Sustainability is here to stay

A quantitative study on the impact brand equity has on purchase intention
Abstract

It is important for companies to reach their goal of marketing success and a way for them doing so is to improve their sales and differentiate themselves from their competitors. There is in fact a need for companies to focus on sustainable consumption and how customers are influenced by purchasing these products. Since several research has been studying the impact brand equity has on purchase intention, this paper intends to explain this impact further by adding the context of sustainability. In order to explain this, this paper used a quantitative approach where a survey was sent out. A total of 220 responses were collected and the answers given were calculated through the program SPSS. In SPSS a multiple regression line was conducted where the results could be found, where the developed hypotheses showed acceptance or rejection. The result showed that the variables of brand equity had different levels of impact, where three out of four hypotheses were accepted. Even though one of the variables was rejected, the overall representation of brand equity had a positive impact on purchase intention when the context of sustainability was added.
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1. Introduction

In this chapter, the aspects of brand equity and purchase intention will be discussed as well as problematized together with sustainability. The chapter will give a definition of sustainability and end with a purpose for this paper.

1.1 Background

To differentiate themselves from competitors as well as improving their sales, companies are advancing and evolving their marketing strategies. A reason for companies to do this is to reach the absolute goal of marketing success, which is to develop a brand which stands out and is different from competitors (Jung and Sung, 2008). A company can gain great profit in the long run with the help of a brand’s value (Jung and Sung, 2008). A brand’s value is closely related to the term brand equity (Farquhar, 1989), which is defined as: “… a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol, that add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or to that firm’s customers” (Aaker, 1991, pp. 15). When Aaker (1991) defined brand equity he included five components: brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality, brand loyalty and brand assets. Yoo and Donthu (2001) as well as Washburn and Plank (2002), do however justify brand equity – particularly consumer-based brand equity – as having four components instead of five, namely: brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty. Brand assets is according to Washburn an(d Plank (2002) a component that is not suitable to use when talking about consumer-based brand equity. In contrast, Yoo and Donthu (2001) present consumer-based brand equity as “cognitive and behavioral brand equity at the individual consumer level through a consumer survey” (Yoo and Donthu, 2001, pp. 2).

Brand equity is the value that a customer adds to a product (Farquhar, 1989). The value which the customer perceives from the product impacts their purchase intention (Zeithaml, 1988). A customer’s purchase behavior is often affected by the brand equity and if the brand equity is greater it often leads to a customer to be more inclined to purchase a product (purchase intention) (Aaker, 1991). Purchase intention is according to Grewal, Monroe and Krishnan (1998) defined as the opportunity for a customer to purchase a product. According to Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard (1995) there are different factors that influences whether or not a customer’s purchase intention really results in an actual purchase (Engel et al., 1995). Factors
such as: changes in a customer’s motivation (Nedra, Sharma and Dakhli, 2015), willingness, planning (Spears and Singh, 2004) and reason (Mirabi, Akbariyeh and Tahmasebifard, 2015).

1.2 Problem Discussion

There has been a history of researchers studying the relationship between brand equity and purchase intention, where brand equity showed a positive impact on purchase intention (Chang and Liu, 2009; Hakkak, Vahdati and Nejad, 2015; Jalilvand, Samiei and Mahdavinia, 2011; Moradi and Zarei, 2011; Lakshmi and Kavida, 2016; Uthayakumar and Senthilnathan, 2011). Hakkak et al. (2015), Jalilvand et al. (2011) and Moradi and Zarei (2011) all recommend to do further investigation about the impact brand equity has on purchase intention, but to conduct such a study in a different context. Steiner, Peschel and Grebitus (2017) research about sustainability, where they more explicitly use sustainability as a context. Customers, companies and researchers are all becoming aware of the environmental issues the world faces and how important the aspect of sustainability really has become (Min Kong and Ko, 2017). There is in fact a need for companies to bring more attention to sustainable products (Min Kong and Ko, 2017) and Paul, Modi and Patel (2016) do in fact highlight the importance to understand the influence sustainable products have on customers’ purchase intention. Previous researches has studied the relationships between purchase intention, sustainability and brand equity, but with only one variable or one component of a variable within brand equity (Braimah, 2015; Wheeler, 2013; Kim and Ma, 2014; Cheung, Lam and Lau, 2015; Park and Kim, 2016). However, some of these contradict each other in terms of their results of the relationships.

There have also been studies made regarding purchase intention and sustainability (Ramirez, Jiménez and Gau, 2015; Braimah, 2015; O’Rourke and Ringer, 2016; Chang, 2011; Joshi and Rahman, 2017), where Joshi and Rahman (2017) recommends future researchers to investigate further about other factors that can influence a customer's purchase intention towards sustainable products. Sustainability has also been researched together with brand equity (Kang and Hur, 2011) as well as the variables within brand equity (Suki, 2013; Wang and Horng, 2016; Magnier Schoormans and Mugge, 2016; Park and Kim, 2016), where Kang and Hur (2011) recommends future researchers to further investigate these two elements, with

---

1 Sustainability/sustainable is referred to as environmentally sustainability/sustainable.
a focus on the financial value. As it is evident that brand equity has an impact on both sustainability and purchase intention and taking Joshi and Rahmans’ (2017) recommendation into consideration it can be seen as significant to investigate and see if brand equity is a factor that impact customers purchase intention when adding sustainability. Since Kang and Hur (2011) argue that brand equity and sustainability are two elements that need to be further investigated by adding financial value and because brand equity has an impact on purchase intention, purchase intention seems like a suitable new element. Especially since, the financial value is described as a customer’s behavior that relates to purchase intention (Gupta and Zeithaml, 2006).

In conclusion, further investigation is recommended in regards of brand equity’s impact on purchase intention, with a new context. Because of the fact that these elements together with sustainability are connected, it is relevant to investigate sustainability as an element and a new context. Also, since brand equity (to the researchers knowledge) has not been researched as a whole variable together with both purchase intention and sustainability, the reason behind conducting this research including the whole variable of brand equity and not just one of its variables is further strengthened. Since Steiner et al. (2017) use sustainability as a context in their research it will be suitable to apply as a context in this paper as well.

### 1.3 Definition

Sustainability has its aim to uncover ways to use limited resources in effective ways. The reason for this is to satisfy the limitless wants of the customer, while at the same time not influencing future generations (Belz and Peattie, 2012). Sustainability can be divided into three different dimensions: social, economic and environmental (Simpson and Radford, 2014). This paper will address the concept of environmental sustainable products, also referred to as green products and environmentally-correct products (de Medeiros and Ribeiro, 2017). According to Kumar, Manrai and Manrai (2017) these products are associated with being environmental-friendly, environmentally superior as well as ecologically safe. Explaining this further, these are the products that adds long term benefits, reduces stress and relieves customers from their environmental responsibilities without affecting the satisfaction of the sustainable product (de Medeiros and Ribeiro, 2017). Acknowledging the fact that environmentally sustainable products can be referred to with different terms whilst having the
same significance, this paper will only use the term *sustainable products* in order to stay consistent throughout.

1.4 Purpose
The purpose is to explain the impact brand equity has on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability.
2. Theoretical framework

In this chapter there will be further discussion regarding brand equity and purchase intention. There will be a deepened research into consumer-based brand equity where its four variables: brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty will be discussed as well, these variables will also be discussed within the context of sustainability.

2.1 Purchase intention

Intentions are explained as “the person’s motivation in the sense of his or her conscious plan to exert effort to carry out a behavior” (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, pp. 168). Studies (Kim, Kim and Park, 2010) show that there are multiple things affecting a customer’s motivation. Kim et al. (2010) explains that a customer’s motivation will be affected whether they are exposed to the brand’s information or not. This indicates that there is a strong relationship between motivation and purchase intention, where a customer’s motivation will influence their purchase intention (Nedra et al., 2015). A customer's product purchase intention is according to Barber, Kuo, Bishop and Goodman (2012) distinguished as a customer’s inclinable willingness to actually purchase the product. The highest price a customer is willing to pay for a product or service is referred to as a customer’s willingness to pay, which is a way to measure willingness within purchase intention (Didier and Lucie, 2008; Franke and Schreier, 2008; Voelckner, 2006; Wertenbroch and Skiera, 2002).

Mirabi et al. (2015) further explains purchase intention as the reason behind consuming from a particular brand. It is used whenever one wants to study purchase intention (Mirabi et al., 2015). The objective of purchase can be viewed as the reason behind why a customer chose to purchase a product or service in terms of what it will actually do for a customer. The reason to why a customer purchase a product or service is to fulfill a need which is important in order for the customer to become satisfied (Armstrong, Kotler, Harker and Brennan, 2012). Spears and Singh (2004) defines purchase intention as attentive planning when purchasing products, meaning that purchase intention is a representation of how likely it is that a customer actually plan to purchase a particular product or service of a brand (Dodds, Monroe and Grewal, 1991; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2007).
2.1.1 Purchase intention, within the context of sustainability

Having knowledge regarding sustainability affects peoples’ attitude towards sustainable products, which in turn affect peoples’ purchase intention for products with sustainable characteristics (Kumar et al., 2017). Kumar et al. (2017) even says that customers’ attitude to these specific products do in fact have a positive impact on customers, making their intention to purchase such products bigger. Silva, Bioto, Efraim and Queiroz (2017) do however express the importance for a product to be labeled with something generating sustainability just by looking at the product. If the product does that while at the same time having the sealing of the product showing that it is of good quality, customers are more prone to purchase such products (Silva et al. 2017). Sustainable products are in fact more favored when offered in comparison with a conventional product, however, that is when the products are offered in similar price and performance (Peattie, 1995).

2.2 Consumer-based brand equity

Brand equity is explained as being the assets and liabilities connected to a specific brand, where a product or a service provided impacts the value generated towards the company (Aaker, 1991). Satisfied stakeholders are what provides great value for the company, enhancing the brand equity as well as the value brought to customers by the brand itself which also strengthens the brand equity (Torres and Tribó, 2011). Similar products that functions in the same manner are frequently provided to the customers on the market but by leaving a mark on how the customers perceive the brand, some products will be the obvious choice for the customer leaving the brand with an upper hand. It is argued that companies that have a high brand equity will be favored by the customers in the long run (Hariharan, Desai, Talukdar and Inman, 2018). This is at its core what indicates a successful brand, hence a strong brand equity which provides high value to the customers as well as for the company (Moon, Park and Choi, 2010). In order for a company to build a strong brand equity, Yoo and Donthu (2001) as well as Washburn and Plank (2002), proposes four different components: brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty (Yoo and Donthu, 2001 and Washburn and Plank, 2002). It is argued that in order for a company to comprehend and measure its brand equity it is equally as important to comprehend these four components (Moon et al., 2010).
2.2.1 Brand awareness

Brand awareness is often of big influence for customers decision-making and brands who are known by customers are often more probable to be covered and included by customers when they make their deliberation. Because of this, the concept of brand awareness is often used by customers when deciding whether or not to purchase (Hoyer and Brown, 1990; MacDonald and Sharp, 2000). The awareness indicates a customer’s ability of recognizing or recalling a brand, where recognition is explained as a customer’s ability of remembering a certain brand during purchasing situations (Liu, Wong, Tseng, Chang and Phau, 2017; Moon et al., 2010). Brand recognition is according to Keller (1993) when a customer confirms the brand when given a cue about it based on their prior exposure with that brand. It is necessary that the customer has been in contact with the brand previously in order to recognize it (Keller, 1993). Furthermore, Moon et al. (2010) explain brand recognition as to how well a brand is distinguished through prior experiences. Keller (1993) describes brand recall as a customer’s capability to think of a certain brand when they are exposed to a certain product category. A brand name can provide a certain recollection for customers, making them aware of either a new or an old brand, creating or strengthening the recall (Aaker, 1991). The first brand that comes to mind is the brand with the highest brand awareness (Moon et al., 2010).

