Master Degree Project in Marketing and Consumption

Clothing that Makes You Feel
The impact of anticipated emotions on purchase intention of sustainable clothing

Elsi Hartikka and Laura Rubio Labat

Supervisor: Jonas Nilsson
Master Degree Project No. 2016:136
Graduate School
Clothing that makes you feel - The Impact of Anticipated Emotions on Purchase Intention of Sustainable Clothing.

Elsi Hartikka  
*School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg*

Laura Rubio Labat  
*School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg*

**ABSTRACT**

This study aims to shed light on the role of emotional aspects in sustainable clothing consumption in order to better predict and understand young consumers’ purchase intentions. It aims at contributing to the existing sustainable decision-making literature in the context of organic cotton clothing. In doing so, emotions of anticipated guilt and anticipated pride are studied within the conceptual framework of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). This is done quantitatively by collecting data through a survey among Swedish business students, and analyzing the results with a three-step multiple regression analysis. The results revealed that anticipated guilt, anticipated pride, attitude and subjective norm were all important factors in determining consumers’ intentions to purchase organic cotton clothing. Perceived behavioral control was reported as an insignificant predictor of behavioral intention. The originality and value of this study rely on the addition of anticipated emotions to the TPB framework. This paper is, as long as the authors are aware, one of the earliest quantitative endeavors to study anticipated guilt and anticipated pride in the context of sustainable fashion consumption. The findings of this study will benefit marketing professionals, enabling them to formulate more efficient strategies to communicate about sustainable fashion clothing.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The clothing industry is the second most polluting industry in the world after oil (Sweeny, 2015), causing substantial amount of pollution and waste as well as contributing to depletion of natural resources (Walter, 2009). Traditionally grown cotton is one of the most used fibers in clothing, accounting for more than half of the fibers used in the clothing industry (Ha-Brookshire and Norum, 2011). As it is highly dependent on pesticides (Luz, 2007), producing a typical cotton t-shirt results in the release of harmful pollutants including toxic chemicals, heavy metals and pesticides to soil, water, and air (Hiller Connell and Kozar, 2014). These toxins can disturb human hormonal action, damage the reproductive
system (Greenpeace Finland, 2011) and even lead to poisoning of farmers (Huang, Hu, Pray, Qiao, and Rozelle, 2003). Cotton production is therefore connected with aspects of both social and environmental sustainability. These are some of the downsides of an industry worth nearly 1.7 trillion USD (Global Fashion Industry Statistics, 2012) that has played an important role in economic and social terms during the last decades, serving as a “stepping-stone to development” in many developing countries (Martin, 2013, p. 42).

One way to contribute to unlocking the industry’s problems is organic cotton production, which is a growing market worth globally 15.7 USD billion in 2015 (Fibre2Fashion, 2016). This study focuses on organic cotton clothing because it is argued to be a fairly well-known form of sustainable clothing among the consumers (Kang, Liu and Kim, 2013) as it is the most widely available organic fiber (Hustvedt and Dickson, 2009). Organic cotton clothing items are produced using sustainable methods and materials that have a lower impact on the environment, protecting thus the biodiversity as well as the livelihood of the farmers (Cottonedon, 2016). Organic cotton clothing is made of non-genetically modified plants (Thylmann, D’Souza Schindler and Deimling, 2014) without synthetic chemicals such as toxic pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers (Hustvedt and Dickson, 2009; Organic Cotton Plus, 2016). Even though it is a growing market, only a few studies that examine organic cotton have yet been conducted (Han and Chung, 2014).

Understanding organic cotton fashion consumption is a way to understand sustainable fashion consumption. It has been proven incorrect that growing interest and pro-environmental attitudes towards environmentally friendly products lead directly to their success (Joergens, 2006; Niinimäki, 2010; Nilsson, 2009; Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006). Generally, this inconsistency has been referred to as the attitude-behavior gap (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002), attitude-behavioral intention gap (Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006) or moral hypocrisy (Batson, Thompson, Seuferling, Heather and Strongman, 1999). When explaining the gap, a widely used framework is the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991). According to this model, attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control form behavioral intention, which consequently lead to actual behavior. The TPB has merely focused on measuring cognitive constructs’ influence on behavior, whereas emotional aspects have been left fairly under-researched (Bamberg and Möser, 2007).

