Rahman, 2015; Perry & Chung, 2016; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). They have in their studies found that there is a long list of factors that can affect the green gap and they will furthermore will be discussed more in detail in section “2.5 Determinants influencing the green gap”.

2.4 Millennials

According to current literature, the use of a generational approach is an effective way of examining consumer behavior and sustainable issues since different lifestyles are shaped, characterized and represented by different generations (Hume, 2010; Bolton et al., 2013). The values belonging to those lifestyles tend to have equal or greater influence on the consumers’ purchasing decision in comparison to traditional demographic variables such as gender, income, educational level etc. (Hume, 2010). Heaney (2007) goes on explaining that each generation and demographic consumer group are exposed to different social and economic opportunities and barriers, different types of technological initiatives and activities, different social perceptions and norms as well as different life experiences and events. This means that each defined generation can and most likely will have a different view of the world and more specifically different views on green products depending on the settings and environment that they are and have been exposed to (Panwar, Han & Hansen, 2010).

This research study focuses on young consumers and more specifically the generation cohort that is called millennials. This generation is chosen due to the fact that their buying power surpass that of generations before them (Yasav, 2014). A news article written by Mak (2016) reveals that millennials represent an estimated $2.45 trillion in spending power. Since they have
such a big influence on purchasing behavior today, they do also have a big influence on future consumer trends to come as well (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008). The population within this generation cohort are considered the ones who could and should be able to make a difference in green consumption within the next decennia (Kolkailah, Aish & El-Bassiouny, 2012). There is yet no definite agreement on the start and endpoint in age for the generation cohort that is named millennials. This is due to the fact that researchers do not precisely agree on what life events that distinguish one generation group from another. Kotler, Armstrong & Parment (2011) define a millennial as a person born between 1978 and 2000. Bolton et al. (2013) defined it as someone born between 1981-1999. Within this research paper the authors have decided to go with the range definition that Goldman Sachs (2018) used in their publication which is someone that is born between 1980 and 2000, since this definition seems to capture an average of all the definitions that most academics have used. The millennials are known for their breeding of wealth, excessive big spending, noticeable big consumption, fashion awareness, strive for quick fixes and career advancement, all characterized by exuberance (Hume, 2010). As consumers, they are the informed ones, and which means that they conduct a well-researched shopping behavior (Heaney, 2007). Most of the millennials in Europe have been brought up with a capitalistic economy, characterized by globalization and opening of trade barriers, and are considered “cool consumers” due to the desire to buy products with “image” (Heaney, 2007). Sheahan (2005) as well as Sullivan & Heitmeyer (2008) found that millennials are socially, culturally and environmentally conscious. Millennials have been subject to commercial messages since they were born and are therefore knowledgeable about persuasion attempts by companies (Schmeltz, 2012). Neuborne & Kerwin (1999) expand on this by saying that young consumers are more skeptical to the messages companies communicate to them. Van Den Bergh & Behrer (2016, p. 27) further comment on this by saying that despite their diversity, this age group has shown more tendencies towards narcissism and are more likely to take care of their own desires first in prior to considering what other people desire. The millennials are considered the most consumption-oriented generation of all time due to the prosperity and constant availability of products and services (Sullivan & Heitmeyer, 2008). It is noted that the millennial generation holds very positive attitudes towards sustainability in general (Hume, 2010). Due to the increased usage of information technology in combination with previously mentioned characteristics of the millennials, those young consumers are very aware and most likely to acknowledge issues related to society and environment (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Nielsen, 2015). Hume (2010) studied in his research the millennials and their view of sustainability and their footprint on sustainable consumption and he further mentions
that millennials in general cares about the environment, social issues, poverty since they seem to be aware of potential threats and therefore have a desire to “save the world”. Furthermore, Swedish millennials was in 2017 asked to rank what issues in the world that they believed was most important to them and the results showed that the number one concern was climate change/protecting the environment with 54% (Deloitte, 2017).

The millennials believe that it is a companies’ duty to invest in a better society and environment by producing products in a more sustainable way or by taking other initiatives that can contribute to the further well-being (Schweitzer & Lyons, 2010; Grimmer & Woolley, 2014). In line with this, other researcher found in their studies that millennials do have very favorable attitudes towards green products (Panwar, Han & Hansen, 2010; Paladino & Serena, 2012; Schmeltz, 2012). The millennials do not only have favorable attitudes but do also show high willingness to pay a higher price for a sustainable product. A report made by Nielsen in 2015 found that millennials continue to be the generation most willing to pay extra for sustainable offerings. It was shown that almost 75% of the millennials was willing to pay extra for sustainable offerings, which was an increase from 50% back in 2014 (Nielsen, 2015). Even though green attitudes are extremely positive, it is shown by researchers that these attitudes are not in any case predictors of behavior among millennials (e.g. Joergens, 2006; McDougle, Greenspan & Handy, 2011; Paladino & Serena, 2012). In line with previous researchers, Hume (2010) also found in his study that there exists a great contradiction between millennials knowledge and attitudes, and how they act when it comes to green consumption. So, in general, the “green gap” seems to exist among the millennials as well, even though their very positive green attitudes and conscience would suggest otherwise. Research on green clothing products among millennials have shown contrasting results. Joergens (2006) and Perry & Chung (2016) found that there seems to exist a green gap meanwhile Kang, Liu, Kim (2013), Zheng & Chi (2015), Han (2017), Nam, Dong, Lee (2017) found that there did not exist a green gap in their research papers on green clothing products.

2.5 Theory of planned behavior

The theory of planned behavior (TPB) proposed by Ajzen (1985, 1991) is a theoretical model that is widely used among researchers in order to investigate consumer’s behavior. TPB was developed by Ajzen in 1985 and is based on the former theory of reasoned action (TRA) created by Fishbein & Ajzen in 1975. TPB contains the constructs attitude, subjective norm, perceived
behavioral control, behavioral intention and behavior. Figure 2 down below demonstrate the theory:

![Diagram of the Theory of Planned Behaviour](image)

**Figure 2.** The Theory of Planned Behaviour.

Behavioral intention measures a person’s relative strength of intention to perform a certain behavior. Ajzen further demonstrate in both TRA and TPB that the stronger the intention to engage in a behavior, the more likely it will actually be performed (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1985). Both TRA and TPB argues that the more positive attitude towards a particular behavior a person has, the more likely he/she is to form positive intentions towards performing it (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1985). Subjective norms are viewed in both theories as a combination of perceived expectations from relevant individuals or groups along with the individual’s intentions to comply with these expectations (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1985). This can with easier words be described as the social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). The TRA (1975) assumes that behavior is completely voluntary and rational. However, in many situations people do not have full volitional control to perform a certain behavior as they might lack the willingness or resources to perform the behavior. Therefore, the TPB does not only look at the attitude towards a behavior and subjective norm but also adds the factor called “perceived behavioral control” (Ajzen, 1985; Ajzen, 1991). This perceived behavioral control (PBC) construct is furthermore explained by Ajzen (1991) as a person’s perception of the ease or difficulty of engaging in the behavior of
interest. Ajzen do however mention that the relative importance of the attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control is expected to vary across different behaviors and situations based on the context. He describes this by saying that in some applications only attitudes may be found having a significant impact on intentions, meanwhile in others that attitudes and perceived behavioral control are sufficient to predict the intentions, and in some cases all three predictors make independent contributions (Ajzen, 1991). So therefore, it is also concluded that attitude, subjective norms and PBC influence each other as well (Ajzen, 1991). The theory of planned behavior furthermore builds on the argument that the behavior performance is decided by the behavioral intention to perform the behavior as well as is moderated by the perceived behavioral control (Ajzen 1985; Ajzen 1991).

2.5.1 Limitation and criticism of TPB in the green context

Many researchers have made use of the theory of the TPB model in order to investigate the green consumer behavior and has more specifically used it in order to test and investigate the green gap (e.g. Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010; Chung & Kim, 2011; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). Despite the popularity of the theory, it has been subject to some criticism according to Ajzen (2011) himself as well.

As previously explained, the TPB models draws on the reasoning that attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control together influence the intention to perform a behavior, and that this in turn will influence the actual behavioral performance (Ajzen, 1985; Ajzen, 1991). By going through that reasoning, one would simply draw the conclusion that the green gap would not exist since the favorable green consumer attitudes would then translate into many favorable intentions which would in turn result in equally much green consumption actions. Empirical evidence has however demonstrated that this is not the case (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). Ajzen, Brown & Carvajal (2004) did also mention in their research study that studies using intentions as a proxy for actual behavior must be interpreted with caution (Ajzen, Brown & Carvajal, 2004). Carrington, Neville & Whitwell (2010) do furthermore mention that one of the reasons for the attitude-intention gap is that consumers may be affected by a “social desirability bias”. Social desirability bias means that a person tends to often respond according to what they think is socially acceptable (Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010).

Secondly, the perceived behavior control (PBC) construct in the TPB model has had its fair share of attention and criticism in the context of green products as well. Carrington, Neville &
Whitwell (2010) argue that the PBC construct is not an accurate proxy of the actual behavioral control. The PBC construct is explained as the consumer’s imagination about how the purchase situation will look like and their perceived capabilities and resources to perform the actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Carrington, Neville & Whitwell (2010) move on to say that real purchasing situations can differ to the imagined purchase situations, and that perceptions of control rarely reflect the actual behavioral control (ABC) that the consumer experience. There are however mixed feelings about this argument since it is found that it is quite difficult to operationalize ABC in practice, which is the reason to why most researchers have used the PBC constructed suggested by Ajzen in 1985 (Ajzen, 2002). Carrington, Neville & Whitwell (2010) recommend in their research paper to use a mixed methods research approach consisting of qualitative, pilot and empirical field testing in order to deal with their proposed operationalization difficulties. The researchers in this study will however utilize the PBC construct as a proxy for ABC in this research paper due to the time limitation of the execution of this research paper.

Perhaps most notable, and something that researchers who have used the TPB framework in the green context have concluded, is that there are more constructs influencing the consumer’s decision making, additional to those within the TPB theory (Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Chung & Kim, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). The TPB framework has gotten criticism due to the fact that it does not consider personal (internal) and situational (external) determinants of the behavior. Carrington, Neville & Whitwell (2010) move on to say that cognitive approaches like for example the TPB framework usually assume perfect and constant conditions without any consideration of the environmental or social settings that exists during the whole purchasing process, which ultimately oversimplify the complex translation of attitudes into purchase intentions and furthermore those into actual buying behavior (Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010). Kolkailah, Aish & El-Bassiouny (2012) did in their publication argue that the TPB framework may show weakness due to the complex nature of personal and situational factors. Personal factors are determinants that internally influence the consumer (Kolkailah, Aish & El-Bassiouny, 2012). It is shown that attitude towards a behavior is a really important personal factor in the green purchasing process, but it does not alone explain why young consumer do or do not purchase green products. Other examples of personal factors that have been found to influence the intention to buy green products are perceived consumer efficiency, scepticism, habits, knowledge and environmental concern (Joshi & Rahman, 2015). Situational factors are
external determinants that a person cannot control, but which can affect their intention (Ajzen, 1991). Researchers within the green context have found that situational factors that affect the intention to buy green products could be price, product performance and conveniences such as availability and time (Joshi & Rahman, 2015).

2.6 Determinants influencing the intention to buy green clothing products

As previously mentioned, the TPB framework alone do not consider personal and situational determinants that may have an influence on the intention to buy green clothing products. In order to overcome this limitation and at the same time bring more value to the present research study, the authors decided to extend the existing TPB model with additional internal and external determinants that was found to have an influence on the intention to buy clothing products. All chosen determinants will be presented in the following sections.