Identified brands are more likely to be a part of both the choices and considerations customers are involved with during their decision making process (Liu et al., 2017; Moon et al., 2010). A customer can identify a brand based on the brands name, symbol, sign or design or a mix of these features. With these features a brand can differentiate themselves from competitive brands (Kotler, 1991). The way a customer identifies a brand is dependent on how well they remember it (Rossiter and Larry 1987) and if they remember it without thinking about another brand it increases the likelihood that the customer will consider that brand over the other (Huang and Sarigöllü, 2012; MacDonald and Sharp, 2000). In order for a customer to make a judgement about a brand which can result in them favoring it over another, they first need to be familiar with the brand (Buchanan, Simmons, and Bickart, 1999; Simonin and Ruth, 1998), therefore brand familiarity is an essential part of brand awareness (Keller, 1993). Barreda, Bilgihan, Nusair and Okumus (2015) further describes brand awareness as a way for customers to gain familiarity with a brand name. A way brands can use familiarity to gain competitive advantage is to make sure that the brand name is remembered by the customers and use words they are familiar with (Keller 1993).
2.2.1.1 Brand awareness, within the context of sustainability

Braimah (2015) explain brand awareness and sustainability as not having a close relationship with one another and that only a minority of people are willing to switch from their preferred brand to a less preferred brand that is more sustainable. They further explain that brand awareness does not have an impact on customers purchase intention when it comes to sustainable products. Wheeler, Sharp and Nenycz-Thiel (2013) and Suki (2013) however, expresses the facts differently, where customers are more aware of sustainable products and connect a brand who is sustainable to being environmental friendly, which according to Wheeler et al. (2013) will impact their purchase intention positively. This makes sustainable products, according to Suki (2013), into a guide for customers’ brand awareness.

2.2.2 Brand association

Krishnan (1996) states that there is a correlation between a strong brand and a brand that have many associations connected to it. The reason is that when the number of links between the associations and the brand grows so does the likelihood that the brand will be remembered (Krishnan, 1996). According to Keller (2002) there can also be a variation regarding the strength of links, while Haugtvedt, Leavitt and Schneier (1993) further explain that when the link is in fact very strong between two associations, it increases the probability that the association spreads from one to another. O’Cass and Lim (2002) further argues through their research that brand association plays an important role when a customer differentiates diverse products from one another when making a purchase.

Brand association is the component within brand equity that refers to a customer’s perception of a certain product (Moon et al., 2010). It does not matter if the particular perception regarding the brand is real or not, it still has a critical role when the brand strategy is developed (Tiwari, 2010). The attributes and the benefits provided by the brand is further classified as brand association, were the attributes indicate the customers’ thoughts regarding what the brand can do specifically for them, the value it adds for them. Additionally, the attributes signify a products characterization in the mind of the customer (Chen, 2017). Keller (1993) describes it in a similar manner, where he explain benefits as a customer's personal value that they attach to the attributes of a product or service, i.e. what a customer believe that particular product or service might do for them. It is understood that brand association can create positive attitudes, where general evaluations are created by the customer, towards a product. Wilkie (1986) defines brand attitudes as the overall judgement a customer has or
makes about a brand. Brand attitude is a crucial part of brand association due to the fact that it at times is the reason to why a customer chooses a particular brand (Wilkie, 1986). Yoo and Donthu (2001) further explains that brand association stems from the memory a customer has. A customer's memory stores knowledge about a brand that is accumulated as single parts of information (Anderson, 1983; Teichert and Schöntag, 2010). The memory regarding the information about a brand is improved by the associations that the customer relates to the brand name. Stronger associations are developed within the memory of customers when they think about the information of a product or service (Craik and Lockhart 1972; Craik and Tulving 1975; Lockhart, Craik, and Jacoby 1976).

2.2.2.1 Brand association, within the context of sustainability
Wang and Horng (2016) explain brand association as being the component that generates significant value to a sustainable brand. Attitude is a component of brand association, where attitude influences whether or not customers’ purchase sustainable products (Kim and Ma, 2014). Customers are getting more involved with the environmental issues which has created a higher demand for sustainable products which results in more people having positive attitudes towards them (Paul et al., 2016).

2.2.3 Perceived quality
Perceived quality considers to what degree a customer perceives the overall quality of a brand. Commonly held opinions about a brand being of good quality is generally based on accomplishing a great level of quality (Aaker and Jacobson, 1994). Aaker and Jacobson (1994) expresses that there simply is not enough with just delivering quality, but it has to be good quality. If a product of a brand is seen as being of good quality according to a customer, marketers can take advantage of this by using high price strategies (Moon et al., 2010). Jacoby, Olson and Haddock (1971) explains that price gives the customer a cue that will give an indication about the quality of a product. Shapiro (1968) further expresses that "price is a powerful piece of information for the consumer.... Since price is concrete and measurable, the consumer views it with much confidence. He trusts it more than most cues concerned with quality (pp. 20, 22)."

Companies that offers services that are of high quality will make customers believe that the brand is favorable, making them potentially purchase that service, which results in a competitive advantage for the company (Bhat, 2005). If customers make the judgement that a
brand is of better quality than another, this will encourage customers to purchase and favor that particular brand (Yoo, Donthu and Lee, 2000; Liu, Wong, Shi, Chu and Brock, 2014). Cues are substantial to customers as they try to judge the quality of a product or service ahead of their purchase (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry, 1985; Zeithaml, 1988). Parasuraman et al. (1985) expresses the fact that customers make use of tangible cues in order to judge quality, for example: style, package, fit, color or label etc. A customer is not necessarily satisfied with a brand even though they believe that the brand has high quality, but it rather depends on the customers’ expectations about the brand. Moon et al., (2010). Bentzen, Christiansen, and Varnes (2011) as well as Horng, Liu, Chiu and Tsai (2012) also argues for expectations as being important and necessary when it comes to perceived quality. They mean that the perceived quality is an outcome of the comparison between the expectations and the perception of the product or service.

2.2.3.1 Perceived quality, within the context of sustainability
Cheung et al. (2015) states that perceived quality is one factor affecting whether or not a customer should purchase from a sustainable brand. Depending on how the product is perceived and whether or not it meets the customers’ expectations, the brand will either be rejected or accepted due to the sustainable perceived quality held by a product (Chen and Chang, 2013). Magnier et al. (2016) has acknowledged the positive influence perceived quality has in regards to sustainable products. However, Newman, Gorlin and Dhar (2014) means that perceived quality is viewed as lower due to the sustainability incorporated in a product. This was mainly due to the customers believing that if a product is made sustainable, it will be of the expense of its quality. Generally, it is more evident through past studies that there is a positive relationship between sustainability and perceived quality (Magnier et al, 2016).

2.2.4 Brand Loyalty
Brand loyalty is explained to be the strongest dimension within brand equity that leads to brand equity (Atilgan, Aksoy and Akinci, 2005). Brand loyalty is explained to be the connection between customers and a brand where the loyalty aspect is the customers’ commitment towards that brand even if it would start changing its products in for example price and features (Aaker, 1991). Based on a customer’s identification with a brand they create an emotional connection to that specific brand (Allen and Meyer, 1990). The level of commitment a customer has with a brand can differ depending on the customer and can be
used by brands as a driving force of brand loyalty (Raïes, Mühlbacher and Gavard-Perret, 2015). Yoo and Donthu (2001) further discusses brand loyalty by explaining that customers choose a brand they are loyal to solely based on the brand being their first choice (Yoo and Donthu, 2001), which is one way that one can measure brand loyalty (Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman’s, 1996). Yoo and Donthu’s (2001) statement is strengthened by Bellenger, Steinberg and Stanton (1976), Newman and Werbel (1973) who argue for the same thing, that customers show their loyalty to a brand when they choose that brand first.

Brand loyalty has furthermore been divided into two categories: behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty. Behavioral loyalty symbolizes a customer’s recurring purchasing behavior of a brand (Mellens, Dekimpe and Steenkamp, 1996). Repeating purchase is not just a spontaneous reaction, but it is also the result of emotions and norms of a customer (Baloglu, 2002). Griffin (1997) explains repurchase as a combination of loyalty and purchase, where a customer will not repurchase a product if they are not loyal to the brand and loyalty would not exist without it. Dick and Basu (1994) and Bolton, Kannan and Bramlett (2000) further explain the behavior of repurchasing in a similar manner, where a customer who is loyal and have a strong connection to a brand will continue to repurchase from that brand. However, the behavioral loyalty is not suitable to be the only explanation of a customers purchasing behavior (Baloglu, 2002; Mellens et al.,1996). There are other important aspects as well that play a role in this, like for example customers personal motives. Because of this the behavioral loyalty has to be accompanied with positive attitude (attitudinal loyalty) (Mellens et al., 1996). Brand attitude is according to Keller (1993) the foundation of customers actions. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) furthermore explains brand attitude as the positive or negative opinions about a brand.

2.2.4.1 Brand loyalty, within the context of sustainability

Park and Kim (2016) argues for that brand loyalty will increase among customers when a company is more sustainable. They also emphasize the impact sustainability has on customers’ brand loyalty, where a customer will show a company loyalty in terms of choosing to purchase a service from that particular company over another when the service is sustainable (Park and Kim, 2016). Kuchinka, Balasz, Gavriletea, Djokic (2018) further implicates through their research that a customer concerned with environmental issues is more likely of maintaining their loyalty towards a company that incorporates sustainability.
Martínez (2015) also emphasizes that there is an increase in customers’ loyalty towards a brand when that brand is working with sustainability.
3. Conceptual Framework

In this chapter the theory presented in chapter 2 will be discussed, leading up to hypotheses that will be tested later on in the paper. Each hypothesis will include a problematization to show its relevance. Four hypotheses have been developed, one for each brand equity variable and they are argued for and presented in section 3.1.

3.1 Hypotheses

As seen in section 2.2.1.1, Braimah (2015) and Wheeler et al. (2013) have different opinions about brand awareness impact on purchase intention regarding sustainable products. Braimah (2015) argues for that it has little impact and Wheeler et al. (2013) argues for the opposite. Both Suki (2013) and Paul et al. (2016) states that people are getting more aware and interested in sustainable products. In regards to this and the statement by Wheeler et al. (2013), an assumption can be made that the increase in awareness for sustainable products will have a positive impact on customers purchase intention. Since Braimah (2015) and Wheeler (2013) contradict each other there is an area to look closer upon and see if brand awareness in fact has an impact on purchase intention regarding sustainable products. With regards to this, the following hypothesis has been developed:

\[ H1: \text{Brand awareness has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability.} \]

Wang and Horng (2016) as well as Kim and Ma (2014) has researched the impact brand association has on customers purchase intention regarding sustainable products. However, Kim and Ma’s (2014) research is limited to only one component of brand association, namely brand attitude, where the result show that attitude has a positive impact on customers’ product choice. Since Paul et al. (2016) express that more people have a better attitude towards sustainable products and taking into consideration what Kim and Ma (2014) says, an assumption can be made that the entire variable of brand association has a positive impact on purchase intention as well, not just attitude. Since brand association is a variable with many other components, such as memory (Yoo and Donthu, 2001), perception (Moon et al., 2010) and benefit (Keller, 1993), it can be understood to be of relevance to measure these components as well in order to see if brand association as a variable has an impact concerning...
purchase intention within sustainability. With regards to this, the following hypothesis has been developed:

**H2: Brand association has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability.**

Cheung et al. (2015) states that perceived quality impacts a customer’s purchase intention towards sustainable products, however, they do not state if the impact is positive or negative. There have however been studies showing that perceived quality has a positive impact on purchase intention but with disregards to the sustainability aspect (Yoo et al., 2000; Liu et al., 2014). Magnier et al. (2016) state that perceived quality has a positive impact on customers regarding sustainable products, however, Newman et al. (2014) state the opposite, that perceived quality is viewed as lower when a product is sustainable. Although Magnier et al.’s (2016) research does not have its focus on purchase intention, their argument for that perceived quality in general have a positive impact on sustainable products, shows relevance for how the following hypothesis has been developed, along with what Cheung et al. (2015), Yoo et al. (2000) and Liu et al. (2014) says:

**H3: Perceived quality has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability.**

The research by Park and Kim (2016) show that customers tend to be more loyal in terms of repurchasing a service if it is sustainable. However, that research was conducted with the focus on services and therefore the same conclusion can not necessarily be drawn regarding sustainable products. This can be seen as an indicator to do further research about brand loyalty’s impact on purchase intention regarding sustainable products. Since Kuchinka et al. (2018) and Martínez (2015) all emphasizes that brand loyalty will become stronger if a brand is working with sustainability and the fact that Griffin (1997) explains repurchase as a combination of loyalty and purchase, the following hypothesis has been developed:

**H4: Brand loyalty has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability.**
1.1 Figure of the proposed model.
4. Methodology

In this chapter the chosen method for this paper will be thoroughly explained as well as a justification of the applied approach. In order to fulfill the purpose with this paper, the different choices were made to accomplish the desired objective. The concepts presented and its focal point will revolve around the research approach, research design, the collection of data, an operationalization, the sampling, the quality criteria’s as well as an ethical and social discussion.