Despite the scholarly emphasis on rational aspects in sustainable consumption, anticipated emotions, defined as present imaginations of future emotions (Onwezen, Bartels and Antonides, 2014), have been pointed out as important factors in motivating individuals’ behavioral changes. Indeed, previous literature shows that anticipated emotions add to explaining behavioral intentions beyond the TPB variables (Onwezen et al., 2014; Rivis, Sheeran and Armitage, 2009). This is also why this study presumes that anticipated emotions will positively explain variance in purchase intention of organic cotton fashion. From a marketing perspective, Bagozzi, Gopinath and Nyer (1999) emphasize the importance of emotions as they influence information processing, responding to persuasive appeals, and engaging in goal-directed behaviors. Thus, this field of study can give significant contributions in order to evoke certain emotions among consumers that could lead to behavior. This is especially important when it comes to ethical products, since having an emotional reaction requires that consumers understand issues relevant to their purchases (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014a). The purpose of this study
is therefore to add two opposite self-conscious emotions, anticipated guilt and anticipated pride, to the TPB model in order to explain behavioral intentions of organic cotton clothing. Guilt and pride can be seen as two sides of the same coin; anticipated guilt is a negative unpleasant feeling aroused when a consumer is considering violating his or her personal ideals (Coulter and Pinto, 1995; Tangney, Stuewig and Mashek, 2007), whereas anticipated pride is a positive and pleasant feeling connected with one’s potential self-achievement (Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead and Fischer, 2000). The importance of this study relies on the need for exploring and understanding the role of self-conscious emotions in consumer decision-making in the context of sustainable clothing. This study further investigates whether demographic variables affect purchase intentions among students. As intentions are presumed to lead to behavior in the TPB framework, this research will help to create marketing strategies for promoting sustainable fashion to young consumer segments in the growing market of organic cotton clothing. Due to the aforementioned discussions, this is investigated with the help of the following research questions:

**Question 1**: Are anticipated guilt and anticipated pride important factors in consumers’ purchase intention of organic cotton clothing?

**Question 2**: Do anticipated guilt and anticipated pride improve TPB’s prediction of purchase intention of organic cotton clothing?

**Question 3**: Do demographic factors predict consumers’ purchase intention of organic cotton clothing?

### THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS AND HYPOTHESES

#### Sustainable decision-making

Consumers increasingly express their concerns about ethicality and impact of their consumption choices upon the environment (Martin and Schouten, 2014). However, despite embracing these values, they are rarely consistent with actual behavior (Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006). Several theoretical frameworks have suggested that there are behavioral limits to consumer concerns evoking disappointment that attitudinal variables, such as environmental awareness and knowledge (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002), are “insignificant” (Ritchie, McDougall and Claxton, 1981, p. 238) predictors. Nowadays the dilemma is still on the agenda (see for example Carrigan and Attalla, 2001; Niinimäki, 2010; Peattie, 2010; Shen, Richards and Liu, 2013), and the general belief is that attitudes alone are often a poor predictor of behavioral intention or behavior (Chan and Wong, 2012; Kim and Choi, 2005). This weak link has led researchers to add other concepts such as perceived consumer effectiveness or involvement to the equation (Berger and Corbin, 1992; Ellen, Wiener and Cobb-Walgren, 1991; Lee and Holden, 1999). However, yet no definitive explanation has been found and consequently the criticism is twofold. First, developing a model that incorporates all the factors behind pro-environmental behavior might neither be feasible nor useful (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002). Second, these previous models have focused on traditional, cognitive based decision-making process (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002; Antonetti and Maklan, 2014a) omitting and neglecting thus emotional measures.
Intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence behavior, they are in other words indicators of how hard people are willing to try to perform a behavior (Ajzen, 1991). The question then becomes what determines purchase intention of organic cotton clothing. Previous research about organic cotton consumption has revealed that several factors, such as environmental concerns, previous purchase behavior (Gam, Cao, Farr and Kang, 2010), positive attitudes, and strong environmental self-identity (Hustvedt and Dickson, 2009) influence organic cotton clothing consumption. Moreover, consumer knowledge, perceived consumer effectiveness and perceived personal relevance (Kang et al., 2013), as well as financial risk (Han and Chung, 2014), have been found to be significant mediators of behavioral intention through attitude and subjective norm. However, since developing a model that includes all potential factors has been argued to be ineffective (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002), this study focuses on the theory of planned behavior, as it is recommended in appraising purchase intentions for high-involvement products such as clothing (Mowen and Minor, 1998).