2.6.1 Attitude

According to Solomon et al. (2006) as well as the ABC-model, an attitude consists of three key elements: affect, behavior and cognition. Solomon et al. (2006) mention that the affect element refers to the way a person feels about an attitude object, the behavior element refers to the person’s intentions to do or not to do something with regard to the attitude object and the cognition element has to do with the beliefs a person has about an attitude object. It can therefore be said that the ABC model emphasize the interrelationships between knowing, doing and feeling. Solomon et al. (2006) further mention that those three parts are always a part of an individual’s attitude formation, the only difference in outcome is in what order and what importance each of the key elements has for the individual. They do also go on to say that the relative importance of the elements will vary depending on the individual’s level of motivation in regard to the attitude object. According to Ajzen (1991), most of social scientists think that attitudes are formed through cognitive mechanisms. Consequently, Ajzen (1991) defined attitude as: “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question.” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188). This is in line with the “cognitive hierarchy model of human behavior” which Fulton, Manfredo & Lipscomb (1996) proposed, which also states that beliefs about an issue/object lead to the formation of attitude about that issue/object. It dwells on the reasoning that beliefs about an object are created through associating with particular characteristics. When a person form attitudes towards a certain behavior, beliefs about certain outcomes of the behavior are created in the mind as well (Ajzen, 1991). Therefore, attitudes consequently affect behavioral intentions (Ajzen, 1991; Fulton, Manfredo & Lipscomb, 1996).
There are many researchers that have investigated the construct of attitude and based on them it has become evident that the results completely depend on how one look at the attitude construct (Solomon et al. 2006). Instead of only focusing on the attitude in relation to the specific product, researchers have used the attitude construct in order assess the consumer’s thought of purchasing the product as well, and with this paying more attention to perceived outcomes of the acquisition (Sheppard, Hartwick & Warshaw, 1988). Sheppard, Hartwick & Warshaw (1988) argued that it is more preferable to gain insights into how an individual experience regarding purchasing a good, as compared with solely understanding the individual’s assessment of the good itself. Therefore, this research paper will look at the attitude towards the particular behavior in mind. The hypothesis that consumer’s attitude affects their behavioral intention with regards to green products have been reviewed a lot. Vermeir & Verbeke (2006; 2008) who concluded that there exists an attitude-intention gap, found in their studies on organic food that the attitude did not significantly influence the intention to buy. Contradictory, Chen & Lobo (2012) found that Chinese consumer’s attitude regarding eco labeled food had a positive influence on their intention to buy eco labeled food. Smith & Paladino (2010) did also in their studies on Australian university students find that the attitude towards purchasing organic food had an influence on the intention to purchase organic food. Kim & Chung (2011) found in their paper that the attitude influenced the intention to buy when it came to the context of organic personal care products as well.

In this study, the construct of attitude is associated with the connection between consumer’s attitude and intention to purchase green clothing products. This sort of hypothesis has been tested within the clothing context recently as well. For instance, Zheng & Chi (2015) found that the attitude regarding buying sustainable clothes among American university students positively influenced the intention to buy sustainable clothes. Hustvedt & Dickson (2009) found similar results in their studies on American households. Kang, Liu & Kim (2013) made a study on environmentally sustainable clothing consumption among Chinese and Korean university students and did also find that the attitude influenced the intention to buy environmentally sustainable clothing products. This is something that Han (2017) recently also found when it came to Chinese university students and their attitude and intentions towards purchasing sustainable clothing products. Perry & Chung (2016) did in their research on American and Chinese people find many people had favorable attitudes towards buying environmental clothing products. They did not however explicitly look at the attitude-intention connection which this present research study is doing, but rather the big attitude-behavior connection. Nam,
Dong & Lee (2017) found through their research on 600 American citizens that the attitude towards buying green sportswear products had an influence on their intention to buy green sportswear as well. Based on previously researchers’ findings along with the reasoning of Ajzen (1991) and his TPB framework, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H1: The attitude towards buying green clothing products positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

2.6.2 Subjective norm

Social norm or subjective norm refers to the level of social pressure that influences an individual to perform (or not perform) a certain action or behavior. Ajzen (1991) did in his research paper define subjective norm as: “the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188). The social pressure can be originated from influential people related to the individual such as close family, friends, relatives, peers, celebrities, idols or even different organizations (Ajzen, 1991). Bandura conducted in 1977 studies on social learning and found that individuals tend to behave in the same way as their surroundings. Based on this finding, he created the Social Learning Theory which suggests that human beings are active information processors who observe the behaviors, norms and beliefs of their surroundings and act in accordance (Bandura, 1977). Solomon et al. (2006) claim that the subjective norm is formed by the individual’s normative belief as well as their drive to obey those beliefs. The individual’s normative belief refers to the strength of the individual's opinion that their important others will approve or disapprove of the action in mind. The drive to obey refers to the intensity of the individual’s wish to obey the view of the relative other (Solomon et al., 2006). Ajzen do furthermore in his research paper explain that subjective norm will influence both the attitude as well as the perceived behavior control and in turn affect the level of intention to perform a certain behavior. Ajzen move on to say that subjective norms that are favorable towards a certain behavior will lead to stronger behavioral intentions, and vice versa as well (Ajzen, 1991).

The subject norm has been shown to have an influence on purchasing behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and therefore the construct has also been used and tested within the green consumption context as well. Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal (2015) found in their research study on millennials green consumption behavior that peer influence had a significant influence on the intention to consume green products (Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal, 2015). Gleim et al. (2013), Gleim & Lawson (2014) and Paul, Modi & Patel (2016) found similar findings in their research papers
on green product consumption as well. The construct has been verified in different specific green contexts too. It has been shown that subjective norm has a strong influence on behavioral intentions within the context of cosmetics (e.g. Chung & Kim, 2011) and in the context of organic food (e.g. Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008; Smith & Paladino, 2010). The construct has also been widely tested in the context of green apparel and green clothing as well. Joergens (2006), Kang, Liu & Kim (2013), Zheng & Chi (2015), Han (2017) and Nam, Dong & Lee (2017) did all find in their research studies that subjective norm had a strong impact on the purchasing intention of green clothing products. Based on this, the following hypothesis was suggested:

H2: Subjective norm positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

2.6.3 Investigation of Perceived behavioral control

In the theory of planned behavior, the perceived behavior control (PBC) construct refers to the individual’s level of difficulty to execute an action based on the individual’s power and capacity (Ajzen, 1991). Ajzen explained it as: “the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior.” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188). Fishbein & Ajzen (2010, p. 175) do furthermore explain that it is shaped by the individual’s conviction of control as well as their perceived ability. Conviction of control refers to supplies and facilities that are needed in order to execute the action meanwhile the perceived ability refers to the power characteristic to further or hinder the execution of the action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). Ajzen (1991) do also say that the PBC construct can be closely related to the Bandura’s (1982) concept of perceived self-efficiency which says “judgments of how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations” (Bandura, 1982, p. 122). Ajzen (1991) further explains that those who have a higher degree of perceived behavior control tend to have stronger intentions to engage in a certain behavior in comparison to those who perceive that it is low. According to the research paper of Ajzen (1991), the perceived behavior control construct influences the intention to perform a behavior. Researchers like Vermeir & Verbeke (2006), Chung & Kim (2011), Zheng & Chi (2015), Nam, Dong & Lee (2017) have tested and investigated the construct and found in their respective studies that the perceived behavioral control had an influence on the intention to perform a certain behavior.

The PBC construct have however been in center of discussion when it comes to the application of the construct in real life green consumption cases. One can look at the construct as one unit
and utilize it in a very broad and general way where the researcher might find that the perceived behavioral control is either “high” or “low”. Most researchers have however found that there is more valuable information stored in depths, and that the general approach is rather undetailed (e.g. Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). The reasoning behind this is that since the construct refers to the ease or difficulty of performing a certain behavior, there exists many different factors that affect the PBC, and consequently affect the intention (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). In the study made by Johnstone & Tan (2015), it was shown that consumers who expressed low perceived control for consumption of sustainable products said that it was “too hard to be green”. This perception was mainly due to reasons such as: lack of knowledge, lack of time, lack of money, just to name a few. Johnstone & Tan (2015) concluded that perceived behavioral control in form of perceived price, time, knowledge, availability, and additional other factors has a big impact on the purchase intention and that attitudes alone are not sufficient predictors. Based on this, this research paper will utilize and test the PBC construct including all the identified factors that consumers may perceive either ease or aggravate their intention to buy green clothing products. Those are presented down below.

**Perceived consumer efficiency**

The perceived consumer effectiveness (PCE) accounts for “The extent to which the consumer believes that his personal efforts can contribute to the solution of a problem” (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 175). PCE can be explained as locus of control, which is an individual’s perception of whether he or she has the ability change something through his or her own behavior (Newhouse, 1991). Vermeir & Verbeke (2006) further mean that in order for consumer to purchase more green products, they need to believe that their purchase will positively impact the environment. One reason for this is the fact that many ecological problems is not perceived as immediate and visible problems, which keeps consumers from truly comprehending the damage that is made to the environment (Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002). Also, people who do not act pro-environmentally often feel like they cannot influence the situation (Blake, 1999; Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002, Gleim et al, 2013). Gleim et al. (2013) argues that retail consumers in particular have a lack of confidence when it comes to evaluating and choosing green products. They point out that the information about green products need to be educational. They say that retail consumers want to have information about the relevant benefits that the green product provides and also what makes the product environmental friendly. On the other hand, a high level of PCE can motivate consumers to show their positive
attitude towards green products through actual consumtion behavior (Roberts, 1996; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008; Kang, Liu & Kim, 2013, Zheng & Chi, 2015). A high level of PCE can also motivate consumer to put their green attitude into action even though they might have people around them who's opinion is that green purchases does not matter (Gupta & Ogden, 2009). This is also the case with environmentally friendly clothing products. Zheng & Chi (2015) found that when an individual believed that he or she could be effective in abatement of pollution, it positively affected his or her purchase intention. They also found that the degree of PCE increased when companies provided information about where the products were produced, what materials was used and how the production process was less harmful on the environment when it came to green clothing (Zheng & Chi, 2015). Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed:
H3: Perceived consumer efficiency positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

Price
Kotler et al. (2005) explains price as: “Price is the amount of money charged for a product or service. More broadly, price is the sum of all the values that consumers exchange for the benefits of having or using the product or service” (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 665). It is shown that price and other economic factors have a strong influence on consumers decisions and behaviors which means that it is important for companies to consider factors like this when creating their strategies (Ackerman, 1997). In a more previous study it was shown that high prices are in fact the most frequent barrier when consumers evaluate whether to purchase a green product or not. When it comes to green products, Gleim & Lawson (2014) found that the consumers price sensitivity very much depended on whether the person was environmentally conscious or not. Gleim et al. (2013) describe in their research that the acceptance to pay a higher price is higher of an environmentally conscious consumer in comparison to a consumer who do not perceive themselves as environmentally conscious. Furthermore, it is found in some studies that consumers perceive green products as more expensive than conventional products, which can prevent them from selecting the green alternative instead of the traditional alternative (e.g. Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al, 2013; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015, Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) found in their study that consumers who purchased a green alternative and found that the price was higher seemed to experience post-purchase distance which in some cases led to future avoidance of green alternatives (Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011). Gleim & Lawson (2014) argues that consumer needs to understand
why green products are priced higher in order to make a green purchasing decision. Research has also shown that consumers are interested in purchasing environmentally friendly clothing products, but that they are not willing to sacrifice much for it, such as paying a higher price (Joergens, 2006). Chan & Wong’s (2012) findings in their study support this conclusion by saying that integrated ethical practices by fashion companies can be deteriorated by higher prices. Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed:

H4: The price of green clothing products negatively influences the intention to buy green clothing products.

**Product performance**

Performance can according to Kotler et al. (2005) be referred to: “the level at which a product performs its functions” (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 472). Perceptions of product quality and design has shown to be other barriers for consumers when it comes to green products. One of the reasons behind this is higher prices which leads to consumers having higher quality expectations on these products (Gleim et al, 2013). Consumer who purchase green products and perceive the quality to be bad are very hard to recapture, which has lead researchers to suggest that the green attribute should not be the sole characteristic of the product since consumer only buy green products that are comparable with conventional ones in terms of quality (Gleim et al, 2013; Gleim & Lawson, 2014). A recent study conducted by Perry & Chung (2016) showed that this is also the case with environmentally friendly fashion. They found that environmentally friendly fashion would never be purchased for only environmental reasons. Furthermore, they also found that consumers were interested in purchasing environmentally friendly clothes only if those clothes performance-wise was at least equal to regular clothes (Perry & Chung, 2016). Chan & Wong (2012) showed that product related attributes also have an impact on consumers purchase decisions when it comes to environmentally friendly fashion. They found that when consumer evaluate environmentally friendly fashion, product attributes such as design and quality did matter. Furthermore, other research has shown that consumers might perceive environmentally friendly fashion as less stylish and less well-fitting (Connell, 2010; Perry & Chung, 2016). Perry & Chung (2016) found that inferior design can be one explanation to why there is an attitude - behavior gap when it comes to environmental friendly fashion. Their study showed that consumer perceived organic cotton apparel to be poorly designed and could be explained as one barrier between consumers attitudes and their purchase behaviors. Besides quality and style, the material has shown to be an attribute consumer evaluate when purchasing clothing, and researchers have
found that some consumers are avoiding environmentally friendly fashion because of a scratchy hand feel and uncomfortable materials (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Joergens, 2006). Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed:

H5: The product performance of green clothing products negatively influences the intention to buy green clothing products.