4.1 Research Approach

A research is explained as being a process that consists of investigation as well as questioning a problem that follows a precise and analytical structure. It is also understood that increased knowledge is gained through a research as a result (Amaratunga, Baldry, Sarshar and Newton, 2002). There is no distinct or clear definition on what a research approach is considered to be (Johnston, 2014). Johnston (2014) explains research approach as a concept that either indicate the methods a research will apply or why the particular methods are chosen for the research in question. The research approach in this paper is viewed as being the foundation for how the research is executed throughout.

4.1.1 Deductive Research

The relationship between theory and research is considered to consist of two different approaches, one being deductive and the other inductive research. The primary difference between them are namely how the knowledge is gained and the psychological beliefs underlying the two approaches foundation (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Deductive research is understood as being associated with a quantitative method whereas the inductive research is associated with a qualitative method (Bitektine, 2005; Bryman and Bell, 2015). There are some distinctions that can be drawn between the two approaches, the deductive research starts of general and is concluded distinctly. In contrary to this, the inductive research begins particularly and achieves a conclusion that is general (Bowles, 1994). The process of the deductive research is an approach where the foundation is based on testing already existing theories. Hypotheses are both drawn based on theories reviewed and tested within new contexts where the hypotheses is later on in the process able to be either rejected or accepted by the researcher. This acceptance or rejection is what enables the adjustments and contributions of the existent theory (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill,
The inductive research on the other hand begins with data collection and instead, based on the analysis of the data and the conclusion drawn, a theory is developed (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

Due to this paper being derived from already existing theory, namely through brand equity, purchase intention and sustainability, the reasoning of having a deductive approach is the more suitable course to pursue. The ambition with this paper will be to test theory (brand equity and purchase intention) on a new context (sustainability), which is yet another argument to why the deductive research is better applicable.

4.1.2 Quantitative Research

Two dominant method approaches, quantitative and qualitative research, is commonly associated with the deductive or inductive research approach. The testing of theories, in other words a deductive research, is frequently linked to quantitative research methods. Opposed to this, the emergence of theory, in other words the inductive research is rather closely associated with a qualitative method (Bitektine, 2005). Bryman and Bell (2015) accentuate the fact that a quantitative research is concerned with quantification whereas opposite to this a qualitative method mainly emphasizes words. A quantitative research is structured and can generalize populations meanwhile, the qualitative method is regarded as being unstructured as well as more bothered with developing theories through collected data (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The quantitative method is described as having the ability of explaining the relationship between the variables, independent and dependent (Saunders et al. 2016). It is understood that both quantitative and qualitative methods are employing different approaches to collect and analyze data, however, both research methods can easily overlap one another. It is the purpose, question as well as the history behind the research that brings the premises for deciding a more suitable research along with avoiding the overlapping (Amaratunga et al, 2002).

The chosen strategy for this paper will be the quantitative method since the foundation of the paper will be based on theory rather than data. The investigation will be theory testing in nature, the focal point will be numbers instead of words and a generalization will be made on the chosen population. This paper will try to explain the impact the independent variables (brand association, brand awareness, perceived quality and brand loyalty) has on the dependent variable (purchase intention) which will enable the hypotheses either being
rejected or accepted hence making the quantitative method suitable. Further, it is also understood that a deductive approach is associated with a quantitative research strategy, making the choice of a quantitative method even stronger.

4.2 Research Design

In order for a research to reach the desired intention of a study, three different designs can be implemented to the method, namely: exploratory, explanatory and descriptive. These designs, depending on whichever is applied, will lead the study towards fulfilling its purpose (Baxter and Jack, 2008).

The exploratory approach is considered being primarily concerned with the objective to explore and find something new that does not exist prior to a particular research (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Exploratory design is further implied to be the introduction of a research (Tellis, 1997). The data that might be of interest for the research is investigated in order to detect the phenomenon within it. Prior research establishes the framework for a exploratory study and both a research question and hypotheses are conducted after already existing research has been investigated (Zainal, 2007). The exploratory design is argued for as being a strategy preferred within a qualitative method. The approach takes on an unstructured path where the researcher is engaged in the process and close to the research in order to explore (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

The explanatory design on the other hand investigates data thoroughly to detect the development within the data. Using the data as a foundation, an explanatory study establishes a theory that is thereupon tested (Zainal, 2007). The primary goal, when having an explanatory design, is to investigate the relationship between variables. The basis making up the explanatory research lays in already existing theories (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Neuman, 2003). This approach is considered being appropriate within a quantitative method where the researcher is distant during the research process (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The last design, the descriptive design, is descriptive in nature and describes the phenomenon encountered. The researcher, when implementing a descriptive design, describes the developments of the research during the process period (Zainal, 2007). The descriptive design is understood to be more quantitative in nature rather than qualitative (Bryman and Bell, 2015).
Since this paper is based on already existing theory, the more suitable choice is considered being the explanatory approach. The focal point with this paper is to test theory and to accept or reject hypotheses which strengthens the reasoning of having this approach. Due to the fact that the purpose is to explain the impact brand equity has on purchase intention when the context of sustainability is added, the explanatory approach is considered more appropriate for this paper.

4.2.1 Cross-sectional design

Cross-sectional research design is described as the process where data is gathered from a sample during one single time. The gathered data varies with respondents, namely by occupation, nationality, city etc. By applying the cross-sectional design, quantitative data that is connected to more than two variables is more commonly collected (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2015). The connection between the variables are analyzed in terms of the impact the variables have amidst one another (Bryman and Bell, 2015). It is also a less costly design as well as a simpler one to make use of (Neuman, 2003). The cross-sectional design was used since the ambition for this paper is to explain how the independent variables impacts the dependent variable. In other words, the purpose for this paper is to explain the impact brand equity (brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty) has on purchase intention, when sustainability is added, hence making the cross-sectional design the more relevant to use. Also, taking the time and money aspect into consideration, the cross-sectional design is even more suitable to implement.

4.3 Data Sources

It is of high importance within a research to gather data that is both up-to-date as well as reliable. The information needs to be analyzed in terms of its limitations and errors and comprehended accordingly (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). There are several approaches available in order to collect data where primary and secondary data being one of them (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The latter, secondary data, brings the possibility of using information that has already been collected prior to the research in question. It is data that has either been collected by other researchers or for other purposes. Official statistics, records or information regarding companies or people is considered being secondary data (Hox and Boeije, 2005). The researcher utilizing secondary data has taken no part in the initial data collection process nor in the research design decision. In the use of secondary data, the data
itself is not gathered in order to answer a particular research question. Opposite to this, primary data is the data collected by the researchers themselves to meet the desired purpose in question (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The process when gathering primary data is by using a relevant data collection approach in order to meet the research problem preeminently. Every time primary data is collected, the researcher contributes with new knowledge (Hox and Boeije, 2005). The more common approach to with take when making use of primary data is usually through either observations or questionings. Primary data might aid new contexts to be discovered which contributes to the area researched (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Krishnaswamy and Satyaprasad, 2010).

Primary data was used due to the lack of prior information that was required to reach the purpose of this paper with the consideration to the added context. Therefore, the need for primary data was high in order to contribute towards the research area for the specific context in this paper. The primary data will be collected through a survey that will be conducted by the researchers. The researchers themselves will collect the data and the primary data gathered will bring new knowledge and help the researchers to reach the desired purpose of this paper.

4.4 Data Collection Method

The collection of data is something that can differ depending on what type of method, qualitative or quantitative, that is applied to the research. These two methods include different approaches for data collection and as mentioned above, a quantitative research is structured in its collection of data whilst qualitative is unstructured (Bryman and Bell, 2015). This paper has chosen to apply a quantitative research strategy and therefore, according to Bryman and Bell (2015), four methods are left to determine amongst. Primarily the choice is between structured interviews, content analysis, structured observation as well as survey questionnaires. It is important to consider the purpose of the paper in order for the method applied to gather the data needed to meet the desired purpose (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2015).

A structured interview is, according to Bryman and Bell (2015), a form of interviewing where the interviewees are given the same questions as well as in the same order and as a result the participants receive the exact same interview. The downfall with a structured interview is the
effect the interviewer might have on the participants. In other words, the answers given by the participants might be unreliable due to the bias that might occur. The structured observation on the other hand gives specific rules for the observer to follow in terms of what should be observed as well as how. The latter is predominantly in need of being scattered over a long period of time and both methods are very time consuming (Bryman and Bell, 2015). A content analysis is, according to Bryman and Bell (2015), a method where documents and newspaper are analyzed with the desire to find patterns and categories within the text.

Lastly, a survey is a questionnaire the participants can answer themselves on their own terms. Within quantitative methods, the survey is most likely to be structured where every participant gets the same questionnaire as well as the same options of answers. The questions are developed by the researcher with the aim of the questions to reach the purpose (Bryman and Bell, 2015). This data collection method is both cheap, easy to manage, time-efficient and it enables responses to be collected with no geographic restrictions. The respondent can answer on their own terms and truthfully without being affected in their answering by the researcher (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2015).

A survey is the more suitable data collection method to apply due to this paper having a quantitative method as well as making use of primary data. Also, the time span available for making this paper and making the paper as unbiased as possible strengthens the reasoning for a survey to be conducted. The survey, alongside with the questions asked, will aid the purpose of the paper to be reached.

4.5 Data Collection Instrument

In this section, the conducted questionnaire will be explained in terms of how it was developed as well as how it was presented to the sample of this paper. The operationalization will show how, through the theories, measurable concepts and questions is derived and connected to one another. The questionnaire was revised and reviewed by both experts and some respondents in order to get approval and change it in order to finalize the questionnaire.

4.5.1 Operationalization

Operationalization is used to operationalize the variables considered being relevant for the research (De Rycke and Swynghedouw, 1999). It is used as a measurement of the concepts
considered intriguing for the researcher (Bryman and Bell, 2015). According to Mueller (2007), an operationalization can aid the measured concepts to be explained and analyzed. When developing an operationalization, future researchers can easily replicate the paper. This can occur mainly due to the operationalization enabling future researchers to follow the process of finding the measurable concepts (Bryman and Bell, 2015). For this paper, in order to find measurable concepts through the theory an operationalization is developed and the operationalization will be based on the theory prior presented.

4.5.1.1 Operationalization table:
The operationalization table presented below shows measurable concepts developed through the found theories that developed both the items and questions used for the survey in order to measure the hypotheses and reach the desired purpose. The first column displays the variables, both independent (brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty) and dependent (purchase intention) variable, followed by the column named Item(s) that states the found concepts, which for this paper is four items per variable, found through the theory in the theoretical framework (seen as the words in italic). The following column describes each item based on the theories as well as the variable with the added context of sustainability. The operationalization ends with the developed questions connected to the items for each variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Brand recognition is when a customer confirms the brand when given a cue about it based on their prior exposure with that brand (Keller, 1993). Customers are more aware of sustainable products and connect a brand who is sustainable (Suki, 2013)</td>
<td>Sustainability is important for me in order for me to recognize a product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Keller (1993) describes brand recall as a customer’s capability to think of a certain brand when they are exposed to a certain product category.</td>
<td>Between similar products, the sustainable product is the first one that comes to my mind, due to its sustainability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Identification | Identified brands are more likely to be a part of both the choices and considerations customers are involved with during their decision making process (Liu et al., 2017; Moon et al., 2010).

Customers are more aware of sustainable products and connect a brand who is sustainable (Suki, 2013). | I am more likely to become aware of a product if I can identify it as sustainable. |
| Familiar | Make sure that the brand name is remembered by the customers and use words they are familiar with (Keller 1993).