The Theory of Planned Behavior

In an attempt to predict and explain complex human behavior, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) of Ajzen (1991) has become one of the most widely used psychological theories (Conner and Armitage, 1998). According to the TPB, the combination of attitude (A), subjective norm (SN) and perceived behavioral control (PBC) lead to the formation of behavioral intention (BI). It was created as an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) by adding the perceived behavioral control dimension (Ajzen, 1991). As a general rule, the more favorable the attitude and the subjective norm and the greater the perceived behavioral control, the stronger is the person’s intention to perform the behavior in question (Ajzen, 1991; 2002; Ajzen and Madden, 1986; Taylor and Todd, 1995). In a meta-analysis of 154 applications, Armitage and Conner (2001) reported that the TPB constructs together accounted for 39 percent of the variance in intention. Further, recent literature about sustainable and ethical consumer behavior (see for example Gadenne, Sharma, Kerr and Smith, 2011; Halepete, Littrell and Park, 2009; Shaw, Shiu, and Clarke, 2000) has recognised these constructs as reliable in predicting ethical consumer behavior. As other cognitive-based theories, the TPB ignores the role of emotions, assuming that people are essentially rational in using information systematically (Ajzen, 1991).

The first TPB construct, attitude, represents what consumers like and dislike (Blackwell, Miniard and Engel, 2006); it is in other words a general evaluation of people, objects or issues (Tesser and Shaffer, 1990; Tormala and Briñol, 2015). Traditionally, attitudes have been used as the basic predictors for consumers’ willingness to pay for sustainable products (Chyong, Phang, Hasan and Buncha, 2006). Even though occasionally subjected to criticism for being insufficient predictors (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002), attitudes have generally been found to positively relate with pro-environmental behavior intentions (Bamberg and Möser, 2007; Kang et al. 2013; Onwezen et al. 2014; Taylor and Todd, 1995; Urban, Zvěřinová and Ščasný, 2012). Specifically in the context of organic cotton clothing, Han and Chung (2014) and Hustvedt and Dickson (2009) found a significant relation between attitude and consumers’ purchase intention. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: There is a significant and positive relationship between attitude (A) and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.
Subjective norm and its influence on behavior is an important research area in green consumption (Zukin and Maguire, 2004), including both descriptive and injunctive norms. Descriptive norm refers to “the customs, traditions, standards, rules, values, fashions and all other criteria of conduct that are standardized as a consequence of contact with individuals” (Sherif, 1936, p. 3), in other words, behavior that individuals perceive as normal or common practice (Cialdini, Reno and Kallgren, 1990). Injunctive norm, on the other hand, can be defined as “the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188), that is, what others approve and disapprove (Cialdini et al., 1990). More research has focused on the descriptive norm, especially when studying the consumption of a specific sustainable product (Jackson, 2005). As several studies in the pro-environmental context suggest a link between subjective norm and behavioral intention (Arvola, Vassal-lo, Dean, Lampila, Saba, Lähteenmäki and Shepherd, 2008; Bamberg and Möser 2007; Lindsay and Strathman, 1997; Onwezen et al. 2014; Onwezen, Anto-nides and Bartels, 2013; Taylor and Todd 1995; Urban et al. 2012; Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006), the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H2**: There is a significant and positive relationship between subjective norm (SN) and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

Moreover, if consumers believe that the benefits of an action are real and likely to happen, they should be motivated to engage in pro-environmental activity (Lindsay and Strathman, 1997). This is studied by perceived behavioral control, which according to Ajzen and Madden (1986), influences behavioral intention. Conversely, the degree to which a person feels able to engage in a behavior has been shown to uniquely reduce behavioral intentions, even under circumstances where attitudes and/or subjective norms towards the action are favorable (Ajzen, 1991). PBC includes factors that either prevent or facilitate one's engagement in a behavior. In the context of clothing, these are for example quality, style, brand, design, location of stores, certainty that the product is truly made of sustainable material, and price. For instance, the price of organic cotton products is typically 10–30 percent higher than the price of products made of conventional cotton (Goldbach, Seuring and Back, 2003). Furthermore, as Han and Chung (2014) suggested to investigate consumers’ level of trust associated with ethical products’ claims, this is included in this research under PBC. All the factors that form the PBC are considered relevant in the formation of purchase intentions of organic cotton clothing, and hence the TPB was chosen over the TRA model. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H3**: There is a significant and positive relationship between perceived behavioral control (PBC) and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

**Emotions and anticipated emotions in decision-making**

A noticeable amount of studies has researched the concepts of attitude, subjective norm, knowledge, and awareness in anticipating pro-environmental behavior. However studies using self-conscious emotions such as guilt or pride as predictors have been conducted considerably less (Möser and Bamberg, 2007). This is rather contradictory, since the field of study can give significant contributions to marketing by evoking emotions that could lead to specific behaviors among consumers (Gregory-Smith, Smith and Winklhofer, 2013). Carrus, Passafaro and Bonnes (2008) argue that previous research in sustainable consumption has emphasized individuals’ rational aspects and cognitive
processes (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014a),
even though the role of emotions and
intuition is suggested to be more im-
portant for behavioral change.