**Convenience**

Convenience is another factor that occurred as a barrier in several studies on the green gap (e.g. Tanner & Wölfing Kast, 2003; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Smith & Paladino, 2010; Gleim et al., 2013; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Perry & Chung, 2016). However, Convenience can entail many things. Berry et al. (2002) mean that consumer perception of convenience is negatively influenced by the cognitive, physical and emotional effort associated with the shopping effort. Seiders et al. (2000) proposes a framework specific for the retailing context, they mean that convenience in retailing can be divided into four stages; (1) Access, (2) Search, (3) Possession, and (4) Transaction. Each of these stages compel the consumer to perceive how difficult or easy the stages are. Previous marketing research on the subject seem to be agreeing that time, or rather the lack of time is a common barrier for consumers when it comes to purchasing green products (e.g. Tanner & Wölfing Kast, 2003; Young et al. 2010; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). The barriers can for example be the time it takes to find the right information (Young et al., 2010), or the time-wasting activity to compare a conventional product with a green product (Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). Another convenience barrier is the perception that there is a lack of availability of green products (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). Research shows that consumers feel that green products are unavailable and not visible inside retailing stores (Chan & Wong 2012; Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). This will furthermore lead to a decrease of intention to purchase these sorts of products since the consumer feel that green products are less available even though their attitude might be positive (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006).

Barbarossa & Pastore (2015) found in their research on environmentally conscious consumers that consumers are unsure where to find the green product due to scarce availability, widespread distributions at retailers and lack of in-store information. They further argue that this will decrease the motivation to take the time required to find the products (Barbarossa & Pastore, 2015). Perry & Chung’s (2016) study also contributes to this subject and they found that
participants in their study perceived it to be hard to access clothes made with organic cotton. Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed:
H6: The inconvenience of buying green clothing products negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

Scepticism

Several studies have also shown that consumers have shown feeling of skepticism due to the lack of trustworthiness towards green advertising claims (Kangun, Carlson & Grove, 1991; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Chen & Lobo, 2012; Johnstone & Tan, 2015). Scepticism has been termed and defined differently during different historical periods. The famous academic philosopher Richard Popkin did however in his publication (2003) say that scepticism could be explained as: a philosophic holding that the possibility of knowledge is limited either because of the limitations of the mind or because of the inaccessibility of its object. It is more loosely also used to denote any questioning attitude (Popkin, 2003). Kanter & Mirvis (1989, p. 301) further described sceptics in their publication as; “those who doubt what others are saying or doing but may be convinced by evidence or proof. In other words; skeptics doubt the substance of communications.”. Some studies have revealed that more than half of the green advertisements examined contained at least one misleading or deceptive claim (Kangun, Carlson & Grove, 1991; David, 1991). Furthermore, when it comes to environmental product claims consumers may suffer from distrust because of awareness of the greenwashing phenomenon (Marder & Dodd, 2012). Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) found in their study that some consumers felt that ethical claims was merely a marketing ploy where companies seek to take higher prices. Other studies found that many of the consumers felt very low confidence that eco-labeled products were truly organically produced (Tung et al., 2012; Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal, 2015). This highlights the importance that marketers need to make their claims about green products authentic. Consumers are often exposed to various environmental claims and this often leaves them wondering which ones to believe (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008; Gleim & Lawson, 2014). Not only does the messages need to be authentic, but retailers should also try do enhance the integrity of environmental labels to further limit the confusions (Leonidou et al., 2014; Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal, 2015). Johnstone & Tan (2015) argues that the uncertainty that some consumers feel regarding the environmental claim can impact their actions to purchase traditional products which furthermore makes them ignore the long-term problems that comes with environmental destruction. Furthermore, distrust in companies’ environmental claims can
harm an environmental conscious consumer from seeking more and necessary information to make a purchase decision. This meaning that even if a consumer has a positive attitude towards green products, the lack of trust towards environmental claims can hinder him or her from doing an actual purchase (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008). Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed:

H7: Scepticism towards green marketing claims negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

Habits

Another barrier between the attitude and purchase behavior when it comes to green products has shown to be the habits of buying conventional products (e.g. Tsakiridou et al. 2008; Gleim et al., 2013; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Perry & Chung, 2016). Lally et al. (2010) describes the concept as: “[...] incremental strengthening of the association between a situation (cue) and an action, i.e. repetition of a behaviour in a consistent context progressively increases the automaticity with which the behaviour is performed when the situation is encountered” (p. 998). Ajzen (2002, p. 119) furthermore explains how a habitual behavior can lead to a decrease in intention: “Although intentions are generally good predictors of behavior, some people fail to carry out their intentions and instead revert to past patterns of behavior. The usual explanation for this phenomenon is that the behavior in question has become habitual, has come under the control of stimulus cues, and no longer conforms to intentions.”. The fact that many green products are new, and they often require consumers to change their current behavior will challenge consumers to break their habits. Moreover, consumer are creatures of habits and therefore it has been suggested that it will take something drastic to make them change their them (Gleim & Lawson, 2014). Consumers who are loyal to a conventional product may not be willing to make the effort to search and evaluate the information needed to seek an alternative that could replace the conventional product such as a green product (Gleim et al., 2013). This is something that Carrington, Neville & Whitwell (2014) also mention and agree upon in their research paper. Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) found that consumers were reluctant to change their habitual purchase behavior, but that some consumer changed from buying conventional products to green products when a news story about a particular ethical problem made them feel personally affected. But eventually these consumers would go back to their original behavior until the next time they were reminded about a similar problem. Perry & Chung (2016) found that this was the case in the context of green clothing products too. They found that consumers perceived that their clothing purchases could be harmful to the
environment, but that the solution should be not to buy any more clothes instead of buying a green alternative. They also found that consumers perceive that they have a lot of clothes already but that this will not stop them from purchasing more, and when they do it will probably not be environmentally friendly clothes anyhow (Perry & Chung, 2016). Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed:

H8: Habits of buying traditional clothing products negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

Knowledge

Knowledge is explained by Gamble & Blackwell (2001) as the information substance in an individual's memory that impacts how he or she evaluates and deduce related selections. From the consumer perspective it is accepted to be one characteristic that influences all of the decision process phases. It is found that a lack of environmental knowledge in general is another barrier between attitude and purchase behavior when it comes to green products (e.g. Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002; Smith & Paladino, 2010; Gleim et al., 2013; Kang, Liu & Kim, 2013; Zheng & Chi, 2015). Mostafa (2006) found that perceived environmental knowledge positively related to both attitude and purchase intention towards green product. However, Kang, Liu & Kim (2013) means that knowledge about environmental issues and solutions such as recycling and pollution might not be sufficient to understand why there exists a gap between attitude and intention in this context. They rather propose that the theoretical basis should be on consumers knowledge about specific products, mainly on consumers familiarity with a product and product-specific knowledge and not general knowledge about the environment. Carrigan & Attalla (2001) established that many consumers are passive ethical consumers, meaning that many do not actively seek information about where a product is produced or other ethical information that might or might not be available. Previous studies have found that consumers perceive a lack of knowledge in two ways, firstly consumers might perceive that they lack the knowledge of how to act in a manner to protect the environment through their purchase decisions (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Gleim et al., 2013; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016), and secondly many perceive that they often lack knowledge about how and why specific product are environmentally friendly (Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Zheng & Chi, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang; 2016). Johnstone & Tan (2015) argues that a lack of knowledge will contribute to confusion and will lead consumers into a feeling of uncertainty. This uncertainty will in turn contribute to not filling the attitude behavior gap that exists when it comes to green products. This dilemma has also been found when it comes to environmentally friendly clothing products.
(Zheng & Chi, 2015). Zheng & Chi (2015) was not able to show that that the knowledge had an immediate effect on the intention, but they found that an increased knowledge about environmentally friendly clothing had a mediating effect between consumers attitudes and purchase intentions. They found that the intention to buy environmental friendly clothes increased when consumers possessed a higher degree of knowledge regarding the product. Joergens (2006) and Kang, Liu & Kim (2013) did also conclude those claims in their research on environmental friendly clothing products. They also argued that there should be information about how environmentally friendly clothing products could contribute to protect the environment since it can help educate the consumers and increase pro-environmental behavior. On this background, the authors will test the immediate effect that knowledge about green clothing products have towards the intention, and the following hypothesis was therefore developed:

H9: Knowledge about environmental friendly clothes positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.

3. Frame of Reference

It is apparent after reviewing existing theory that there are many determinants that influence the intention to buy green products. However, the authors of this research study have chosen to test nine determinants to further investigate their cause. Those determinants are based on the literature review and are proven through prior research to influence the intention to buy green clothing products as well as could apply to the context of Swedish millennials and their intentions to buy green clothing products.

3.1 Research Model

In this research paper, data will be gathered and analyzed to test the hypotheses and relationships that exist between the nine determinants (independent variables) emerging from the literature review and the intention to buy green clothing products (dependent variable). All this will be done in order to answer the mentioned research questions. Furthermore, figure 3 displays the corresponding research model which is the base for the following operationalization:
Figure 3. Determinants affecting the intention to buy green clothing products - Research Model

3.2 Operationalization table

In order to evaluate the relationship between the nine determinants and the intention to buy green clothing products, the dependent and independent variables need to be measured. Therefore, at least three items for measurement are deployed for each variable. A detailed overview of the operational definitions, adapted items, along with related studies of each variable can be found in the operationalization table down below.

Table 1: Operationalization table (Self-created)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operational definition of variable</th>
<th>Adapted items</th>
<th>Related Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude towards buying green clothing products (A)</th>
<th>“the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question.” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1: I believe that buying clothes that are made with environmental friendly materials is a good idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2: I believe that buying clothes that are made with less harmful chemicals is a good idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3: I believe that buying clothes that can be recyclable is a good idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm (SN)</td>
<td>“the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN1: My choice of clothing products is influenced by people such as friends and family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2: My choice of clothing products is influenced by people such as role models and influencers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3: People whose opinions I value prefer that I should purchase green clothing products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Consumer Efficiency (PCE)</td>
<td>“The extent to which the consumer believes that his personal efforts can contribute to the solution of a environmental problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE1: I perceive that each person’s individual small effort can make meaningful difference when it comes to environmental problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Knowledge (K) | The information substance in an individual's memory that impacts how he or she evaluates and deduce related selections. From the consumer perspective it is accepted to be one characteristic that influences all of the decision process phases (Gamble & Blackwell, 2001). | K1: I am familiar with green clothing products.  
K2: I feel that I know what a green clothing product is and where to find it.  
K3: I feel that I know in what ways a green clothing product is environmental friendly. | Carrigan & Attalla (2001)  
Kollmus & Agyeman (2002)  
Mostafa (2006)  
Smith & Paladino (2010)  
Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011)  
Gleim et al. (2013)  
Kang, Liu & Kim (2013)  
Barbarossa & Pastore (2015)  
Johnstone & Tan (2015)  
Tan, Johnstone & Yang (2016) |
| Price (P) | “Price is the amount of money charged for a product or service. More broadly, price is the sum of all the values that consumers exchange for the benefits of having or using the product or service” (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 665). | P1: I perceive that green products often have higher prices than conventional products.  
P2: I perceive that environmentally friendly clothes have a higher price than conventional clothes.  
P3: Higher prices on environmentally friendly clothes is something that prevents me from buying them. | Kollmus & Agyeman (2002)  
Smith & Paladino (2010)  
Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011)  
Chan & Wong (2012)  
Gleim et al. (2013)  
Gleim & Lawson (2014)  
Barbarossa & Pastore (2015)  
Johnstone & Tan (2015)  
Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal (2015)  
Perry & Chung (2016)  
Tan, Johnstone & Yang (2016) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Product Performance (PP) | “the level at which a product performs its functions” (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 472) | PP1: I perceive that environmentally friendly clothes do not have the same standard as conventional clothes.  
PP2: I perceive that the design and style of environmentally friendly clothes is inferior in comparison to conventional clothes.  
PP3: I perceive that the fabric material of environmentally friendly clothes is inferior to conventional clothes. | Ottman (1998)  
Smith & Paladino (2010)  
Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011)  
Chan & Wong (2012)  
Gleim et al. (2013)  
Gleim & Lawson (2014)  
Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal (2015)  
Perry & Chung (2016) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Habits (H) | H1: I have developed habits of buying traditional products which prevents me from buying green product.  
H2: My loyalty towards traditional brands and products prevents me from buying green clothing products.  
H3: I have developed habits of buying traditional clothing products which prevents me from buying green clothing product. | Vermeir & Verbeke (2006)  
Tsakiridou et al. (2008)  
Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011)  
Gleim et al. (2013)  
Gleim & Lawson (2014)  
Johnstone & Tan (2015)  
Perry & Chung (2016) |“habits are acquired through incremental strengthening of the association between a situation (cue) and an action, i.e. repetition of a behaviour in a consistent context progressively increases the automaticity with which the behaviour is performed when the situation is encountered. “Automaticity” is evidenced by the behaviour displaying some or all of the following features: efficiency, lack of awareness, intentionality and uncontrollability” (Lally et al., 2010, p. 998). |
### 4. Methodology