Customers are more aware of sustainable products and connect a brand who is sustainable (Suki, 2013). | I am more likely to become familiar with a product if the brand name displays sustainability. |
| **Brand association** |  |
| Perception | Brand association refers to a customer’s perception of a certain product (Moon et al., 2010).

Brand association is the component that generates significant value to a sustainable brand (Wang and Horng, 2016). | Sustainability has a positive influence on my perception towards a product. |
| Benefits | Benefits are a customer's personal value that they attach to the attributes of a product or service (Keller, 1993).

Brand association is the component that generates significant value to a sustainable brand (Wang and Horng, 2016). | I believe a sustainable product adds value for me. |
| Positive attitudes | Brand association can create positive attitudes, where general evaluations are created by the customer, towards a product (Chen, 2017).

Brand association is the component that generates significant value to a sustainable brand (Wang and Horng, 2016). | It is easier for me to make a positive evaluation towards a sustainable product. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>A customer’s memory stores knowledge about a brand that is accumulated as single parts of information (Anderson, 1983; Teichert and Schöntag, 2010). Brand association is the component that generates significant value to a sustainable brand (Wang and Horng, 2016).</td>
<td>I am more likely to remember a product if it is sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality</td>
<td>Aaker and Jacobson (1994) expresses that there is simply not enough with just delivering quality, but it has to be good quality. Perceived quality has a positive influence in regards to sustainable products (Magnier et al., 2016)</td>
<td>I believe a sustainable product is of good quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Shapiro (1968) further expresses that &quot;price is a powerful piece of information for the consumer... Since price is concrete and measurable, the consumer views it with much confidence. He trusts it more than most cues concerned with quality (p. 20, 22).&quot; Perceived quality has a positive influence in regards to sustainable products (Magnier et al., 2016)</td>
<td>I am willing to pay a higher price for a sustainable product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>If customers make the judgement that a brand is of better quality than another, this will encourage customers to purchase and favor that particular brand (Yoo et al., 2000; Liu et al., 2014). Perceived quality has a positive influence in regards to sustainable products (Magnier et al., 2016)</td>
<td>I believe a sustainable product is of better quality than a non-sustainable product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>A customer is not necessarily satisfied with a brand even though they believe that the brand has high quality, but it rather depends on the customers’ expectations about the brand. Moon et al., (2010). Perceived quality has a positive influence in regards to sustainable products (Magnier et al., 2016).</td>
<td>A sustainable product meet my expectations in terms of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>First choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty is explained to be the connection between customers and a brand where the loyalty aspect is the customers’ stickiness towards that brand (Aaker, 1991). Brand loyalty will increase among customers when a company is more sustainable (Park and Kim, 2016).</td>
<td>When I choose between two similar products the sustainable product would be my first choice.</td>
<td>Sustainability is important for me when I commit myself to a product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willingness
The highest price a customer is willing to pay for a product or service is referred to as customers’ willingness to pay, which is a way to measure willingness within purchase intention (Didier and Lucie, 2008; Franke and Schreier, 2008; Voelckner, 2006; Wertenbroch and Skiera, 2002).
When offered in similar price and performance, sustainable products are favored over conventional products (Peattie, 1995).

I am more willing to purchase a product if it is sustainable.

Reason
The reason to why a customer purchase a product or service is in order to fulfill a need which is important for customers to become satisfied (Armstrong et al., 2012).
When offered in similar price and performance, sustainable products are favored over conventional products (Peattie, 1995).

Sustainability is an important reason behind why I would purchase a particular product.

Planning
Purchase intention is a representation of how likely it is that a customer actually plan to purchase a particular product or service of a brand (Dodds et al., 1991; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2007).
When offered in similar price and performance, sustainable products are favored over conventional products (Peattie, 1995).

When I plan to purchase a product, sustainability affects my purchase in a positive manner.

4.5.2 Survey Questionnaire Design
As previously mentioned, a survey is chosen as a data collection method for this particular paper. It is important to decide upon what media the survey is administered through. Face-to-face and telephone interviewing is one alternative versus e-mail and postal surveys as another (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The latter mentioned alternative is considered to be a web-based survey that uses the Internet as a medium (Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun, 2012).

When administering online surveys, both the time and cost can be kept at a minimum and the ability to be flexible with how to share the survey whilst simultaneously obtaining vital information for the study from different individuals can be achieved (Evans and Mathur, 2005). Web-based surveys bring both more accuracy and credibility in the responses and one dominant advantage achieved through conducting surveys is the possibility to reach a large amount of individuals otherwise impossible to come across (Gunter, Nicholas, Huntington and Williams, 2002). With online surveys, the respondents are given the ability to answer at
their own terms and whenever it suits them, this gives a better accuracy in the responses and biased answers can be avoided. Online surveys are easier to comprehend and use for the respondents, more secure as well as both efficient and easy to organize the answers for the researcher. Online surveys also simplify the analysis and the measurement of the gathered data. One major disadvantage with online surveys that needs to be considered is the poorer response rate (Evans and Mathur, 2005). Researchers cannot help the respondents once the survey is sent out and if a question is not understood properly or wrong, the responses given will be affected (Bryman and Bell, 2015). To avoid this or to ensure a higher response rate, it is resourceful to make sure to send out the survey on several occasions as a reminder (Gunter et al., 2002).

When conducting an online survey, the researcher can tailor the survey in order to reach the wanted sample through control questions. It is also in the hands of the researcher to decide what questions is required to answer, if not all, as well as in what order the questions are asked (Evans and Mathur, 2005). Closed-ended questions are the more common type of questions developed within a survey, where the respondent can choose a number of answers that represents, for example, their opinions or attitudes (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The Likert-item scale was used when designing the survey which refers to a scale where participants evaluate statements and answer in accordance to their level of agreement. These levels usually range between 1 to 5 or 7 where 5 or 7 is strongly agree and 1 is strongly disagree (Dimitrov, 2014). The scale ranging from 1 to 5, referred to as 5-point Likert scale, is argued for as being more forthright as well as easier to manage. By developing a scale with fewer options, the result might be less skewed. The 5-point Likert scale consists of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree (Dawes, 2008). A cover letter, as Bryman and Bell (2015) describes, is a letter in which information regarding the survey is presented including information about the paper and the research area which can be seen as an advantage to include in a survey.

For this paper an online survey was chosen mainly due to the ability for the survey to reach a large amount of individuals and the time-efficiency of conducting it. Also, money would be saved as well as a less bias answering by the respondents. Google Forms was used as the medium for the survey to be developed through and a cover letter was included as a first page in the hopes of making the survey easier to comprehend. The main reasoning behind including the cover letter was mainly to express information regarding the study, who the
researchers are and why the survey should be answered. Another reasoning behind why an online survey was chosen was due to the possibility of measuring the responses easier which makes it more suitable. The second page for the survey included general questions regarding the respondents age, gender, occupation etc. where one control question was added since the chosen population for this paper is restricted to Swedish citizens only. If they answered “no”, that participant was not included in the results. Before the respondent proceeded to the last page, they were asked to choose and remember an industry they frequently purchase from throughout the rest of the survey. The choice of industry was also something stated throughout the survey to ensure that the respondent remembered it. The last page of the survey included closed-ended questions which was designed in accordance to the 5-point Likert scale specifically due to it being straightforward, easy to manage and less skewed with the results. The survey can be viewed in Appendix 1.

4.5.3 Pre-Testing

According to Bryman and Bell (2015) pretesting a survey is of high importance before gathering any significant data (Bryman and Bell, 2015). It is a reoccurring issue that survey questions are usually misunderstood and therefore it is crucial to apply a pretest. The pretesting is a method in which the researcher can determine if the questions are understood and performs as expected (Hilton, 2017). Babonea and Voicu (2011) stresses the usefulness of pretesting since this is the only method that shows beforehand whether or not the survey contains defaults (Babanoa and Voicu, 2011). Bryman and Bell (2015) also stresses the importance of using pre testing, since once confusion has occurred and with no interviewer available to help, the respondents cannot resolve their perplexity alone (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Therefore, pretesting is essential prior to employing the actual survey (Babonea and Voicu, 2011).

A pretest can take on various forms where the survey is sent to either experts or a small group of targeted respondents. When constructing a pretest on a small group of targeted respondents, two different structures of pretesting can be selected. One possible form is where the respondents are aware of the pretest occurring whilst the other is made undeclared (Babonea and Voicu, 2011). Essentially, a pretest is capable to identify what language to adopt, the arrangement and structure of the questions, the time taken to finish the survey and if questions where disregarded by the participants. If the respondents are informed of the test and questions regarding the survey in terms of how the survey is comprehended is asked as
well (Bolton, 1991). The respondents will then give their input which the researchers will consider when improving the survey if needed. When the survey is undeclared on the other hand, the respondents will answer the questions depending on their initial impressions and this will in turn give the researchers an insight on how the survey is understood on first sight (Babonea and Voicu, 2011).

In this paper, the pretesting will be applied since the ambition is for the survey to be as clear and understandable as possible. The first pretest was conducted on an expert where the given advice was applied and resulted in a revised survey. Thereafter, with the revisited version of the survey, a second pretest was conducted on 10 targeted respondents aware of being pre-tested. The reasoning behind choosing an aware pretesting was due to the researchers wanting the initial understandings of the survey where the respondents could explain their interpretation. The interpretation and understanding of the questions, the appropriate order as well as if any questions were skipped was identified during the second pretest. With the response and patterns seen from the targeted participants, a second revision was made and the survey was yet again reviewed by an expert before amended and finalized.

4.6 Sampling

Within the research procedure, the next action to employ is sampling, were the desired participants are decided upon. This step is crucial when constructing a research in order to be able to collect the wanted data. Without a sample to gather information from, a survey, interview or observation would not be possible to administer (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Bryman and Bell (2015) argues that there is two methods to apply when choosing a sample to research, namely probability or non-probability sampling.

Probability sampling brings the opportunity for every individual in a targeted population to be chosen for the sample without excluding any unit. Within the population, all individuals bear the same likelihood of being a part of the sample if probability sampling is employed (Doherty, 1994). Contrary to this, the non-probability sampling refers to individuals being selected from the population without considering randomizing the sample. The individuals for the sample does not share the same probability of being selected, it is in the hands of the researcher to make the decisions of who to include (Bryman and Bell, 2015). When choosing what method to incorporate in regards to the sampling for the research, a number of aspects
could be considered. The purpose of the research is important to acknowledge when making a choice of who and what to sample as well as how the selection will be made. Once, who and what are answered, the how, will be solved (Uprichard, 2013).

The non-probability sampling was applied to this paper due to the limits seen in both time and money during the process. The sample is decided beforehand and some individuals had a bigger chance of being a part of the sample than the rest, making the non-probability sampling more appropriate.

4.6.1 Sample Selection
Bryman and Bell (2015) argue for two forms of non-probability sampling, namely convenience and quota sampling (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Convenience sampling is described as a non-random sampling technique where units from the desired population are chosen based on common criteria. Easy access, geographical availability, desire to take part as well as attainable at any given time, are primary factors for choosing convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is further looked upon as accidental due to units being chosen coincidental and easy accessible for the researcher. This technique of non-probability sampling is both easy to conduct as well as affordable, however it is also important for the researcher to explain how the convenience sample was administered, if any units were excluded or over represented (Etikan, Musa and Alkassim, 2016). According to Bryman and Bell (2015) a convenience sample is prominently applied when choosing a non-probability approach (Bryman and Bell, 2015). One approach within the convenience sampling is called snowball sampling, which usually can be seen when a probability sampling is either impossible, impractical or too expensive to apply in a research. The snowball sampling is explained as an approach where the involved respondents in a sample is asked to refer to other suitting respondents for the research. These new respondents then identify another group of suitting respondents and so forth it continues (Handcock and Gile, 2011).

The quota sampling on the other hand is explained as a sampling approach where the targeted population is divided into groups, also called quotas or strata, consisting of units with mutual characteristics (Górny and Napierała, 2016). These quotas can include common attributes suchlike age, gender, status and so forth. Depending on the purpose of the research, the quotas are selected according to the significance for the research at hand. If the criteria of the quotas
are met, the researchers can select whoever is desired without any restrictions (Yang and Banamah, 2014).