Psychology literature distinguishes a
group of emotions called self-conscious
emotions, which are for example guilt,
shame, embarrassment, and pride. What
characterizes these emotions is that they
are evoked by self-evaluation or self-
reflection (Tangney et al., 2007). Accord-
ing to Tracy and Robins (2004), self-
conscious emotions differ from basic
emotions such as joy or sadness, since
they need self-awareness to arouse. How-
ever, self-conscious emotions do not only
concern the self, but also act between
social and personal dimensions (Onwezen
et al., 2014). These emotions have re-
ceived less research attention than basic
emotions, even though they play a re-
markable role in decision-making as they
are regarded as motivational (Tracy and
Robins, 2004). Thus, Bamberg and Möser
(2007) call for further research on self-
conscious feelings.

Individuals tend to forecast how their
decisions will make them feel in the
future, and these anticipated emotions
therefore work as present imaginations of
future emotions on the condition that
certain desirable or undesirable events
will happen (Onwezen et al., 2014). Earlier research has found that they can
predict a significant amount of variance in
behavioral intentions (Baumeister, Vohs,
DeWall and Zhang, 2007; Coulter and
Pinto, 1995; Richard, Van der Pligt and
De Vries, 1996; Rivis et al., 2009) and in
pro-environmental behaviors (see appen-
dix 1). Furthermore, previous studies
indicate that adding anticipated emotions
in the TPB framework leads to a better
predicting power of behavioral intention
(Kim et al., 2013; Onwezen et al., 2014).
Nevertheless, the research about anticipat-
ed emotions is considered to be in its
starting phase (Steenhaut and Van
Kenhove, 2006).

Guilt and anticipated guilt

Guilt is a negative moral emotion, which
prevents socially undesirable behavior
through self-consciousness (Steenhaut and
Van Kenhove, 2006; Tangney et al.,
2007). It informs the individual that he or
she has failed his or her personal ideals or
standards (Tracy and Robins, 2004) and
thus triggers the focus on what the indi-
vidual should do or should have done in a
situation (Sheikh and Janoff-Bulman,
2010), increasing one’s willpower (Hoch
and Loewenstein, 1991).

In ethical consumption, guilt feelings
occur when consumers feel they have
personally done something that caused a
negative outcome, such as buying an
unethical product or causing pollution
(Lindenmeier, Schleer, Pricl, 2012;
Soscia, 2007). Guilt can also make con-
sumers more easily realize the connection
between their own behavior and sustaina-
ibility outcomes. Consumers who have
stronger guilt feelings when they are not
behaving in a pro-environmental way
perceive sustainable consumption options
more positively (Bamberg and Möser,
2007). Izard (1977) argues that guilt
attaches the person to the source of guilt,
and therefore guilt feelings do not dimin-
ish before the individual does something
to atone what caused the emotions. Hence,
this urge to reduce the level of guilt could
be channeled into purchasing a product
(Dahl, Honea and Manchanda, 2003;
Ghingold, 1981; Huhmann and Brothert-
on, 1997), and therefore, purchasing
sustainable clothing could be the answer
to end guilt feelings that different contexts
might evoke.

Guilt has been operationalized in three
different ways. First, as a personality trait,
that an individual’s predisposition to feel
guilt ("guilt trait"). Second, as an emotion, referring to a temporary state followed by violation of moral standards ("guilt state"). Third, on the basis of one's moral values (moral standards) (Kugler and Jones, 1992). Previous research has tended to confound these conceptualizations, and sometimes guilt is even used alternately with its sibling feeling shame. However, guilt and shame activate distinct psychological mindsets (Han, Durachek and Agrawal, 2014). Particularly, guilt can be distinguished from shame by its one-to-one correlations to particular situations or events, whereas shame is followed by violations of ethics in a community or in a public behavioral event (Tangney et al., 2007). This research focuses exclusively on "guilt state", understood as a distinct emotion from shame, since purchasing non-organic cotton clothing that might evoke guilt is a temporary and single event. Guilt is found to play a significant role in one’s self-regulation, affecting positively consumers’ future sustainable purchase intentions. In other words, a positive connection between guilt and behavioral intention/behavior has been found in the pro-environmental context (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014a; Elgaaied, 2012; Hunecke, Blöbaum, Matthies and Höger, 2001; Onwezen et al., 2013, 2014).