This section describes the chosen methods and techniques applied to carry out the current research. It argues for the different choices of approaches, strategies and methods related to the purpose of the study as well as deals with the important topics of quality criteria and ethical considerations that might appear when conducting research.

#### 4.1 Research approach and strategy

The research approach shows the relation and order between the theory and the research carried out. It shows in what way and order the researcher will collect the data and answer the research questions and is divided into the two key approaches: inductive and deductive approach (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). In this research paper, the authors started out studying existing theory about green marketing, millennials, TPB and factors that may influence the intention to buy green clothing products. As the purpose of this study was to potentially reveal a possible attitude-intention gap as well as investigate the determinants affecting the intention...
to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials, the authors decided to use and test existing theories on the found gap that is the Swedish millennial context, instead of building or inferring new theory. Since this study adopted previous generated academic literature as it’s theoretical foundation and used this to form hypotheses which later got tested, the research approach was deductive.

Closely related to the research approach is the research strategy. According to Bryman & Bell (2015), the research strategy shows very generally how the research will be conducted and is divided into quantitative and qualitative. The present research study used a quantitative research strategy since quantitative data was gathered and hypotheses were tested. The quantitative strategy is closely linked to the deductive approach and is more concerned with numbers and numerical calculations and is usually more concerned with larger sample sizes (Bryman & Bell, 2015). It focuses on quantification of data and enables the researcher to reveal relationships between variables in form of for example hypothesis testing.

4.2 Research Design

Bryman & Bell (2011) describe research design as the foundation for data gathering and data analysis. Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2016) categorize research designs into exploratory, descriptive and explanatory research designs. They explain that exploratory research is carried out to obtain insights into a managerial issue or a research problem. The aim for this sort of study is to create possible hypotheses or propositions for further studies. The aim of descriptive research is to obtain a precise description of occurrences, individuals or circumstances. It is most likely conducted in prior to an explanatory study or following an exploratory study. In comparison to exploratory and descriptive research, the explanatory research design aims to verify the cause-effect association between chosen variables (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Based on the research aim and research questions of the present study, an explanatory research design was selected. The reason for this was that the authors intended to verify the cause-effect relationship between the independent variables derived from the literature review (found in section “2.5 Determinants influencing the intention to buy green clothing products”) and the dependent variable, the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials.

Bryman & Bell (2015) have an alternative categorization of research designs consisting of experimental, cross-sectional, longitudinal, case study and comparative research designs. A
cross-sectional research design was applied in this research study. Bryman & Bell (2011) stress that cross-sectional design involves information gathering beyond a single incident and in a particular timeframe to gather the amount of measurable information related to several constructs, which are later on studied to identify patterns of relationships. “Beyond a single incident” means that the study is looking at more than one case (participant) and contains a relatively large sample size in order to obtain differences among the constructs. “In a particular timeframe” implies that the research is carried out to respondents simultaneously at one given point in time. “Measurable information” refers to possibility that the information gathered can be measurable with a measurement instrument, such as for example a Likert scale. Lastly, “Patterns of relationships” is linked with the investigation of the correlation and connection between constructs (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Based on this, a cross-sectional research design enabled the authors to meet this study’s research aim of testing the association between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Such aim is difficult to be achieved by experimental and longitudinal design despite their strength in determining the cause-effect connection. The experimental research design requires control of the independent variables, which was not feasible as the independent variables were studied from the individuals’ point of view (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A longitudinal research design requires reoccurred observations on variables including subjects, which was not viable due to the constraints of both time and monetary costs (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Lastly, case study and comparative design were not chosen as they handle a very limited variation of cases (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

4.3 Data Sources and data collection

Burns & Bush (2014) explains that there exist two sorts of data sources, namely primary and secondary data. The information that is collected particularly for the research conducted by the researcher is primary data. This is collected by various techniques such as interviews, focus groups, observations, surveys and so on (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Secondary data is data which another person previously have collected for not that exact same purpose (Burns & Bush, 2014). It is gathered from sources such as scientific articles, books, organizational records, videos and so on (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

Within the initial stage of the research paper, a literature review was performed and presented by taking part of scientific articles as well as books. Those scientific articles and books were read, managed and used in order to present the reader with necessary theories and concepts which became the theoretical basis of the research paper. In order to find the relevant news
articles, scientific articles and books, the authors used search engines such as Onesearch and Google scholar. The focus when searching for articles was to find peer-reviewed scientific articles to assure a high-quality level of sources. For assuring high quality when it came to books, the authors made sure to select books and authors that had a good reputation as well as proven worthy in their specific field. Keywords when searching in the databases were: *Green marketing, consumer behavior, green consumer behavior, green product, green clothing product, millennials, Swedish millennials, TPB, attitude, subjective norm, perceived behavioral control, price, convenience, perceived consumer efficiency, performance, scepticism, trustworthiness, habits, knowledge*, and different combinations of these.

As far as the authors know, no previous research has been conducted on green clothing products and on Swedish millennials. This meant that for the second phase of the study, primary data was collected in form of a survey, and more specifically a self-completion questionnaire. The self-completion questionnaire was available for the respondents to fill in online. Surveys are relatively affordable at most of the times, and they usually receive more honest answers from respondents since no person is influencing them at the time they fill in the survey (Burns & Bush, 2014). Online surveys also possess some advantages over postal surveys, such as delivering faster responses and being more affordable. It has also been proved that they provide less missing data since respondents usually complete more questions on an online survey than a postal one (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

### 4.4 Operationalization and questionnaire construction

An operationalization table can help to ensure that the data gathered will be relevant along with providing a framework for the collection and analysis of the data (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Furthermore, the aim of the operationalization table is to translate concepts into concrete indicators of their existence (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Therefore, based on the literature review the authors formed hypotheses to investigate the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. After that the operationalization table was created to breakdown the theories into measurable items. Constructs such as: Attitude towards buying green clothing products (A), Subjective Norm (SN), Perceived Consumer Efficiency (PCE), Knowledge (K), Price (P), Product Performance (PP), Convenience (C), Trustworthiness-Scepticism (TS), Habits (H), Intention to buy green clothing products (ITB) was operationalized into measurable items (See table 1). These constructs and hypotheses was further broken down into statements in the self-completion questionnaire. The questionnaire
was created by the author of this study through the Google survey tool named Google Forms. Since the target population was Swedish millennials the survey was translated into Swedish before making it available online. Both the authors of this research study speak English fluently and has Swedish as a mother tongue and could therefore translate the questionnaire accurately. According to Usunier (1998), it is preferable that a person translates to its mother tongue, rather than from it.

The questionnaire in its full form, in both languages, can be found in Appendix A and Appendix B. Before the participants could start filling in the survey they encountered an informational text where the authors explained who they are, what they aimed to investigate, how the respondent had been chosen and who the respondent could contact in case they had any questions. The questionnaire then continued with a short description of what a green clothing product is referred to in this research study. All the statements/questions were closed ones, meaning that respondents only had pre-made alternatives which they could select. Benefits that derives from using such questions are that they require less effort and time from the respondent. The findings collected from these questions are also easier compared as well. This survey used one certain type of closed questions, called rating questions (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). This part constituted of 30 statements, which was divided into section accordingly to the operationalization table, where the respondent had to select an answer on a seven-degree Likert scale ranging from completely disagree to completely agree. This type of question was chosen since it can be argued to be appropriate when one wants to gather the opinion concerning a certain topic or phenomenon (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Lastly, the respondents were also asked to fill in age, gender and whether they had a Swedish citizenship or not in order to give the authors the opportunity to distinguish if the respondent belonged to the target group or not. These questions were put last since they were more personal, and according to Burns and Bush (2014), these kinds of questions should preferably be put last to avoid refusal responses. Furthermore, to prevent low participation numbers and enhance the amount of responses in the research study, the authors offered a gift card worth 500 SEK to one lucky random respondent. Therefore, the respondent had an optional final choice to fill in their Email in the end of the survey to participate in the giveaway. The gift card was at a Swedish fashion company named “Filippa K” which is a company that is in the forefront within the Swedish fashion industry when it comes to sustainability and environmental concerns.
4.5 Sampling

As earlier mentioned, this study targets the population of Swedish millennials since they as earlier explained plays an important role when it comes to green consumption. Bryman & Bell (2015) argue that it is important for the research study to specify the sample that is being involved. A sample consists of a segment (a small piece) from a population whereas the population refers to all the individuals within this population. Bryman and Bell (2015) further explain that it is important to pay attention to the decision of the sample since sampling errors might arise. Sampling errors would then as a clarification mean that the samples beliefs do not represent the entire population's beliefs (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Furthermore, to reach the population of Swedish millennials a suitable sampling technique was required, meaning that the researchers needed to choose from non-probability and probability sampling. Non-probability sampling refers to a sample that is not chosen by applying a random collection approach, meanwhile a probability sampling technique is related to a randomly selected sample in which every sampling unit in the population possesses a possibility to be chosen (Bryman & Bell, 2011). For this study a non-probability convenience sampling technique and a snowball sampling technique was used. The non-probability convenience sample was conducted in the manner that the authors of this study distributed the survey online to friends and family, this meaning that the probability of being selected was not equal among all Swedish millennials. However, Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2016) also states that the results of a convenience sample can be generalized. Furthermore, the authors chose to send it geographically to participants from all parts of Sweden in order to receive more representative answers. The snowball sampling method was also used since the survey was distributed on Facebook and related Facebook groups where individuals were asked to share the survey further as well. Based on the fact that the survey was distributed on a social media channels such as Facebook, the sample frame for the current research consist of individuals who themselves currently use those social media channels or know someone that use those social media channels which have sent the survey to them. Due to the characteristics and habits of millennials in general, this does not seem to be a big problem since most of them actively and frequently use those mentioned social media channels.

4.6 Pre-test

Before distributing the survey, several pre-tests were conducted. To conduct a pre-test of one's questionnaire can contribute with several benefits. The focus of a pre-test is to find potential issues that can occur when the respondent is answering the questions, obtain a clearer overview
regarding what extent the respondent perceive it is easy to understand the questions and the instructions. The aim is also to see what time is needed for the respondent to finish the questionnaire as well as to gain feedback regarding the relevance, validity, and reliability of the content. A pre-test is also done in order to assure what is called face validity as well as content validity. Face validity refers to the extent to which a test is subjectively viewed as covering the concept it tries to portray (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Based on the results of a pre-test, adjustments and enhancements can be made in order to avoid misunderstandings before sending out the actual survey (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill., 2016). The pre-test in the current research was conducted in two stages. Firstly, the authors decided to let ten participants fill in the survey and give detailed feedback on it. Those ten participants constituted of seven participants which all were a part of the target sample, chosen with convenient sampling which is commonly used for pretesting questionnaires, as well as three participants who were professors at the Linnaeus University. The feedback gotten from the professors revealed that the statements/questions were correct and valid in terms of testing the hypotheses and operationalizing the constructs. The feedback also revealed that a few of the statements/questions could be reformulated in order to strengthen the questionnaire. This reformulation concerned small changes in sentence structure as well as some certain choice of words. After adjusting the survey, those ten respondents were asked to fill in and give detailed feedback again. This time, the feedback showed that most of the respondents were satisfied and had nothing - to minor - remarks when it came to the survey. Those minor remarks concerned choice of words and the understandability of certain sentences. After having taking care of and adjusted to this second phase of feedback, the survey was published.