Due to this paper applying a non-probability sampling and since it is argued by Bryman and Bell (2015) that the convenience approach is one approach to apply, this sampling technique was decided upon to use. Convenience sampling was recognized as being the more suitable approach to administer due to the easy accessibility of the participants to sample. The choice of conducting convenience sampling is further strengthened due to the low cost and since it is considered being simple to manage which suits the time-frame for this paper. The snowball sampling was also implemented during this paper in order to attract more suitable respondents which might have not been reached otherwise. The sampling began with reaching out to individuals the researchers for this paper is connected with, hence making the sampling convenient. To be able to gather even more responses, the individuals connected to the researchers was asked to share the survey on social media which enabled more responses to be collected. The survey was sent out via Facebook and email hence making the population individuals using social media, with no restriction on age, gender nor occupation but only the limit of being a Swedish citizen. This restriction was due to the fact that the researchers themselves are Swedish, hence, so are their family and most of their friends who was reached through Facebook and email. Without limiting the respondents in terms of age, gender or occupation, the opinions of everyone could be collected and getting the opinions of everyone is desired for this paper. The topic of sustainability, as Chang (2011) states, is something customers feel hesitant towards, therefore it is relevant to get the most general view possible. By not disregarding any participants, the answers given will hopefully be by the (potential) hesitant and non-hesitant participant, which equals a more general view of the topic.

4.6.1.1 Sample Size

When determining the sample size for this particular paper, a few rules of thumb were followed. Bryman and Bell (2015) explains that the larger the size of a sample can be, the better it will represent the chosen population. Green (1991) suggests $N > 50 + 8m$ as a guideline to apply when determining the sample size when conducting a regression. The $m$ in this formula refers to the number of predictors involved in the research, namely the independent variables and the $N$ equals the sample size. In this research, the number or independent variables are 4 which equals $N > 50 + 8 \times 4 = 82$ and this indicates that the sample size should be at a minimum of 82 respondents. Harris (1985) suggested that when having
five or less independent variables and in order to determine the minimum sample size, 50 or more participants per variable should be included. In this research, having 4 independent variables and applying Harris’s (1985) rule of thumb, the minimum sample size needs to equal 50x4=200 participants. With these guidelines at hand, it was determined for this particular research to reach a sample size of at least 82 participants but desirably 200 or more. The sample size obtained for this paper were 220 respondents which through the calculations by Harris (1985) and Green (1991) is considered being sufficient.

The survey for this paper was shared to individuals on a Friday and after the weekend it was re-shared on Facebook to ensure more responses. The survey was shared with a direct link and a small introduction was included to why the survey should be answered. After one week a number of 220 responses was collected where every single respondent passed the control question, hence making every 220 of the answers applicable to use for the results in this paper.

4.7 Data Analysis Method

Once the raw data has been gathered, the forthcoming step is to process and analyze it in accordance to the research purpose. It is at this stage the relevance of the collected data emerges, allowing for the intended comparisons and analysis to be made. The process involves editing, coding, classification, tabulation and is ended with an analysis of the data. Editing is explained as the action taken when investigating the raw data closely in order to discover errors that can be amended. This stage prepares the data to be consistent, authentic and completed in order for the next step to be applied. When the editing is finished it is then followed by coding which applies numerals or symbols on the edited data (Kothari, 2004). It is the coding stage that enables the data gathered from surveys to be relocated and inserted to the computer (Zikmund, Babin, Carr and Griffin, 2010). When conducting a survey, it is of high importance to begin coding at the early stages due to the helpfulness it might aid for the researchers when transferring the data to the computer later on in the process (Kothari, 2004).

The process ends with a classification and tabulation where the coded data is divided into groups consisting off shared characteristics which are then displayed and summarized through, for example, statistical tables (Kothari, 2004). The common approach to employ
when summarizing the data is to implement the use of spreadsheets or computer programs such as SPSS (Zikmund et al., 2010). The analysis is conducted as a final stage when all of the stages mentioned are completed (Kothari, 2004).

For this paper the computer program SPSS was used in order to summarize the gathered data. The process, after the 220 responses was collected, began with editing in order to detect missing data. For this paper, fortunately, no missing data was encountered making coding the forthcoming step to with take. During the coding and due to the survey being designed using the 5-point Likert scale, the codes for the questions ranged from 1 - 5, where 1 indicates “Strongly Disagree” and 5 equal “Strongly Agree”. The questions developed as control variables were coded as “Female”=1, “Male”=2 and “Other”=3 whereas the age span was coded “Below 18”=1, “18-24”=2,” 25-34”=3, “35-44”=4, “45-54”=5, “Above 54”=6. The occupation was coded as “Student”=1, “Employed”=2, “Unemployed”=3,“Retired”=4, “Other”=5. Coding the respondents answers of the control question about their nationality was coded as “Sweden”=1 and due to “Other” being disregarded, it could be disregarded in terms of coding as well. The industry the respondents were supposed to remember while answering the questions was coded with “Electronics”=1, “Fashion”=2 and “Groceries”=3. If a respondent considered themselves as a sustainable customer was coded “Yes”=1, “No”=2 and “Do Not Know=3”. The coded data was then continued on and used to be summarized and presented through statistics to later on be able to be analyzed.

4.7.1 Descriptive Statistics

Statistics are considered a tool within research when wanting to analyze and draw conclusions from gathered data. The classification and tabulation stages stated above enables statistics to be implemented in order to analyze the data further. One method to apply in order to achieve a valuable analysis of the data is descriptive statistics (Kothari, 2004). Descriptive statistics is described as a measurement that compiles or explains the gathered data (Byrne, 2007). The emphasis lies on measuring the central tendencies of the data, the dispersion, asymmetry and the relationships within the gathered data (Kothari, 2004). Central tendency measures the distribution of the results and provides information on how the results are grouped (Byrne, 2007). The common approach to take when measuring the central tendency is through calculating the mode, median and mean (Kothari, 2004). Bryman and Bell (2015) describes the mean as the average result, the median as the distributions middle point whilst the mode describes the value regularly occurring in a distribution (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The
dispersion is argued for by Kothari (2004) to typically be measured with the use of standard deviation (Kothari, 2004). In order for a standard deviation to be calculated, the mean is necessary to compute (Byrne, 2007).

The dispersion, using the standard deviation, expresses the average variation that occurs around the mean (Bryman and Bell, 2015). With the use of software, the standard deviation is uncomplicated to calculate where a result of zero indicates a zero diversity between the values. A high standard deviation implies a larger variation amongst the values (Byrne, 2007). The asymmetry is computed through the measurements of skewness and kurtosis appearing in the distribution. The skewness displays if and how the distribution around the mean is allocated. It essentially portrays the distributions curve. Depending on which side the distribution is skewed, the value can be determined as either negative or positive (Kothari, 2004). If the skewness appears on the left side the value is negative whilst skewness to the right indicates positive value. If skewness is absent, the distribution is considered being normal. The kurtosis depicts how the distribution is shaped, whether or not it is centered, peaked or flat in the curve. To be able to conduct statistical analysis it is of high importance to determine the shape of the distribution (Kothari, 2004). Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010) explains the values for skewness usually ranging between $\pm 1$ and $\pm 3$ for the kurtosis, where a closer value to zero indicates a more normal distribution.

The descriptive statistics for this paper will be presented in the result chapter where each item developed for the four independent variables and one dependent variable is calculated and displayed in terms of both the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. This will show the average answers given from the survey as well as the distribution of the answers.

4.7.2 Correlation Analysis

When the research is concerned with explaining the relationship between two variables, also called bivariate analysis, different statistical analysis can be executed (Byrne, 2007). The common measurement to perform in a bivariate analysis is usually Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation, also known as Pearson’s r. This measures to what extent a relationship amidst two variables exist as well as the strength of the relationship (Kothari, 2004; Bryman and Bell, 2015). The range for the correlation lies between 0 to 1 where 0 indicates a non-existing relationship between the variables and 1 indicates a perfect relationship. If the result of the coefficient is negative, the relationship is negative as well. Furthermore, if the coefficient is
measured with a positive outcome, a positive relationship will be identified (Bryman and Bell, 2015). If a negative relationship appears, this indicates one variable increasing as the other decreases whereas a positive relationship signifies one variable increases together with an increase of the other (Byrne, 2007). The closer the coefficient is to 1, the stronger the relationship (Kothari, 2004).

4.7.3 Regression Analysis

The measurement of regression demonstrates the relationship between two variables. Normally, there is a dependent and independent variable which the regression analysis is employed upon to determine the relationship amongst the variables (Kothari, 2004). When implementing a regression line, the dependent variable is expressed as being the response variable whilst the independent variable is referred to as either the explanatory or predictor variable. It is the explanatory variable that might affect the response variable which in turn might result in a change (Yan and Su, 2009). If a research is concerned with several independent variables, a multiple regression analysis is adopted in order to understand the relationship amongst the variables. The range of regression analysis lies between negative 1 and positive 1. If the result shows positive 1 then the independent variable completely explains the dependent variable (Kothari, 2004). The Beta coefficient is the value that explains both the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variable, this value appears when a multiple regression line is conducted (Hair, Wolfinbarger Celsi, Money, Samouel and Page, 2011). It essentially displays the affect a change in the independent variable causes on the dependent variable. If the Beta value equal a number above 0 it indicates positive relationships. Contrary to this, negative relationships are implied if the value results a number below 0 (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The Adjusted R-square is also a value to consider during a multiple regression which explains to which extent the dependent variable is explained (Moore, McCabe and Craig, 2009; Hair et al., 2010). The number for the Adjusted R-square ranges from 0 to 1 where the latter implicates a stronger indication that the independent variable explains the dependent (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to test the four independent variables (brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty) and their impact on the dependent variable (purchase intention). This enabled the hypotheses to be tested, where they either was accepted or rejected depending on, after running the multiple regression, if the significance level was accepted.
4.8 Quality Criteria

In order for a quantitative research to be considered having quality, the main criteria to fulfill is the validity and reliability of the research (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Validity is considered being the extent to which the indicators making up a concept really measures that concept, in other words, is the research really measuring what is desired (Muijs, 2004). Reliability refers to the consistency of a measurement and how well a research can be repeated by future researchers. The extent to which a research can be replicated for future research is also of high importance when determining its quality. Future researchers needs to be able to repeat the same procedure of the research and having the same outcome as well as the ability for them to contribute with new knowledge for the future (Bryman and Bell, 2015). It is also important for a research and its findings to be generalized and give an accurate representation of the investigated subject. These mentioned criteria’s is what is mainly focused on when determining the quality of a quantitative research (Muijs, 2004).

4.8.1 Content Validity

Content validity refers to what extent the measurements conducted actually measures the desired content (Muijs, 2004). This type of validity measures how strongly the content is comprehended as well as how well it represents the actual content (Bryman and Bell, 2015). According to Muijs (2004) content validity can be attained through seizing the targeted participants’ opinions regarding what is measured to determine whether or not it seems valid based on their perception. The use of participants to conclude the validity of the measurement is called face validity. Due to the participants lacking knowledge regarding the theory in question, the validity might be insufficient if this was to be the only approach to take. Therefore, the use of an expert in the field is another approach to implement when wanting to depict the content validity of a measurement (Muijs, 2004). Content validity is of high importance since it indicates that the interpretation of the measurements is precise (Yaghmale, 2003). Once content validity has been assessed, the researchers are given an understanding on how to improve the measurement and its content if necessary. Thereafter a revision is made in order to make the measurement clearer and representative of the content in question (Rubio, Berg-Weger, Tebb, Lee and Rauch, 2003).

To implement content validity for this paper, an operationalization of the theory has been developed in order to assure that the right concepts is measured. Furthermore, an expert in the
field brought insight towards the measurement used. The survey and the questions employed for the measurement was reviewed by the expert to bring the researchers an evaluation of the content validity. The insight given by the expert was then implemented on the survey and thereafter a revised survey was sent out to the respondents. Face validity was implemented on the revised survey where targeted participant examined the survey and the researchers was given the opportunity to evaluate the surveys validity once more. Thereafter the finalized survey was used.

4.8.2 Construct Validity

According to Davis (1989), “construct validity refers to how well operationalizations in research reflect the theoretical constructs they are supposed to reflect (Davis, 1989, pp.31)”. This form of validity distinctively demonstrate whether or not the correct concepts are measured based on the operationalization and the relationship between theory and measurement (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Muijs, 2004). To determine construct validity, it is important to deduce a hypothesis through the theoretical framework. This will in turn ensure that the relevant variables are being measured (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The approach to take when assessing the construct validity is by implementing and measuring the coefficient of correlation $r$. The pattern exhibited through the correlation indicates the strength and direction between theory and what is measured (Malhotra, 2015). Pearson’s $r$ is the common measurement to conduct in order to determine the correlation during a bivariate analysis. A result close to 1 indicates a strong relationship whereas a weak relationship when resulting 0 (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Pallant (2013) states that the minimum value for Pearson’s $r$ should equal .5 to be considered being valid. O’Brien and Scott (2012) further states that a value above .9 is not a value the Pearson’s $r$ should equal since this causes problems.

To demonstrate this papers construct validity, the Pearson’s $r$ was computed through SPSS that displays whether or not the questions developed actually measures what is presumed to be measured. Based on this, the value of Pearson’s $r$ desired in this study will be a minimum of .5 and maximum of .9 in order to achieve validity.

4.8.3 Criterion Validity

Criterion validity refers to the prediction of other concepts a operationalization can take and having the relationship to other variables performing as expected (Bryman and Bell, 2015).
The measurement developed is expected to predict the outcomes or at the very least relate to other measures. The criterion validity is acknowledged as taking on two forms, either concurrent validity or predictive validity (Muijs, 2004). Concurrent validity indicates how well an operationalization predicts the outcome whilst the predictive validity applies future criterions in order to make predictions (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

This paper applies concurrent validity in order to measure the criterion validity of the study. The questions used for the survey was thoroughly examined in order to determine its credibility and how well the operationalization relates to the measurement and the expected outcome. Therefore, the criterion validity more specifically the concurrent validity was applied for this research.

4.8.4 Reliability

The reliability refers to how consistent the measurement of a concept is as well as if the findings are stable over time (Sekaran, 2003). The reliability indicates the extent to which the measurement is free from errors (Muijs, 2004). According to Bryman and Bell (2015) reliability can be divided into three different types, the first being what is called stable reliability. This type of reliability refers to whether or not the findings of a research will be stable and with minor fluctuation over time (Bryman and Bell, 2015). A measure's ability to remain stable with limited error and changes in the outcome indicates a reliable measure (Sekaran, 2003). The second type of reliability is called the internal reliability which refers to how consistent the participants are with their answering. The last reliability is called the inter-rater reliability which describes whether or not any subjective judgement has been involved in the research by the researcher, which in fact should be avoided as much as possible for a successful research (Bryman and Bell, 2015). If a research design is replicated and the outcome is the same, the findings are considered being both consistent and repeatable, the measure indicates reliability. In other words, if a research design is repeated and the findings are the same, the measure is considered being reliable (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009).

It is common within a quantitative method to measure the Cronbach’s Alpha in order for the reliability to be determined. The range for the alpha lies between 0 to 1, where the former expresses no reliability at all and 1, a perfect reliability (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Zikmund et al., (2010) describes the alpha as weak if the value is under .6, fair if the value ranges between .6 to .7 and good if the value of the alpha is between .7 and .8. A value of .8 or more indicates
a very good reliability and the closer to 1 the alpha reaches, the more reliable will the research be (Zikmund et al, 2010). Sekaran and Bougie (2013) explain an alpha lower than .6 as being unreliable and is therefore in need of being either eliminated or changed. In other words, a value of .6 is a minimum to strive for in regards of the Cronbach’s alpha and the higher the value ranges the more reliable it is considered to be.

For this paper, in order to show its reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha was computed. Considering the aforementioned guidelines, the minimum value to aim for in this study is .6 where a lower value will not be acceptable and the desire will be a higher value closer to 1 to achieve a strong reliability. Future researchers will be able to replicate this study since this paper has done such a thorough study where every decision and every step can be seen through the methodology chapter, making the reliability even stronger.

4.9 Ethical Considerations and Social Issues

When discussing the concept of ethics in business, the importance lies in the codes and social norms of behavior during the research. These ethics applies to both the researchers as well as handling the respondents coming in contact with the research (Sekaran, 2003). The ethical concerns involve whether or not the respondents have given their consent to participate in the survey as well as handling their privacy appropriately. If the participants have been exposed to harm, if they are forced to participate in the research and how the researcher handles the collected data is all ethical matters necessary to consider (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Due to the ethical concerns being a sensitive matter it is crucial for the researcher to handle it well and that the ethical rules are followed accordingly (Saunders et al., 2009).

Hair et al. (2011) describes the social responsibilities as the concern towards certain actions taken and the effect these actions has on society or people. It is the increase of good in the world generated through a research (McAreavey and Muir, 2011). According to Bryman and Bell (2015) it is useful to look into how other researchers works with ethical issues. They explain that the Social Research Association is one example to look closer upon in order to get an understanding of this. In the Social Research Association's ethical guide (2003) it is explained to be of high importance that a research is conducted responsibly by taking moral and legal aspects of the society into consideration. The behavior of the researcher and its consequences to the society is what the research depends on in terms of its integrity and
conduct. It is an obligation for the researchers to oblige to the ethical standards of the society. Having concerns regarding the individuals and their rights as well as the want to benefit the society through the research is something that can develop conflicts inevitable to avoid. The consequences that might occur, as a result from the research, is something researchers needs to be sensitive towards in order to defend against predictable harmful outcomes. The actions that takes place based on the findings of a research is something that the researcher might not be able to prevent. Therefore, to avoid this, the likely consequences that might occur can be uncovered beforehand in order to counteract them if they take place. It is essential for researchers to behave according to the value systems of the society without any fear or favor. Misinterpretation of findings as well as any misleading is necessary to avoid. Once the research is done, the findings and its benefits should be communicated to a large scope of individuals in the society (Social Research Association, 2003).

When conducting this research, during the gathering of the data, a cover letter was included alongside the survey in order to ensure the respondents having knowledge why the survey should be filled. Background information about the researchers, knowledge about the study was given to the respondents through the cover letter in order to eliminate any confusion that might arise and to capture the respondents trust. The researchers emphasized the respondents’ privacy to be held as well as every response would be given anonymously. All of the responses collected through the survey was solely used to meet the purpose of the research, which was also communicated to the respondents. All of this was made as an effort from the researchers to assure the respondents of the reliability. The respondents were reached through the internet, mainly Facebook and e-mail, and every response the survey was able to gain was considered respondents giving their consent to be a part of the study. No respondent was forced to participate; it was done on their terms based on the trust they felt towards being a part of the survey.

Since sustainability is added as a context in this paper it gives the society and insight of whether or not sustainability is an important part to incorporate, both for companies and customers. Managers might get an understanding of sustainability and if it is worth including sustainable strategies within the company whilst customers might be influenced to become sustainable in terms of their lifestyle, making this paper a foundation for both parts. A negative impact that might occur, which is worth mentioning, is the fact that if sustainability would show to have no relevance in this study, then as a result, the managers might disregard
environmental concerns in their companies. Also, customers might not incorporate sustainability in their lives hence having a negative effect on earth which can be explained as a domino effect. In other words, this domino effect might be either positive or negative in terms of the topic of sustainability depending on the results of this paper, making it of high importance to not mislead or misinterpret the result. Hence, this paper will hopefully benefit to the society.

4.10 Summary of the methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Approach</th>
<th>Deductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Explanatory - Cross-Sectional Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Primary Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Non-Probability Sampling - Convenience and Snowball Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis Method</td>
<td>SPSS: Descriptive Statistics Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Criteria</td>
<td>Validity (Content, Construct and Criterion Validity) and Reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Table of Summary of the Methodology
5. Results

*In this chapter the findings will be presented thoroughly, both displayed through tables as well as explained with words. In order to calculate the findings, the statistical program SPSS was used and thereafter summarized in tables. The chapter begins with showcasing the descriptive statistics followed by the Alpha coefficient, Pearson’s r and ends with a multiple regression line and hypotheses testing.*

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

The online survey was able to collect answers from a total of 220 individuals where all of the responses were considered being a part of the population, hence used for this paper. The reasoning behind why every respondent was included in the paper was since they all fulfilled the requirements based on the control question. The control question for this paper was whether or not the respondents were Swedish citizens since the target population was limited to Swedish individuals only. In this paper, 75.5% females participated, 23.6% males and 0.9% identified themselves as other. The main occupation that could be seen amongst the respondents were either employed (44.5%) or students (46.8%) and out of all responses collected, 58.6% considered themselves being sustainable customers whereas 20% did not know and the rest where not sustainable. The respondents were given the choice of selecting a preferred industry when answering the survey and the majority chose groceries (63.6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error of Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error of Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>-.604</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.449</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>-1.225</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>-.855</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>-1.187</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>-.942</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>-1.562</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>-1.320</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 Table of the Descriptive Statistics

Table 5.1 displays the descriptive statistics run for each question that was included in the survey. The variables are presented in the first column where each variable include 4 questions respectively. The two columns named Minimum and Maximum depicts the lowest and highest alternative to answer for each question in the survey. Due to the survey being designed using the 5 point Likert Scale, 1 represents the lowest answer possible to choose, whereas 5 show the highest possible choice to answer. The next column demonstrates the mean, in other words the average answers given for each question. It can be seen through the table that all the questions answers mean ranges between 3 and 5, the lowest value being 3.49 and the highest 4.45. The standard deviation can be seen in the column that follows which informs the variation of the answers from the mean. The results display a standard deviation that ranges from .790 – 1.322 where the former indicates the lowest value and 1.322 the highest. The closer to 0 the standard deviation is, the less variation one can see, therefore, a higher variation can be detected when investigating the values of the standard deviation in the table, hence a higher variation.
The remaining columns in Table 5.1 display the skewness and kurtosis of the answers. The aim is for the values of skewness to range between ±1 and the kurtosis ±3 in order for the answers to be considered having a regular and normal distribution. Some values of skewness is identified as not being between the ranges ±1, these values are highlighted in a separate table (see table 5.2 below) in order to make it clearer. Eight questions out of 20 is seen as having a value under -1 (these eight questions can be seen in the boxplot in Appendix 3) but due to the majority of the skewness lying in the correct range of values, the overall distribution can be argued for as being normal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (Items)</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness2</td>
<td>-1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness4</td>
<td>-1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association2</td>
<td>-1.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association3</td>
<td>-1.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association4</td>
<td>-1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty4</td>
<td>-1.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention2</td>
<td>-1.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention3</td>
<td>-1.572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Table of Skewness

As identified through table 5.2, the values for the highlighted skewness is not differing from -1 greatly and can therefore strengthen the argumentation for the results having a generally normal distribution. Explaining this further, the eight values of skewness that is lower than -1 also has a higher mean which can be a reason for the identified values of skewness. Hair et al. (2010) also explains that a skewed distribution can be a result influenced by the sample size. They further state that a sample size above 200 respondents that displays somewhat of a skewed distribution can in fact be neglected since the effect of the skewness diminishes (Hair et al, 2010). Due to this paper having a sample size of 220 respondents and taking Hair et al’s. (2010) statement into consideration, no elimination of any responses were necessary to make which strengthens the skewed distribution to be kept as is, continuing on. The data was also kept due to the Cronbach’s Alpha being above .6 when the skewness was included in the calculations. Therefore, it was decided to maintain the values unchanged, not eliminating any, since the Alpha coefficient still indicates the variables being reliable, hence representative of
the population and the opinions of people. The Alpha coefficient will be further discussed in the next paragraph.

5.2 Reliability

5.3 Table of the Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Association</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability of the questions was calculated through the use of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient that assures the internal consistency of the used questions. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient indicates whether the question is actually measuring the same concepts. The table, table 5.3 presented above, displays in the first column the variables used for this paper. Both the dependent and independent is presented whereas the first four variables are the independent ones whilst the last is the dependent variable. All of the variables consists of four questions each, which is informed in the last column named item(s) and in the middle column the alpha coefficient value is stated.