4.7 Data analysis

When analyzing the data, the authors had to export the responses of the respondents from the survey software (Google forms) into a Microsoft Excel document which then could be imported into the statistical data analysis program used which was SPSS. SPSS is a widely-used program proved being robust when analyzing this sort of data. Bryman & Bell (2015) note that is important that a researcher has decided at an early stage in what ways they will analyze their data. Even though the process of analyzing data occurs at a later stage, one should design its study in the way that proper techniques are used that goes well with the variables one will assess. The possibility exists that the size and nature of the sample will exhibit restrictions on what techniques one alternatively can use (Bryman & Bell, 2015). The specific techniques that
have been used in this research paper are: Descriptives, Cronbach’s Alpha test, Pearson’s correlation test, independent sample t-test and multiple linear regression test.

4.7.1 Cronbach’s Alpha

It is important to make sure that the research study is reliable. Reliability is concerned with replication and the consistency of the collection, analysis and interpretation in the research study. It concerns the consistency and stability of the results being gathered from the research in mind (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). In order to test the reliability of a study, many researchers have applied a popular test called Cronbach’s Alpha test. A Cronbach’s Alpha test measures if a set of questions measure the same underlying construct or not. Hence, it calculates the reliability of answers around a subset of questions (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). The range of a Cronbach alpha coefficient will range between 0 and 1 where the former shows zero reliability and the latter shows perfect reliability. Based on this, a Cronbach Alpha test was conducted in this research paper in order to ensure reliability.

4.7.2 Descriptives

Descriptive statistics was applied in this study to analyze the data gathered. Such statistics allows researchers to quantitatively report and contrast variables. Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2016) mention that central location and dispersion are the main elements on which descriptive statistics concentrate. A central location is usually measured with either mean, mode, or median. Researchers are most likely to use mean, more known as average, to measure the central location. Mean contains all data values in its computation. Mode refers to the most frequently occurred value while median shows the midpoint. Apart from reporting the central location, it is vital to report the way values are dispersed across the central location (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Researchers may use interquartile range or standard deviation (SD) to portray the dispersion. Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2016) argue that SD plays a more important role in research. SD shows the degree to which values are contrasted with the average. They further explain that a high SD means that there is a large deviation among the respondents from the mean value. A low SD means that the answers is deviation a small amount from the mean value (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Skewness as well as kurtosis was also included in the Descriptives. Skewness is a measure of symmetry, or rather the lack of symmetry within the data collected. A data set is symmetric if it looks the same to the left and the right of the center point. Kurtosis is a measure of whether the data are heavy-tailed or light-tailed relative to a normal distribution. Data sets with high kurtosis tend to have heavy tails, or outliers (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016).
4.7.3 Pearson's correlation

It is also important to ensure validity in the research study. Validity can be categorized as either internal or external validity. Internal validity refers to if the instruments or procedures in the research measured what they were supposed to measure meanwhile external validity refers to the generalizability of the results beyond the immediate study (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). In order to check the internal validity, the present study made use of face validity, content validity as well as construct validity. As previously mentioned face validity was tested with a pre-test and refers to the extent to which a test is subjectively viewed as covering the concept it tries to portray (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016) and is further described in the “4.6 Pre-test” section. Content validity refers to the validity of each measurement question or item or how well each measurement question covers the investigative question (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Content validity was assured through a careful literature review where most of the items in the questionnaire originates from previous theory, as well as through the pilot-test. Construct validity refers to the degree which a test measures what it claims or purports to measure and is commonly linked with when the researcher deduce hypotheses from a theory that is relevant to a concept (Bryman & Bell, 2015). In order to check the construct validity, a Pearson’s correlation test was performed. The Pearson’s correlation test assesses the linear correlation relationship between two variables. This is done by evaluating both the direction as well as the strength of the relationship between the variables.

4.7.4 Multiple linear regression

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, a multiple linear regression test was performed. The interest of this research study was to investigate the relationship between a number of independent variables (See Figure 3: Research Model) in relation to one dependent variable (intention to buy green clothing products). Hair et al. (2017) argue that multiple linear regression (MLR) is a suitable approach to take when having this purpose. The approach is an addition of the simple linear regression (SLR). MLR has the advantage in comparison to SLR that it takes several independent variables into the regression calculation. For every variable, a different regression coefficient is computed that illustrates its association with the dependent variable. These coefficients allow the researcher to study the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The simplest method to examine the associations is to first check the statistical significance of the relationship and then inspect the regression coefficient in each of the independent variables, which shows the mean quantity of change anticipated in the dependent variable considering a unit change in the independent variable. The coefficient
shows with other words the strength of each of the independent variables (Hair et al., 2017). The included parameters included in the multiple regression test when looking at the regression coefficients were unstandardized beta, coefficient standard error, standardized beta, t-values, significance values, and collinearity statistics like tolerance and the variation inflation factors (VIF).

**4.7.5 Independent sample t-test**

Lastly, an independent sample t-test was performed in order to reveal any gender differences that could be of additional value to the study. An independent sample t-test can be used in order to investigate and compare differences among two normally distributed populations (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). In the present study, the t-test was performed based on the gender (male and female) and included parameters such as mean values, standard deviations, F-values and T-values in order to reveal any gender differences.

**4.8 Ethical considerations**

While conducting research it is important to consider the people that participate in the study. Ethical issues can occur on several stages in the research process when gathering data (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). In business research, Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2016) argues that the ethical concerns are associated with the actions that lead the researcher’s behavior in connection to the people that participate in the study. Bryman & Bell (2011) further explains that it is therefore important for researchers to consider several factors when researchers carry out their research. These factors can be consent or rather lack of consent from the participants, in form of for example privacy intrusion or whether the researcher is deceiving the participant (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). There are however ways of avoiding these ethical dilemmas. One can, which is done in this research study, clearly state in an introductory letter who is doing the research and what the research is about as well as state that the participation is completely voluntary. This also allows the participant to make an informed decision before consenting to participate in the study or not (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Also, to make sure that anonymity and privacy of the respondents were remained intact it was stated that the answers was to remain anonymous if the participants chose to participate both in the survey and in the contest for the gift card. Another ethical concern is to make sure that the questions/statements which the respondents are answering will not inflict harm in any way. It is of importance to consider what sort of questions that are being asked. People seem to care about their privacy and could choose not to answer any specific questions or even leave the survey if there would be questions that they consider harmful (Bryman & Bell, 2015). In
order to ensure that the type of questions was not harmful or intruding the privacy of the respondent, the survey was pre-tested by several professors as well as individuals from the sample group.

5. Results

*This section presents the empirical findings from the data gathered. These results will be the foundation for the analysis and discussion illustrated in the following sections.*

5.1 Demographics

The survey was deactivated once the authors felt satisfied with the numbers of responses collected. The survey was active from the 9th of April 2018 to the 20th of April 2018. Due to the fact that a snowball sample technique was used when distributing the survey, it was impossible to keep track and estimate exactly how many people that received an invitation to participate in the survey which following made it impossible to calculate the response rate of the survey. The amount of collected responses in total was 169 completed responses. Of those, 19 respondents and their respective responses were excluded because of that the respondent did not have a Swedish citizenship or was not a millennial and did therefore not belong to the sample population of the research study. This meant that 150 valid responses could be used for further analysis. Table 2 shows the amount and shares of the sample population divided on the two demographic variables age and gender.

Table 2. Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>87,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 150

The results showed that the 87,3 % of the respondents were between the age of 20-29 meanwhile 12,7 % were between the age of 30-39. In order to draw conclusions regarding the sample population, which is Swedish millennials, it is important to make sure that there exists a fair representation among the genders since gender differences might exist depending on the
research context (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Of all the respondents, 46 % were male and 54 %
were female. This shows that an almost equal gender distribution existed in the present study.

### 5.2 Cronbach’s Alpha

In order to test the reliability of the study, a Cronbach’s alpha test was performed. Every
construct consisted of 3 numbers of corresponding items/statements in the survey, which is
according to Hair et al. (2014) considered being the minimal number of items when covering a
construct in quantitative research. According to Petrick & Backman (2002), Cronbach values
ranging above 0.6 is considered acceptable. According to the researchers Hair et al. (2014), a
Cronbach alpha value of 0,7 and higher is satisfactory when it comes to comparing groups.
However, they do also argue that values of 0,6 and above are acceptable, although they mention
Cronbach values ranging close to 0,6 should be handled with caution. Table 3 down below
show the results of the performed Cronbach Alpha test for this research study.

Table 3. Cronbach’s Alpha Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Consumer Efficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scepticism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Buy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that there were no Cronbach values ranging below the critical limit of 0.6
which meant that all constructs had an acceptable level of internal consistency. Only two
constructs had lower values than 0.7, these were Subjective Norm (0,636) and Price (0,697).
Furthermore, Subjective Norm was the only one of those that was close the threshold of 0.6 and
could potentially be subject of discussion due to its value. Based on the previous arguments
regarding the threshold of 0,6 however, the Cronbach’s alpha values of all of the construct and
items were valid and accepted.
5.3 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics was performed on all of the individual questions/statements as well as on the computed values for each of the constructs. The Descriptives included the amount of responses, mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. The corresponding Descriptives for each of the individual questions/statements was the empirical basis for all of statistical analysis done and is attached in the Appendix C - Descriptives. The results show that there were no missing answers on any of the questions since all of the questions had 150 responses. To achieve a clearer picture concerning each of the constructs in the research study, descriptive statistics values were computed into its respective construct as well. Table 4 down below shows the computed value of mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis on each of the constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M (1-7)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-2.510</td>
<td>6.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Consumer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-1.566</td>
<td>2.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Performance</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scepticism</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>-0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habits</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Buy</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By reviewing the numbers in Appendix C as well as the numbers in table 4, one can see that the highest mean values were among the constructs of attitude, perceived consumer efficiency, convenience and price. Attitude had the absolute highest computed mean of 6.68 and did also have the lowest amount of standard deviation (0.66), which shows that many people had favorable attitudes towards buying green clothing products. That was followed by perceived consumer efficiency with a computed mean of 5.85, and then came convenience (4.99) and price (4.84). The lowest mean scores of the research study had the constructs product performance (3.20), knowledge (3.42), subjective norm (3.69) habits (3.80) and intention to buy (3.83). What was mentionable here was that the construct of intention to buy had quite a low mean value (3.83 out of 7) which shows that the intention to buy green clothing products...
is lower than the favorable attitudes of the respondents. The standard deviation varied showing values between 1.2 and 1.8 on most of the constructs. Majority of the construct had low skewness and kurtosis which meant that the distribution was rather symmetrical and even-tailed. High numbers on skewness and kurtosis were seen at the constructs of attitude and perceived consumer efficiency which meant that many respondents had answered almost the same answers and that those responses were distributed in the end tail (high mean values).

5.4 Pearson Correlation

A Pearson correlation test was performed in order to test the correlation and furthermore the validity of the constructs. This test generates correlation values ranging from 1 to -1 and do also reveal if the correlation coefficient is statistically significant or not. 1 means a perfect positive correlation between the variables and -1 means a perfect inverse correlation, meanwhile 0 represents a random distribution (Barlow et al., 2010). Correlation coefficients between 0.21 to 0.40 can be considered weak correlations, coefficients between 0.40 and 0.60 can be considered moderate and between 0.61 and 0.80 are considered strong correlations (Shiu et al, 2009). Table 5 down below shows the results of the Pearson correlation test by portraying the correlation coefficients as well as conveying which constructs are significant at a p level of < .05, and a p level of < .01.