The value for the Cronbach’s alpha ranges from 0 - 1 where the closer the value is to 1, the stronger the relationship is. Zikmund et al. (2010) argued for a value lower than .6 as weak and as can be seen through the table, the alpha coefficient for all variables surpasses the value of .6 and is therefore considered being reliable. Sekaran and Bougie (2013) also describes Cronbach’s alpha lower than .6 as weak and should thus be either eliminated or changed. This strengthens the decision of keeping all the items and variables as they are, since they exceed the minimum value considered acceptable for the alpha coefficient. The lowest value, as displayed in table 5.3, is .657 and all other values ranges up to .9, hence all the variables and the concepts measured are reliable.
5.3 Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand Awareness</th>
<th>Brand Association</th>
<th>Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Brand Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Pearson’s r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-Tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Association</strong></td>
<td>Pearson’s r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-Tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.842**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Quality</strong></td>
<td>Pearson’s r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-Tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.666**</td>
<td>.708**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Loyalty</strong></td>
<td>Pearson’s r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.812**</td>
<td>.852**</td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

5.4 Table of Pearson’s r

Pearson’s coefficient r was calculated in order to determine the construct validity for this paper, which is displayed in table 5.4 above. All four of the independent variables were included when calculating the correlation using Pearson’s r. In order to run the correlation analysis, the mean score for each variable was computed, hence enabling an accurate calculation of the correlation coefficient. It can be understood through the table that all the values are positive, indicating a positive correlation amidst every variable alongside with the “***” sign, marking the significance. The “***” sign implicates that the correlation between all variables is in fact significant. These positive values and the positive relationship amongst the variables expresses that when one variable increases the other will invoke an increase as well, hence the positive correlation. The values for Pearson’s r range between .666 - .891 and as stated before, the closer the value is to 1 the stronger the relationship is. Pallant (2013) argues for .5 to be the value to aim for as a minimum and it can be concluded through the table that every value exceeds .5 and is therefore considered being valid. O’Brien and Scott (2012) considered the Pearson’s r larger than .9 not ideal and hence, for this paper none of the values surpasses the value of .9 which fulfills the maximum criteria for achieving validity. Through the calculation of the Pearson’s r and since the values range above .5 and below .9 as well as being positive and significant, it can be stated that validity is in fact existent.
5.4 Hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 - Control</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6 - All</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>4.717</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Results</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Industry</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Consumption</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Results</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H1 - Accepted*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H2 - Accepted***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>H3 - Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.84315</td>
<td>0.53142</td>
<td>0.48540</td>
<td>0.64856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F-value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.902</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at level <0.05
***Significant at level <0.001
a) Dependent Variable: Purchase Intention

5.5 Table of the Multiple Regression

In order to test the hypotheses for this paper, a multiple regression analysis was computed which is presented in Table 5.5 above. The table begins with presenting each models intercept.
as well as significance which can be seen from the first row of the table. The control variables, listed under Control Variables, can be seen tested in Model 1 - Control on their own, but they are thereafter included and analyzed together with each independent variable as well as all of them together. Model 1 displays how the control variables influence the dependent variable of purchase intention and the impact the control variables have on purchase intention. The control variables, as seen in table 5.5, includes gender, age, choice of industry and sustainable consumption where all except age shows significance in regards to purchase intention where the significance level is <0.001 and <0.05 when tested alone in Model 1. However, when the control variables are tested with each independent variable individually as well as together with all independent variables, the majority of the control variables loses their significance since they do not reach the accepted significance level of <0.001 or <0.05. The adjusted $r^2$ resulted in a low number of .203 for Model 1 which equals only 20.3% of the control variables explaining the dependent variable. In order to define the dependent variable, more variables need to be included for further interpretation.

The independent variables are listed below Independent Variables where each variable is given a + sign, showing the expected relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable which in this case is expected to be positive. Model 2 - 5 presents the multiple regression for each independent variable together with the control variables, whilst Model 5.5 includes every independent variable as well as the control variables and its regression line. For each model, the Adjusted $r^2$ is presented alongside with the std. error of the estimates. The Adjusted $r^2$ is closer to 1 than 0, specifically for the independent variables, which indicates that the independent variables do in fact explain a lot of the dependent variable, some more than others.

When analyzing the test results and viewing the table, it can be concluded that three out of four of the hypotheses are accepted (H1, H2 and H4). It is the last column, Model 6, where every control variable and independent variable shows the impact it has on the dependent variable. Therefore, the last model, Model 6, is considered relevant when determining whether or not each hypothesis is accepted or rejected. It is worth acknowledging the intercept and its significance of .473 that can be seen for Model 6, which essentially makes it non-significant however, since the F-value in fact is significant the hypotheses testing is proceeded with. In the table, the F-value and its significance is stated for each model where the values are found through the ANOVA (see Appendix 2). When viewing the F-value, it is
evident that each model, including Model 6, is significant since the significance level of .000 is <0.001. The decision of proceeding with the hypotheses testing is further strengthened due to the significance of the intercept rarely being considered interesting, as Richardson (2011) emphasize. He further explains that the hypotheses are not specified by the intercept (Richardson, 2011). Therefore, based on Richardsons’ (2011) statement as well as the results presented through the ANOVA table, all of the models presented in table 5.5 is determined to be significant despite the intercept of Model 6 being non-significant, hence the proceeding with the hypotheses testing further on.

Models 1 - 5 presents the influence each individual independent variable has, alongside with the control variables, on the dependent variable. Each model indicates all of the independent variables as being significant whereas when analyzed together H3, namely Perceived Quality, loses its significance. H3 is not significant due to its significance level equaling .741 and is therefore rejected since it does not result in the accepted significance level of <0.05 and <0.001. In Model 6, each significance level has been highlighted in order to make it clear. H2 and H4 are accepted since the significance results the value of .000 for both, indicating its significance at the level <0.001 and is hence supported. H1’s significance results .003 and has therefore a significance level <0.05. Either way, these three hypotheses are all significant and accepted.
6. Discussion

* In order for a hypothesis to be accepted, the significance level needs to be <0.001 or <0.05 meaning that any significance level over that is not significant, making the hypotheses ending up being rejected.

* When an independent variable is tested independently, it means that it is tested separately from the other independent variables, however, it is always tested together with the control variables.

Brand awareness was tested independently in Model 2 and when tested together with the other independent variables in Model 6 it is in fact significant since the significance level reaches .000 respectively .003. Therefore, based on this, the significance is accepted and the hypothesis: Brand awareness has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability, is accepted as well. Based on the adjusted $r^2$ (.683) for Model 2, brand awareness explain 68.3% of what influences purchase intention. Even though Braimah (2015) explain that brand awareness is of little impact on customer purchase intention, this could not be seen from the hypothesis testing, where brand awareness showed a positive impact. As opposite to Braimah (2015), research by Wheeler et al. (2013) shows that brand awareness has a positive impact on customers purchase intention. Acknowledging this, it can be said that brand awareness does impact purchase intention positively even if the sustainable context is added, strengthening the result of H1 being accepted, hence supporting the statement made by Wheeler et al. (2013). Even though sustainability is added, the impact of brand awareness and purchase intention still remain positive, as can be seen from the results and can be further strengthened by Sukis’ (2013) statement about customers being more aware of sustainable products.

Brand association was tested independently in Model 3 and tested together with the other independent variables in Model 6. In Model 6 it can be seen that brand association is significant since it reaches the significance level of .000 for both models. Based on this, the significance is accepted and the hypothesis: Brand association has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability, is accepted as well. Based on the adjusted $r^2$ (.736) for Model 3, brand association explain 73.6% of what influences purchase intention. The fact that the hypothesis is accepted means that brand association do in fact have significant influence on purchase intention when the context of sustainability is included. This
is in align with what O’Cass and Lim (2002) argues for, that brand association is important for customers when making a purchase which can be seen from the hypothesis test to still be accurate, when adding the context of sustainability. Wang and Horng (2016) agrees, however, they only measure one component of brand association, whereas the hypothesis tested in this paper gives a wider view regarding brand association as a complete variable. This is due to the fact that it measures the same variable as Wang and Horng (2016), (positive attitude) along with memory, perception and benefit. A reason behind why H2 was accepted might be in accordance with Paul et als’. (2016) statement, where they emphasize that customers are getting more involved in today's environmental issues. Also, because of this paper revolving around sustainability and since the result of brand awareness indicates having a positive impact on purchase intention in a sustainable context, the statement by Paul et al. (2016) can be supported.

Perceived quality was tested independently in Model 4 and then tested alongside with the other independent variables in model 6. Model 6 shows that when perceived quality is tested together with the other independent variables, it is not significant, as it reaches the level of .741. Due to the significant level being larger than <0.05 and <0.001, the hypothesis: Perceived quality has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability, is rejected. However, when perceived quality is tested on its own in Model 4, without the other independent variables, it does in fact show significance since it reaches a significance level of .000. The hypothesis was developed in regards to Yoo et al. (2000) and Liu et al. (2014) stating that a customer’s purchase intention is impacted in a positive way when they perceive a product as having good quality. This statement, along with Magnier et al. (2016) acknowledging the positive influence perceived quality has in regards to sustainable products, was the reason for why the hypothesis was thought to end with a positive outcome when adding sustainability. However, the fact that the hypothesis testing resulted in perceived quality being rejected can be supported by Newmans et als’ (2014) statement saying that, when a product is sustainable the sustainability will be at the expense of the quality. Also, based on the adjusted $r^2$ (.528) for Model 4, perceived quality explains only 52.8% of what influences purchase intention. In comparison to the other tested variables, perceived quality has the lowest $r^2$, meaning that it has the least influence on purchase intention of all the variables within brand equity.
In Model 5 brand loyalty was tested independently and then tested together with the other independent variables in model 6. Model 6 indicates that brand loyalty is significant as it reaches the significance level of .000 for both Model 5 and 6. Based on the accepted significance level, the hypothesis: *Brand loyalty has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability*, is accepted as well. The fact that the hypothesis is accepted can be supported by the fact that a company’s sustainability increases a customer’s brand loyalty, making customers purchase intention increase as well (Park and Kim, 2016). Park and Kims’ (2016) research had its focus on services and therefore an assumption that the same result would apply on products was made when developing the hypothesis, which is seen as correct as the hypothesis is accepted. Another reason for the positive impact brand loyalty has on purchase intention regarding sustainable products can be due to how Kuchinka et al. (2018) and Martínez (2015) describes that a customer’s loyalty will increase when a brand is sustainable and one way for a customer to show their loyalty is by repurchasing (Griffin, 1997; Dick and Basu, 1994; Bolton et al. 2000), which is one component that the hypothesis is testing. Based on the adjusted $\text{r}^2$ (.793) for Model 5, brand loyalty explains 79.3% of what influences purchase intention.

The fact that brand loyalty had the biggest influence on purchase intention can be a reason for why H3 was rejected, meaning that brand loyalty together with the other variables (brand awareness 68.3% and brand association 73.6%) “took over” perceived quality’s influence on purchase intention (52.8%). Out of all the variables tested, brand loyalty showed to have the biggest influence on purchase intention when sustainability was in the picture, which can be supported by Atilgan et als’. (2005) statement, where they argue for that brand loyalty is the strongest variable within brand equity that leads to brand equity. The fact that perceived quality has the lowest influence on purchase intention can be supported by the fact that Newman et al. (2014) states that sustainability makes customers perceive the quality of a product as lower.
7. Conclusion and Implications

Chapter 7 includes a conclusion discussing the purpose and how brand equity in fact impacts purchase intention. The chapter also includes managerial implications as well as academic implications showing what in fact has been contributed.

7.1 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to explain the impact brand equity has on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability. With the results from the hypotheses testing it can be concluded that the hypotheses H1, H2 and H4 was accepted, meaning that brand awareness, brand association and brand loyalty all have a positive impact on purchase intention within the context of sustainability. H3 on the other hand was rejected in the hypotheses testing, meaning that perceived quality does not have a positive impact on purchase intention within the context of sustainability. The fact that H3 was rejected can be seen as something that weakens brand equity’s impact on purchase intention. However, when perceived quality was tested independently without the other variables, it showed to actually have a positive impact on purchase intention. Even though one variable was rejected when tested together, the majority of brand equity was accepted and especially since one of those variables was the one with the biggest impact (brand loyalty) it can be concluded that brand equity has a positive impact on purchase intention within the context of sustainability.