Table 5. Pearson Correlation Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PCE</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>ITB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (A)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34 **</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.22 **</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-.13 **</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm (SN)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20 *</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23 **</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Consumer Efficiency (PCE)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.16 *</td>
<td>.23 **</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.34 **</td>
<td>.18 *</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (K)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19 *</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.39 **</td>
<td>.47 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (P)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.32 **</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results showed that the majority of the variables showed a “weak” correlation between each other which means that the construct validity was high. Only one connection was considered having a “moderate” correlation and that was the relationship between knowledge and the intention to buy (highlighted green in table 5) with a correlation coefficient of 0.47. Furthermore, there were no variables that portrayed any strong correlations.

5.5 Hypotheses testing with multiple regression

To answer the mentioned research questions, a simultaneous multiple linear regression test was performed in order to measure the influence that the independent variables (attitude, social norm, perceived consumer efficiency, knowledge, price, product performance, convenience, scepticism, habits) had on the dependent variable (intention to buy green clothing products). Table 6 down below shows the results of the performed multiple regression test.
Table 6. Multiple Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$ $B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Tol.</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-1.432</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>2.391</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Consumer Efficiency</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>4.263</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Performance</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scepticism</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habits</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-2.429</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.515</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R = 0.545$  $R^2 = 0.297$  Adj. $R^2 = 0.251$  $F(9, 149)= 6.559$  $p < 0.0001$

$B =$ Unstandardized Coefficient Beta  $SE$ $B =$ Standard Error Unstandardized Beta
$\beta =$ Standardized Coefficient Beta  $t =$ T-Value  Sig. = Significance Coefficient

To begin with, the test showed that it was statistical significant ($p < 0.0001$) which shows that the intention to buy green clothing products is significantly explained by the mix of independent variables. It had a multiple correlation coefficient of 0.545 and a $R^2$ of 0.297. It implies that 29.7 % of the variance in intention to buy green clothing products can be explained by all constructs taken together. Furthermore, looking at collinearity statistics, one could see that all values for tolerance were higher than the limit of 0.10 which enforced that there was no multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2014). All values on VIF were lower than 10 which also meant that the authors had not violated the multicollinearity assumption (Hair et al., 2014). When looking at the statistical significance value (Sig.) of all the constructs, it became evident that 3 constructs were statistical significant (sig. < .05), namely: subjective norm, knowledge and habits. The results also showed that the attitude towards buying green clothing products did not statistically significantly influence the intention to buy green clothing products. What is worth pointing out is that all constructs are taken into account when the values were calculated. Thus, removing one insignificant construct may have an effect on the other constructs’ degree of significance as well. The standardized coefficient beta enables the researcher to compare the strength and influence of each of the independent variables in the regression test. When looking
at the significant constructs, the results showed that knowledge ($\beta = .35$) had the most impact on the intention to buy green clothing products, followed by habits ($\beta = -.20$) and subjective norm ($\beta = .18$).

**5.6 Revised Research Model and Table of Hypotheses**

Figure 4 down below illustrates the revised research model based on the findings of the multiple regression test, including the corresponding standardized regression coefficient as well as the statistical significance for each of the constructs.

![Revised Research Model](image)

Figure 4. Revised Research Model.

*Note. All values are standardized regression coefficients. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.*

By using the information from the multiple regression analysis, the authors compiled table 7 down below based on the statistical significance (sig.) of each of the constructs. The table portrays each of the hypotheses and then the outcome of the individual hypothesis.
Table 7. Table of hypotheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>H1: The attitude towards buying green clothing products positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H2: Subjective norm positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H3: Perceived consumer efficiency positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H4: The price of green clothing products negatively influences the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H5: The product performance of green clothing products negatively influences the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H6: The inconvenience of buying green clothing products negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H7: Scepticism towards green marketing claims negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H8: Habits of buying traditional clothing products negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H9: Knowledge about environmental friendly clothes positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products.</em></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 Additional Findings

Descriptives and an independent sample t-test were also performed in order to reveal additional information such as gender differences in the study. Table 8 down below shows the mean scores of each of the genders, the statistical p-value and if each construct had any statistical significant gender difference.
Table 8. Gender differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Male</th>
<th>Mean Female</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Sign. Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Consumer Efficiency</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Performance</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scepticism</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habits</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Buy</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 69 males and 81 females

Based on the result, it was determined that there exists a significant difference in mean scores between males and females when it comes to seven out of the total ten constructs. Statements where there were not significant differences were the constructs subjective norm, convenience and scepticism. Females scored slightly higher mean scores in comparison to males when it came to the statements of attitude, perceived consumer efficiency, knowledge, price and intention to buy. Males scored slightly higher mean scores in comparison to females when it came to the statements of product performance and habits.

6. Discussion

*This section presents a discussion on the empirical findings that were collected in the present research study.*

Attitude

The attitude towards buying green clothing products had the highest mean score (M=6.68) and showed also the lowest amount of standard deviation (0.66) among all of the constructs. This shows that Swedish millennials agree upon that buying clothes that are made with environmental friendly materials, less harmful chemicals or clothes that can be recycled is a good idea. The results showed that Swedish millennials held very favorable attitudes towards buying green clothing products. This confirms that the beliefs of the Swedish millennials are in line with the results reported by the European Commission (2011; 2013; 2014) on Europeans beliefs which reported very favorable attitudes towards buying green products. The results do also support the findings of Panwar, Han & Hansen (2010), Paladino & Serena (2012) and Schmeltz (2012) which found that that millennials in particular have very favorable attitudes.
towards buying green clothing products. It is also in line with what Kang, Liu & Kim (2013), Zheng & Chi (2015), Perry & Chung (2016), Han (2017) and Nam, Dong & Lee (2017) found in their research studies that millennials holds favorable attitudes towards buying green clothing products in particular.

The findings in this research study showed that those favorable attitudes did not however influence the intention to buy green clothing products ($\beta = -.114$, sig.=.154) and H1 was therefore rejected. This result shows that there indeed exists an attitude-intention gap among Swedish millennials when it comes to buying green clothing products. This supports the claim many researchers within the green context have made (e.g. Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Mohr, Webb & Harris, 2001; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2008; Gupta & Ogden, 2009; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Davari & Strutton, 2014; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016) that green attitudes and beliefs plays a relatively smaller role when it comes to them translating into actual intention to purchase green products. It does also confirm the same claim that Hume (2010), McDougle, Greenspan & Handy (2011) and Paladino & Serena (2012) argued for after having researched millennials in the context of green products. The findings of this study are contradictory to what Smith & Paladino (2010), Kim & Chung (2011) and Chen & Lobo (2012) found when they investigated the context of organic food and organic personal care products. This suggests that there may exist differences depending on the context that is being studied. However, when looking at previous research studies within the context of green clothing products, the findings was in line with what Joergens (2006) and (Perry & Chung, 2016) found. Kang, Liu & Kim (2013), Zheng & Chi (2015), Han (2017) and Nam, Dong & Lee (2017) all found that the attitude towards buying green clothing products influenced the intention to buy green clothing products among American, Chinese and Korean millennials. One potential explanation to the contradicting results in comparison to their studies could be the difference between the populations. There seem to exist a difference between the Swedish millennial population and the American, Chinese and Korean millennial population when it comes to translating attitudes to actual purchasing intentions.

**Subjective norm**

First of all, subjective norm was the only determinant that could potentially be of discussion when looking at the Cronbach alpha value (lower than 0.6). As the findings showed, the construct had a Cronbach alpha value of .636 which was acceptable. The subjective norm is
very subjective and ambiguous in its nature which can make the construct difficult to quantify. This could be one explanation as to why there was a rather low Cronbach alpha value in comparison to the other constructs. The mean scores of the construct subjective norm was considered neither low or high on the 7 Likert scale (M=3.69). It had a standard deviation of 1.26 and a low degree of skewness (-0.169) and kurtosis (-0.275) which meant that the distribution around the mean was fairly normal. H2 was accepted and confirmed as the subjective norm was shown to significantly positively influence the intention to buy green clothing products (sig.=.018) in the multiple regression test. The results show that Swedish millennials consider and care about what people around them think and believe, and that this influence their intention to buy green clothing products. This result is in line with previous studies on green products, where the majority found that peer influence did have a significant influence on the intention to buy green products (e.g. Gleim et al., 2013; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Muposhi, Dhurup & Surujlal, 2015; Paul, Modi & Patel, 2016). The result of the present research study is also in line with what previous research studies has shown when it comes to the context of millennials and green clothing products. Joergens (2006), Kang, Liu & Kim (2013), Zheng & Chi (2015), Han (2017) and Nam, Dong & Lee (2017) all found that the subjective norm had a significant influence on the purchasing intention of green clothing products as well. The results showed that the influence of the subjective norm towards the intention in the present study ($\beta$=.183) was not as strong as in the cases of Kang, Liu & Kim ($\beta$=.43) and Nam, Dong & Lee ($\beta$=.32) meanwhile it reached almost the same strength of influence as the cases of Zheng & Chi ($\beta$=.22) and Han ($\beta$=.24).

**Perceived Consumer Efficiency**

Swedish millennials did also agree to a very large extent when it came to the statements regarding their perceived efficiency (M=5.85). The skewness (-1.566) and kurtosis (2.650) also told us that the variance was distributed around the upper tail which meant that high scores were given. This shows that Swedish millennials possess a positive mindset and believes that the individual small efforts by themselves as well as the people around them can make a difference when it comes to environmental problems. Even though Swedish millennials hold this positive and favorable mindset regarding their perceived efficiency, the results showed that this did not matter and had a low significant influence on the actual intention to buy green clothing products ($\beta$=.082, sig.=.328). H3 was based on this result rejected. This finding contradicts the reasoning of Roberts (1996), Vermeir & Verbeke (2008), Kang, Liu & Kim (2013) and Zheng & Chi (2015) who said that a high level of perceived consumer efficiency
has an immediate effect and can motivate consumers to go through with their green consumption behaviors. The investigation of this construct in the green clothing context has been rather scarce, but the results of this research study is in contradiction to the results of Zheng & Chi (2015), which found that this construct had a strong influence towards the intention to buy ($\beta=.35$) in the study on American millennials. The findings show that the positive and favorable attitudes regarding consumer efficiency alone does not influence the intention towards buying green clothing products in the context of Swedish millennials.

**Price**

The result also showed that Swedish millennials agreed to a medium-large extent on statements regarding that they perceive the price of green products and green clothing products ($M=4.84$) to be higher than ordinary ones. This is in line with Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011), Gleim et al (2013), Barbarossa & Pastore (2015) and Tan, Johnstone & Yang (2016) said. The multiple regression test did however show that H4 was not significant ($\beta=.058$, sig. .463) and the hypothesis was therefore rejected. This was surprising since the previous studies carried out by Joergens (2006) and Chan & Wong (2012) had unifying results saying that the consumer wasn’t ready to pay a higher price in order to buy a green product. The results of this research study further mean that Swedish millennials perceives that a higher price on green products in general and on green clothes is acceptable and is not something that can be seen as a barrier that significantly influence their intention to buy green clothes. To know that Swedish millennials do not have a problem with higher prices on a green clothing product is furthermore very valuable information for practitioners who is targeting young Swedish consumers.

**Product Performance**

The respondents’ answers resulted in relatively low mean scores ($M=3.20$) on statements involving product performance which means that Swedish millennials do not agree on the reasoning that green clothing products are inferior in quality and design in comparison to traditional products which Connell (2010) and Perry & Chung (2016) claimed. Moreover H5, which says that the product performance of green clothing products negatively influences the intention to buy green clothing products was rejected which implies that product performance is not one of the barriers that significantly impact the intention in this study ($\beta=-.02$, sig.=.790). This result does not support the findings of Chan & Wong (2012) who found that product related attributes negatively influenced consumers consumption of environmentally friendly fashion. Perry & Chung (2016) argued that consumers was only interested in purchasing green
clothing products if the product performance was at least equal with regular clothed. The findings imply that Swedish millennials have rather equal perceptions on product attributes and product performance when it comes to the comparison between regular and green clothing products.

**Convenience**

The mean scores submitted on the statements belonging to convenience (M=4.99) showed that Swedish millennials perceived that it is rather difficult to find green clothing products which is in line with what Vermeir & Verbeke (2006), Barbarossa & Pastore (2015) and Johnstone & Tan (2015) said in their studies on green products. It is also in line with what Chan & Wong (2012) and Perry & Chung (2016) found in their research study within the context of green clothes. This finding suggests that improvements could be made by the retailers by making green clothes more available in order to change the perception that seem to exist among the Swedish millennials. H6 which said that the inconvenience of buying green clothing products negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products was however not significant (β=.065, sig.=.439) and did based on this got rejected. The results show that even though Swedish millennials perceive that green clothing products is difficult to find; the inconvenience is not something that has any influence on their intention to buy green clothing products. The perceived convenience of buying green clothes in relation to the intention to buy have according to the authors knowledge not been previously investigated in the context of millennials and clothing products which entails that this research study brings valuable new insights.

**Scepticism**

The mean score (M=4.37) on scepticism indicates that the Swedish millennials position themselves somewhere in between on the statements regarding if they trust green marketing claims when it comes to green clothes. Their potential scepticism was not however something that showed any influence when it came to their intentions to buy green clothing products (β=.038, sig.=.619). Based on this, H7 which said that scepticism towards green marketing claims negatively influence the intention to buy green clothing products was rejected. Skepticism has as far as the authors know not been investigated in the context of green clothing products or in combination with millennials and therefore this result is the first of its kind when it comes to green clothing products and Swedish millennials. Skepticism has however been investigated in studies on green products in general, those studies did however either use a qualitative research approach or used other conceptual models in order to come to their
conclusion on the subject. The results in the present research paper was contradictory to what Vermeir & Verbeke (2008) found when they were looking at a population from Belgium and more specifically in the context of sustainable food. They found in their case that a lack of trust in environment friendly claims about green products did in fact impact the consumers intention negatively. A possible explanation for the difference in results may be that it might exist contextual differences between environmental friendly clothes and sustainable food as well as differences between the average Belgian population and the Swedish millennials.

Habits

Swedish millennials declared low to neutral mean values (M=3.80) when looking at the statements which concerned habits. After the multiple regression test, H8 which stated that the habit of buying traditional clothing products negative influence the intention to buy green clothing products was confirmed and supported (β=-.206, sig.=.016). This means that the habits among Swedish millennials does in fact have a significant negative impact on their intention to buy green clothing products. This is in line with what Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011) and Perry & Chung (2016) argue for in their studies by saying that existing habits may be hard to change when it comes to green products in general as well as with clothing products. This would suggest that Swedish millennials may feel that the transition from traditional clothing products to environmental friendly clothing products is an obstacle and points also to where companies and marketers could lay their focus in order to improve and change their potential consumers habits.

Knowledge

The responses by the Swedish millennials on statements regarding their knowledge of green clothes was considered low to neutral (M=3.42). This suggests that the majority of the Swedish millennials might not be too familiar with what a green product is, in what ways it is environmental friendly and have the knowledge of where to acquire it. This is in line with what Bray, Johns & Kilburn (2011), Zheng & Chi (2015) and Tan, Johnstone & Yang (2016) argued for when they found that many perceive that they often lack knowledge about how and why specific product are environmentally friendly in their research studies. The results showed that the knowledge regarding green clothing products had a strong influence (β=.354, sig.=.000) on the Swedish millennial’s intention to buy green clothing products and H9 was therefore confirmed and accepted. The result shows that the intention to buy was significantly higher if the respondent possessed a high degree of knowledge, and vice versa as well. This supports the
claim of Johnstone & Tan (2015) that the degree of knowledge regarding the green product will affect the consumer’s intention and by this also affect to what degree the “green gap” might unfold. The findings are in line with what Joergens (2006) found in their study on German and British millennials. They do however differ in comparison to the research study of Kang, Liu & Kim (2013) and Zheng & Chi (2015) who found that the knowledge did not have an immediate, but a mediating effect on the American millennial population. This suggests that there exist differences in opinion or behavior between the American and Swedish millennials.

**Intention to buy**

The findings showed that Swedish millennials reported fairly low mean scores (M=3.83) when it came to the statements regarding intention to buy green clothing products. This indicates that the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials is rather low. This confirms what many researchers have concluded in their research studies within the green consumption field that consumers are not buying green products as much as their concern, attitude and beliefs are stating (e.g. Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Gupta & Ogden, 2009; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Davari & Strutton, 2014; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016).

**Additional findings**

The additional findings did also show that there existed quite a lot of gender differences when it came to the mean scores. It was rather surprising and interesting that there was a significant difference between the genders in seven out of the total ten constructs. Those were: attitude, perceived consumer efficiency, knowledge, price, product performance, habits and intention to buy. Based on the fact that this research study did not focus on gender differences and therefore did not include this sort of theory in the theoretical framework, the authors propose that this could be of subject of further research based on their very basic findings on the subject.
7. Conclusions & Further Research

In light of the research objectives and research questions, this section begins with drawing general conclusions of the research study. This is followed by a presentation of the implications of the research study. The end of this sections presents this study’s limitations along recommendations for future studies.

7.1 Conclusions

The purpose of this research study has been to reveal if there exists an attitude-intention gap among Swedish millennials when it comes to buying green clothing products along with further investigating determinants that influence the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials. Most previous studies in the area of green products have been focused on mostly organic food, meanwhile the context of environmental friendly clothes apparel have had little attention. Prior research on green clothes and Swedish millennials have according to the knowledge of the authors not been done before. By conducting this study, the authors intentions were that the findings would provide insightful knowledge for different stakeholders such as decision makers, marketers as well as policymakers. In order to fulfill the purpose of the research study two research questions were developed and answered based on the empirical findings.

The findings of this research study showed that the attitude towards green clothing products did not significantly influence the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials. The findings did also show that Swedish millennials possess very favorable attitudes towards buying green clothing products, meanwhile their intentions remained rather low. All those findings reveal that there in fact exists an attitude-intention gap among Swedish millennials when it comes to the context of green clothing products.

The findings also showed that there were three determinants that significantly influenced Swedish millennials’ intention to buy green clothing products, namely: Subjective norm, knowledge about green clothing products and habits of buying traditional clothing products. It was revealed that knowledge about green clothing products was the strongest influencer followed by habits of buying traditional clothing products and then subjective norm. Besides this, the knowledge about green clothing products and subject norm were revealed to have a positive effect, meanwhile the habits of buying traditional clothing products had a negative effect on the intention to buy green clothing products among Swedish millennials. Additionally,
findings from the study did also reveal that there existed significant gender differences among Swedish millennials in seven out of the ten constructs investigated.

Furthermore, new insights regarding what determinants that affects the intention to buy green clothing products when it comes to the context of Swedish millennials were found. When comparing those findings to other international millenial studies in the context of green clothing products from America, China and Korea, certain differences were identified which suggests that there exist differences among populations from an international perspective. Those differences were found on the following determinants: attitude, price, perceived consumer efficiency and product performance.

### 7.2 Implications

This research study has contributed with plenty of theoretical, practical and societal implications. All those are mentioned down below.

#### 7.2.1 Theoretical implications

A substantial amount of research has already been conducted on the investigation of the green purchasing gap across different nations, cultures and product categories (e.g. Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Tanner & Wölfing Kast, 2003; Bray, Johns & Kilburn, 2011; Gleim et al., 2013; Zabkar & Hosta, 2013; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Davari & Strutton, 2014; Gleim & Lawson, 2014; Johnstone & Tan, 2015, Bray, Johnstone & Tan, 2015; Tan, Johnstone & Yang, 2016). As earlier mentioned, numerous studies related to purchase intention toward green products has been focused on organic food. Little research has been carried out in the context of green clothing products and more specifically on millennials (e.g. Kang, Liu & Kim, 2013; Zheng & Chi, 2015; Perry & Chung, 2016; Han, 2017; Nam, Dong & Lee, 2017). Therefore, this study makes a theoretical contribution by investigating a topic that currently has not been researched on a larger scale. A few constructs that earlier have proven to influence consumers intention to buy green products has in this study been proven to apply (subjective norm, knowledge, habits) meanwhile some constructs did not apply (attitude, perceived consumer efficiency, price, product performance, convenience, skepticism). Thus, this study helps to contribute regarding knowledge in the area of green clothing products in general, as well as the context of green clothing products in combination with millennials. In addition, this is according to the knowledge of the authors most likely to be the first study which examines the attitude-intention gap within the context of green clothing products and Swedish millennials. The results can therefore serve as a starting point and guideline for further research.
on this specific context and population. Furthermore, the findings of this study make it possible to draw conclusions and compare the Swedish millennials to other millennial populations that has been studied in the context of green clothing products. Relevant theoretical outcomes are that factors which have been regarded as vital for the green purchasing gap in their context such as attitude (Kang, Liu & Kim, 2013; Zheng & Chi, 2015; Perry & Chung, 2016; Han, 2017; Nam, Dong & Lee, 2017), price (Perry & Chung, 2016), perceived consumer efficiency (Zheng & Chi, 2015) and convenience (Perry & Chung, 2016) might play a less significant role when it comes to the context of Swedish millennials. This might be due to the fact that Swedish millennials do not act according to their attitudes in a larger degree and do not perceive the price of green clothing products to be a barrier. Moreover, they do not seem to feel that their positive beliefs regarding making an environmental difference has an effect on their intentions to buy green clothing products as well as they do not feel that the inconvenience of finding green clothing products pose a barrier towards the intention to buy green clothing products. The Swedish millennials do however share the opinion that people such as family and friends have an effect on their intentions.

7.2.2. Practical implications

Furthermore, the findings do also contribute with implications for marketers and decision makers in clothing companies selling green clothing products as well. The direct benefit towards the consumer’s well-being might be relatively difficult to be identified in the context of green clothing products in comparison to for example organic foods where a consumer might see a clear difference in their individual health condition. In the context of green clothing products, the benefits are rather distributed to others’ well-being. This is concerned with the preservation of the nature which collectively affect everyone in the society as well as the wellbeing of garment factory workers who operate in the production process. The findings illustrated that the biggest influence on the intention among Swedish millennials were that Swedish millennials did not exactly know how a green clothing product is environmental friendly and where to find it, which shows that practitioners who sell green clothing products need to focus on increasing the knowledge about the products among the consumers. The authors suggest that marketers should focus on educating the consumer in how green clothing products are environmental friendly by displaying in advertising, both in store as well as in media, the benefits of buying green clothing products as well as displaying the disadvantages and environmental impact that is associated with purchasing traditional clothing products. The findings showed that Swedish millennials also seem to care about what people around them
think and believe, which is another motivation as to why education towards all consumers is a good suggestion. Another suggestion is also to have a better packaging and labeling of the green clothing products in order for the consumers to understand how the clothing item is environmental friendly. Since many Swedish millennials did not know where to find green clothing products, practitioners should clearly mention the brand name in their campaigns so that the consumers can know where to acquire them. The findings do also suggest that the physical retailers need to make the green clothing products more accessible in the store, in order for the consumers to know where to find it. Practitioners should also focus and try to ease the apparent difficulty of transitioning from a traditional clothing product to a green clothing product. This could be to give incentives to buy the “greener” option in form of discounts as well as to inform about the apparent environmental degradation that is congruent with buying traditional products.

7.2.3 Societal implications

Inescapable, the idea of environmental protection and environmental improvement is concerned with society and economy as well. Due to the rising prominence of environmental and sustainability concerns, governmental and nongovernmental organizations increasingly aim to emphasize sustainable consumption and tries to influence the public’s consciousness of their impact on the environment (Kilbourne & Pickett, 2008). The findings of this research study contribute with valuable new information for those nongovernmental supporting organizations as well as policymakers such as the Swedish government. Those organizations can by knowing the most influential determinants influencing the intention to buy green clothing products focus their resources and attention towards those determinants in order to encourage and boost the green consumption. Governmental organizations are firstly advised to embrace, execute and even provide finance for campaigns related to increasing the knowledge about green clothing products. This is feasible since this research study found that Swedish millennials was not sure about what a green clothing product is, how it is environmental friendly and where to acquire it. Furthermore, stricter regulations and monitoring by policymakers could be introduced when it comes to environmental degradation caused in the production process. Additionally, it is important for policymakers to provide attractive incentives to become more environmental friendly for supply chains producing clothing products.
7.3 Limitations and further research

Certain limitations and suggestions for further research exist in the current research paper. The researchers used a quantitative research approach by conducting a survey which was quantitatively analyzed. To ensure that the attention of the participant would last throughout the whole survey, the amount of question asked had to be limited. A result of using survey as a collection method might be that it is difficult to have a deeper and more detailed discussion on the subject since the questions are fixed and the response section is limited. By having this in mind, the researchers suggest for further research to either test the significant, or all of the chosen determinants, with a qualitative research approach by having focus groups in order to gain more in-depth and detailed information. By doing this, a verification of the findings in this research paper, as well as the possibility of gaining new valuable information would be possible and of value.