7.2 Managerial Implications

Brand awareness, brand association and brand loyalty all showed a positive impact on purchase intention, which makes all of these three variable important for companies to focus on when working with sustainability. Even though brand awareness and brand association has a big impact, brand loyalty is the variable with the biggest impact, making brand loyalty the most important variable within brand equity. Brand awareness and brand association do not have as big of an impact as brand loyalty, however they are still variables companies should focus on. If companies takes this into account they have the probability to influence their customers purchase intention in a positive way. Since perceived quality does not have a positive impact on purchase intention there is no need for companies to focus on that variable when working with sustainability.
7.3 Academic Implications

Since it was understood that further investigation was recommended in regards of brand equity's impact on purchase intention, with a new context – and the fact that these elements together with sustainability are connected ((Purchase intention and sustainability: Ramirez et al., 2015; Braimah, 2015; O’Rourke and Ringer, 2016; Chang, 2011; Joshi and Rahman, 2017); (Brand equity and sustainability: Kang and Hur, 2011; Suki, 2013; Wang and Horng, 2016; Magnier et al., 2016; Park and Kim, 2016)), was the reason behind the development of this paper, which is presented in the introduction chapter. By combining previous researchers’ recommendations, this paper contributes with additional knowledge to the already existing research regarding brand equity, purchase intention and sustainability. Where this paper reveals that three of brand equity’s variables, namely: brand awareness, brand association and brand loyalty, has a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability. The paper also contributes with a rejection, were brand equity’s variable perceived quality, does not show to have a positive impact on purchase intention, within the context of sustainability, which in fact is contradicting to what some of the previous researchers thought. However, they did not have the sustainability aspect into their consideration when making those statements. As of now, previous research regarding purchase intention and sustainability has only had its focus on one variable or one component within a variable of brand equity. However, since this paper show that there is in fact a difference in the impact of the variables of brand equity when either measuring them independently or together, this brings something new to the academic research. Because of this, this paper’s overall contribution is the sustainability context in regards of brand equity’s impact on purchase intention.
8. Limitations and Future Research

This chapter will discuss the limitations that has been brought up during this paper as well as giving recommendations on what to focus on when researching regarding this subject in the future.

8.1 Limitations

One thing that can be seen as a limitation with this research is the number of participants in the survey. There was a total of 220 participants, which according to Harris (1985) and Greens’ (1991) calculations is a sufficient amount, however, if the sample size would have been larger it would have generated a more general view, which according to Bryman and Bell (2015) would have been a better representation of the chosen population. The hope with this paper was to get such a general view on the topic as possible, however, since the participants was sampled through convenience and not at random, the people participating was only collected via the researchers themselves. Therefore, it is likely that the participants are homogeneous which can result in that they answer in similar ways, also making the sampling of the sample size being seen as a limitation.

8.2 Future Research

In regards to the limitations of this paper, the recommendations for future research is to increase the sample size by doing probability sampling, trying to obtain a more heterogeneous sample size. By assimilating these recommendations, the future research can receive a broader view on the topic of research. When looking at the result from the hypotheses testing regarding perceived quality, it could be of interest to look closer upon that variable and attempt to understand why it is that the relevance of perceived quality disappears when testing it together with the other variables of brand equity. By understanding this, perhaps companies would get a better understanding about how they can work with perceived quality and sustainability as it is evident that it has a positive impact on purchase intention when tested independently. It is also evident from Model 1 in the hypotheses testing that the control variables have an impact on purchase intention. Since this paper did not have its focus on the control variables and therefore chose not to dig deeper into why and how these control variables impacted purchase intention, a recommendation for future research is to investigate further in that underlying impact.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Survey - in its original state (in Swedish)

Hej! Vi är tre studenter som studerar på Linnéuniversitetet och skriver just nu våran kandidatuppsats om köpintentioner gentemot hållbara produkter. Vi fokuserar vår studie inom Sverige och den svenska marknaden.

Vi hade verklin uppskattat om du hade kunnat svara på den här enkäten för att hjälpa oss med vår undersökning. Det tar inte mer än 5 minuter och du kommer förbli anonym och svaren kommer bara användas för den här studien och inte utanför!

Definitioner:

I denna undersökning är fokuset på dimensionen miljö. Miljömässig hållbarhet, handlar om att hushålla med mänskliga och materiella resurser på lång sikt. Vi kommer i nästa steg av enkäten be dig välja en bransch att ha i åtanke när du svarar på frågor i steg tre. Valet av bransch kommer sedan kopplas till varje fråga som handlar om miljömässig hållbarhet.

Hållbar produkt: En produkt som produceras med miljöhänsyn genom hela livscykeln och håller hög kvalitet vilket gör att den har en lång livslängd och kan säljas vidare på andrahandsmarknaden.

Tack på förhand!

Jennifer Guldberg Lindqvist
Matilda Matthys
Melliz Draguanova Mihaylova

Personliga frågor
Vilket kön identifierar du dig med?
   o Kvinna
   o Man
   o Annat

Vilken åldersgrupp tillhör du?
   o Under 18
   o 18-24
   o 25-34
Vad är din huvudsakliga sysselsättning?
- Studerande
- Arbetande
- Arbetslös
- Pensionerad
- Annat

Vilket land är du medborgare i?
- Sverige
- Annat

När du svarar på följande frågor vill vi att du har en bransch som du ofta handlar ifrån i åtanke, välj något av följande förslag:
- Elektronik
- Mode
- Livsmedel

Anser du att du är hållbar när du konsumerar?
- Ja
- Nej
- Vet inte

Din syn på hållbarhet
Svarsalternativen kommer att ges på en skala 1-5.
1 = Instämmer inte alls
2 = Instämmer i låg grad
3 = Neutral
4 = Instämmer i hög grad
5 = Instämmer helt

Kom ihåg att ha din valda bransch i åtanke när du svarar på följande frågor!

Denna undersökningen har fokus på dimensionen miljö så kom också ihåg att miljömässig hållbarhet handlar om att hushålla med mänskliga och materiella resurser på lång sikt.

För mig är hållbarhet viktigt för att jag ska lägga märke till en produkt.
Hållbarhet är en viktig orsak till varför jag skulle köpa en viss produkt.

Jag är mer benägen att minnas en produkt om den är hållbar.

En hållbar produkt uppfyller mina förväntningar när det gäller kvalitet.

Hållbarhet är viktigt för mig när jag engagerar mig i en produkt.

Jag är mer benägen att bli bekant med en produkt om varumärkets namn på något sätt förmedlar hållbarhet.

Hållbarhet är det som motiverar mig till att köpa en hållbar produkt.

Hållbarhet har ett positivt inflytande på min uppfattning om en produkt.

Jag är villig att betala ett högre pris för en produkt som är hållbar.

När jag väljer mellan två liknande produkter skulle den hållbara produkten vara mitt förstahandsval.

Jag är mer benägen att bli medveten om en produkt om jag kan identifiera den som hållbar.

För mig är det viktigt att en produkt är hållbar för att jag ska ha en positiv inställning till en produkt.

När jag planerar att köpa en produkt påverkas mitt köp positivt om produkten är hållbar.

Jag anser att en hållbar produkt ger värde åt mig.
Jag anser att en hållbar produkt är av bättre kvalitet än en produkt som inte är hållbar.

När det gäller produkter som liknar varandra så är det den hållbara produkten som först kommer i åtanke, just på grund av dess hållbarhet.

Det är lättare för mig att skapa en positiv association till en produkt om den är hållbar.

Jag anser att en hållbar produkt är av bra kvalitet.

För mig är hållbarhet viktigt för att jag ska återköpa en produkt.
Appendix 1: Survey (English version)

Hi! We are three students studying at Linnaeus University and are currently writing our bachelor thesis about purchase intentions towards sustainable products. We focus our study within Sweden and the Swedish market.

We would really appreciate if you could answer this survey in order to help us with our paper. It will not take more than 5 minutes and you will remain anonymous and the answers will only be used for this paper and nothing else!

Definitions:
Sustainability: Sustainable development is a development that satisfies today's needs without jeopardizing the opportunity for future generations to satisfy their needs. Sustainable development is based on three dimensions: the social, the environment and the economy.

In this study the focus is on the dimension environment. Environmental sustainability is about maintaining long-term human and material resources. We will in the next step of the survey ask you to choose an industry to keep in mind when answering the questions in step three. The choice of industry will then be linked to each issue that deals with environmental sustainability.

Sustainable Product: A product that is produced with environmental considerations throughout the life cycle and maintains high quality, which means it has a long life and can be sold on the secondary market.

Thanks in advance!

Jennifer Guldberg Lindqvist
Matilda Matthys
Melliz Draguanova Mihaylova

Personal questions:
What gender do you identify yourself with?
  o Female
  o Male
  o Other

What age group do you belong to?
  o Under 18
  o 18-24
  o 25-34
  o 35-44
  o 45-54
  o Over 54
What is your main employment?
- Student
- Working
- Unemployed
- Retired
- Other

In which country are you a citizen?
- Sweden
- Other

When you answer the following questions we would like you to have an industry that you regularly purchase from in mind, chose one of the following:
- Electronic
- Fashion
- Grocery

Do you consider yourself being sustainable when consuming?
- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Your view on sustainability
The response options will be given on a scale from 1-5.
1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Remember to have you chosen industry in mind when you answer the following questions!
This survey has its focus on environmental sustainability so also remember that environmental sustainable consumption is about maintaining human and material resources in the long-run.

Sustainability is important for me in order for me to recognize a product.

Sustainability is an important reason behind why I would purchase a particular product.

I am more likely to remember a product if it is sustainable.
A sustainable product meets my expectations in terms of quality.

Sustainability is important for me when I commit myself to a product.

I am more likely to become familiar with a product if the brand name displays sustainability.

Sustainability is what motivates me to purchase a sustainable product.

Sustainability has a positive influence on my perception towards a product.

I am willing to pay a higher price for a sustainable product.

When I choose between two similar products the sustainable product would be my first choice.

I am more likely to become aware of a product if I can identify it as sustainable.

Sustainability is important in order for me to have a positive attitude towards a product.

When I plan to purchase a product, sustainability affects my purchase in a positive manner.

I believe a sustainable product adds value for me.

I believe a sustainable product is of better quality than a non-sustainable product.
I am more willing to purchase a product if it is sustainable.

Between similar products, the sustainable product is the first one that comes to my mind, due to its sustainability.

It is easier for me to make a positive association towards a sustainable product.

I believe a sustainable product is of good quality.

Sustainability is important in order for me to repurchase a product.
Appendix 2: ANOVA table

The tables down below displays the ANOVA connected to each Model in chapter 5. Results. The first ANOVA is connected to Model 1, the second to Model 2, the third to Model 3, the fourth to Model 4, the fifth to Model 5 and the sixth to Model 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>14,902</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Intentions Mean score  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>14,902</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26,957</td>
<td>95,455</td>
<td>.000c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Intentions Mean score  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age, Brand Awareness Mean score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>14,902</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28,960</td>
<td>122,914</td>
<td>.000c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Intentions Mean score  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age  
c. Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age, Brand Association Mean score
### ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>14.902</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21,041</td>
<td>50.024</td>
<td>.000c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a.** Dependent Variable: Purchase Intentions Meanscore
- **b.** Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age
- **c.** Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age, Perceived Quality Meanscore

### ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>14.902</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31,149</td>
<td>168.871</td>
<td>.000c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a.** Dependent Variable: Purchase Intentions Meanscore
- **b.** Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age
- **c.** Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age, Brand Loyalty Meanscore

### ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>14.902</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,434</td>
<td>135.807</td>
<td>.000c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a.** Dependent Variable: Purchase Intentions Meanscore
- **b.** Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age
- **c.** Predictors: (Constant), Sustainable, Industry Choice, Gender, Age, Perceived Quality Meanscore, Brand Awareness Meanscore, Brand Association Meanscore, Brand Loyalty Meanscore
Appendix 3: Answers of participants with a skewed distribution

The answers of the participants that has a skewed distribution that is not normal is shown below. The specific answer of the participant(s) for Brand Association 4 cannot be identified, however, according to Table 3 it still has a skewed distribution that is not normal.