The present research study collected 150 valid responses through the survey. Based on this, the researchers would advise for further research to investigate the same constructs with a larger represented population in order to verify the representativeness of the present research findings. In addition to this, certain aspects of demographics could have influenced the sample population since it was distributed with a snowball sampling technique among mainly student colleagues, friends and family. The authors suggest for further research to use a stratified sampling technique to achieve an even better generalizability of the research findings.

This study did also investigate nine independent determinants that have been proven in different context to have an influence towards the intention to buy. It was found in the multiple regression analysis that the $R^2$ was 0.297 which implies that 29.7% of the variance in intention to buy green clothing products could be explained by those nine determinants taken together. Based on this, the authors argue for further research to investigate additional determinants to gain an even better fitting model in the context of Swedish millennials.

This thesis investigated gender differences very generally and which meant that it did not investigate the potential gender differences in depth or in detail. Since the findings showed that there existed gender differences among the majority of the constructs, the authors argue that a more detailed and in-depth investigation regarding gender differences would be interesting for further research. This could, depending on the results, contribute with additional very valuable
information that helps to explain the attitude-intention gap that exist among the Swedish millennials in the context of green clothing products.

This thesis investigated determinants that has an effect on the Swedish millennials’ intention to buy green clothing products since this is according to previous researchers (Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010) the first part of the attitude-behavior gap. The authors do therefore suggest for further research to put more emphasis on the actual behavior and investigate the second part of the attitude-behavior gap in the context of Swedish millennials. This would contribute with valuable information for people trying to understand, test and explain the whole “green gap”.

Furthermore, it would also be valuable to use the same framework on another age cohort such as for example generation X or Z within the Swedish population in order to reveal potential differences among the Swedish population that could be of value for different practitioners.
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Appendix A - Survey in Swedish

Hej,

Vi är två studenter från Linnéuniversitetet i Växjö som skriver vår avhandling på civilekonomprogrammet med inriktning marknadsföring. Du har blivit inbjuden till att delta i vår undersökning som rör svenskars åsikter och intentioner när det kommer till köp av miljövänliga klädprodukter. Vi skulle verkligen uppskatta om vi kunde få 5–10 minuter av din tid för att hjälpa oss med datainsamlingen till vår undersökning. Genom att delta i denna undersökning är du med i utlottningen av ett presentkort på 500 kr hos klädmärket Filippa K som ligger i framkant när det kommer till hållbarhet bland företag i den svenska klädindustrin. Din medverkan är frivillig och dina svar behandlas konfidentiellt. Om du har några frågor angående undersökningen, vänligen kontakta William Henriksson eller Sandra Jönsson på:

Wh222ap@student.lnu.se  
Sj222pp@student.lnu.se

Tack så mycket för din medverkan på förhand!

Beskrivning miljövänliga klädprodukter: Miljövänliga kläder är i denna studie definierat som: kläder som innehåller miljövänliga material, kläder som är gjorda med mindre skadliga kemikalier och kläder som är återvinningsbara.

Vänligen, ta ställning till följande påståenden:

**Åsikt om att köpa miljövänliga klädprodukter**

- Att köpa kläder som är gjorda med miljövänligt material är en bra idé.

Instämmer inte alls O O O O O O O Instämmer helt

- Att köpa kläder som är gjorda med mindre skadliga kemikalier är en bra idé.

Instämmer inte alls O O O O O O O Instämmer helt

- Att köpa kläder som är återvinningsbara tycker jag är en bra idé.

Instämmer inte alls O O O O O O O Instämmer helt

**Normer**

- När det kommer till val av klädprodukter så påverkas jag av andra människor såsom vänner och familj.


Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- När det kommer till val av klädprodukter så påverkas jag av andra människor såsom förebilder och influencers.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Människor vars åsikter jag värdesätter föredrar att jag köper miljövänliga klädprodukter.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

Konsumentens syn på effektivitet

- Jag tror att varje persons individuella gärningar kan göra en meningsfull skillnad när det kommer till miljöproblem.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Jag tror att mina miljövänliga handlingar kan göra en skillnad när det kommer till miljöproblem.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Genom att köpa kläder som är miljövänligt producerade tror jag att varje konsuments individuella gärning kan ha en positiv inverkan på både samhälle och miljö.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

Kunskap

- Jag känner att jag har en god kunskap när det kommer till miljövänliga klädprodukter.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Jag känner att jag vet vad miljövänliga klädprodukter är och vart man hittar dem.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Jag känner att jag vet hur och på vilka sätt gröna klädprodukter är miljövänliga.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

Pris

- Jag upplever att miljövänliga produkter ofta har högre priser än traditionella produkter.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Jag upplever att miljövänliga kläder ofta har högre pris än traditionella klädprodukter.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

- Ett högre pris på miljövänliga kläder är något som hindrar mig från att köpa dem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Prestation av produkt**
- Jag upplever att miljövänliga kläder inte har samma kvalitativa standard som traditionella kläder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Jag upplever att designen och utformningen på miljövänliga kläder är sämre i jämförelse med traditionella kläder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Jag tycker att känslan av materialet i miljövänliga kläder är sämre i jämförelse med traditionella kläder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Bekvämlighet**
- Jag tycker att det är svårt att hitta miljövänliga klädprodukter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Jag tycker att det tar för mycket av min tid och energi att hitta miljövänliga klädprodukter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Jag tycker att klädbutiker inte gör sina miljövänliga klädprodukter tillräckligt synliga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Skepticism**
- Jag är skeptisk mot företag och deras produkter som de hävdar är miljövänliga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Jag brukar inte lita på de gröna påståenden som företag annonserar angående deras produkter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Jag känner mig ofta osäker ifall en produkt som är marknadsförd som miljövänlig verkligen är det.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instämmer inte alls</strong></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Vanor**
- Jag har som vana att köpa traditionella produkter vilket hindrar mig från att köpa miljövänliga produkter.
Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt
  • Min lojalitet gentemot traditionella klädmärken och deras produkter hindrar mig från att köpa miljövänliga klädprodukter.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt
  • Jag har som vana att köpa traditionella klädprodukter vilket hindrar mig från att köpa miljövänliga klädprodukter.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

**Intention att köpa miljövänliga klädprodukter**
  • Nästa gång jag ska köpa ett klädesplagg så har jag för avsikt att köpa ett som är gjort med ett miljövänligt material.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt
  • Nästa gång jag ska köpa ett klädesplagg så har jag för avsikt att köpa ett som är gjort med mindre skadeliga kemikalier.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt
  • Nästa gång jag ska köpa ett klädesplagg så har jag för avsikt att köpa ett som har mindre skadlig påverkan på miljön.

Instämmer inte alls  O  O  O  O  O  O  O  Instämmer helt

**Demografi**
  • Är du en svensk medborgare?
    O Ja  O Nej
  • Kön
    O Man  O Kvinna
  • Ålder
    O 0-19  O 20-29  O 30-39  O 40-49  O 50+

**Kontaktuppgifter**

Om du vill vara med på utloppningen av presentkortet på 500 kr hos Filippa K, vänligen fyll in din e-mail:
__________________________________________________
Appendix B - Survey in English

Hello,

We are two students from the Linnaeus University in Växjö whom are writing their thesis at the program of business and economics with the direction marketing. You have been invited to participate in our survey regarding Swedish people’s thoughts and intentions regarding buying green clothing products. We would really appreciate if we could have 5-10 of your valuable time in order to collect data for our survey. By participating in this survey, you will have the possibility to participate in a giveaway of a gift card worth 500 SEK to the fashion brand Filippa K whom is one of the leading companies in the fashion industry when it comes to sustainability. Your participation is optional, and your answers will be handled confidentially. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please feel free to contact William Henriksson or Sandra Jönsson at:

Wh222ap@student.lnu.se
Sj222pp@student.lnu.se

Thanks for your participation in advance!

**Description of green clothing products:** Green clothing products are in this study defined as: clothes using environmentally friendly materials, clothes made with a decreasing use of pesticides, and clothes that are recyclable.

Please take a stand on the following statements:

**Attitude towards buying green clothing products**

- I believe that buying clothes that are made with environmental friendly materials is a good idea.

  **Completely Disagree** O O O O O O O O **Completely Agree**

- I believe that buying clothes that are made with less harmful chemicals is a good idea.

  **Completely Disagree** O O O O O O O O **Completely Agree**

- I believe that buying clothes that can be recyclable is a good idea.

  **Completely Disagree** O O O O O O O O **Completely Agree**
Norms

- My choice of clothing products is influenced by people such as friends and family.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- My choice of clothing products is influenced by people such as role models and influencers.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- People whose opinions I value prefer that I should purchase green clothing products.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

Perceived Consumer Efficiency

- I perceive that each person’s individual small effort can make meaningful difference when it comes to environmental problems.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- I believe that my pro-environmental actions can make a difference when it comes to environmental problems.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- By purchasing clothing products made in an environmentally friendly way, I believe that each consumer’s effort can have a positive effect on the environment and society.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

Knowledge

- I am familiar with green clothing products.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- I feel that I know what a green clothing product is and where to find it.
  
  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree
● I feel that I know in what ways a green clothing product is environmental friendly.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

Price

● I perceive that green products often have higher prices than conventional products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

● I perceive that environmentally friendly clothes have a higher price than conventional clothes.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

● Higher prices on environmentally friendly clothes is something that prevents me from buying them.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

Product Performance

● I perceive that environmentally friendly clothes do not have the same standard as conventional clothes.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

● I perceive that the design and style of environmentally friendly clothes is inferior in comparison to conventional clothes.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

● I perceive that the fabric material of environmentally friendly clothes is inferior to conventional clothes.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

Convenience

● I feel that it is difficult to find environmentally friendly clothing products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O O Completely Agree
I find that it takes too much time and energy to find environmentally friendly clothing products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

I believe that clothing stores do not make their environmentally friendly clothes visible enough.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

Scepticism

I am skeptical towards companies and products that claim to be environmentally friendly.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

I usually do not trust the green advertising claims made by companies regarding their products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

I often feel unsure about whether a product advertised as environmentally friendly truly is environmentally friendly.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

Habits

I have developed habits of buying traditional products which prevent me from buying green products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

My loyalty towards traditional brands and products prevents me from buying green clothing products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree

I have developed habits of buying traditional clothing products which prevent me from buying green clothing products.

Completely Disagree O O O O O O Completely Agree
Intention to buy green clothing products

- Next time I am in need of a clothing product, I intend to buy one which is made with environmental friendly materials.

  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- Next time I am in need of a clothing product, I intend to buy one which is made with less harmful chemicals.

  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

- For my next purchase, I intend to buy a green clothing product since they have less negative impact on the environment.

  Completely Disagree O O O O O O O O Completely Agree

Demographics

- Are you a Swedish citizen?

  O Yes O No

  Gender

  O Man O Woman

  Age

  O 0-19 O 20-29 O 30-39 O 40-49 O 50+

Contact Details

If you want to participate in the giveaway contest of the gift card on 500 SEK at Filippa K, please fill in your e-mail:

__________________________________________________
### Appendix C - Descriptives

#### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>-2.247</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>-3.736</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>16.829</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>-2.872</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>7.902</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>-3.330</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-1.102</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>-1.571</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.253</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>-1.199</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>-1.608</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.157</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.301</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.684</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>-0.622</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.662</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.573</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.824</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.368</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.427</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.646</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>-0.784</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.546</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.770</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>-0.348</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.655</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.988</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-1.086</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.972</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-1.148</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITB1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.899</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITB2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.871</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITB3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.909</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>