There are two periods of time when guilt feelings can occur: after a violation of a norm or value (reactive guilt) and before an actual transgression (anticipated guilt) (Burnett and Lunsford, 1994). Reactive guilt is found to be a mechanism of influence, but very little is known about the impact and effect of anticipated guilt (Massi Lindsey, Yun and Hill, 2007; O’Keefe, 2002). Consumers’ anticipated guilt feelings are aroused when considering an alternative that might violate a moral standard (Tangney et al., 2007). Anticipated guilt is hence defined as an unpleasant emotional state that stems from the belief that one might be in the wrong or that others might have such a percep-

tion (Baumeister, Stillwell and Heatherton, 1994). Previous research has found that anticipated guilt can predict ethical behaviors (Chang, 2011; Elgaaied, 2012; Lindsey, 2005; Onwezen et al. 2013, 2014; Pelozza, White and Shang, 2013; Wang, 2011). It has been suggested that anticipated guilt can indeed be more essential than reactive guilt, since anticipated emotions last for a longer time, and individuals tend to spend more time to mentally stimulate future experiences with anticipated emotions (Van Boven and Ashworth, 2007). Based on the previous findings, the following hypothesis is presented:

**H4:** There is a significant and positive relationship between emotions of anticipated guilt (AG) and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

**Pride and anticipated pride**

According to Scheff (1988, p. 399) people are “virtually always in a state of either pride or shame”. Research about pride in consumer behavior is narrow, and has focused more on topics such as product desirability (Griskevicius, Shiotia and Nowlis, 2010) and promotion (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk and Taylor, 2001). When it comes to ethical consumption and pride, only a handful of studies have yet studied the relation (Gregory-Smith et al., 2013; Onwezen et al. 2013, 2014).

Pride is a positive self-conscious emotion that reflects self-worth and achievement (Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead and Fischer, 2000). The feeling of pride is evoked by a similar appraisal process than the one of guilt. However, contrary to guilt, pride is a positive feeling related with events where the behavior is congruent with one’s personal norms and identity goals (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014a; Ellsworth and Smith, 1988; Frijda, 1987; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 1991). Pride has been shown to support ethical perfor-
mance, since it increases one’s motivation to behave along one’s own personal standards (Tracy and Robins, 2007; Williams and DeSteno, 2008). More specifically, it has been suggested to lead to more engagement towards responsible choices (Gregory-Smith et al. 2013; Higgins et al., 2001; Patrick, Chun, and Macinnis, 2009; Williams and DeSteno, 2008). Moreover, pride bolsters behavior that will lead to future pride feelings (Tracy, Shariff and Cheng, 2010). In practice, it has been found to guide individuals to be more involved as well as to have a bigger dedication for task completion (Boezeman and Ellemers, 2007; Michie, 2009; Williams and DeSteno, 2008). Anticipated pride, formed from evaluations of a specific behavior in the future (Onwezen et al., 2014; Tracy and Robins, 2007), has received only minor research attention. Similarly to pride, previous research about anticipated pride suggests that it is based on individual’s assessments of social and personal standards (Onwezen et al., 2014). It encourages pro-social behavior and is seen as an end-state that individuals strive to get and to maintain (Onwezen et al., 2014). Further, it has been found to guide future decision-making in a regulatory way by increasing self-control and affecting behavior over time (Katzir, Eyal, Meiran and Kessler, 2010; Onwezen et al., 2014; Page Winterich and Haws, 2011; Patrick, Chun and McInnis, 2009). To conclude, both anticipated pride and pride have been indicated to directly influence behavioral intention and behavior (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014a; 2014b; Onwezen et al. 2014), and therefore it is proposed that:

**H5:** There is a significant and positive relationship between emotions of anticipated pride (AP) and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

### Demographics

The TPB does not include demographic characteristics, but they have been pointed out to affect behavior in fashion consumption (Roy, Sethuraman and Saran, 2016). When it comes to pro-environmental behaviors, demographic variables have also called researchers’ attention. For instance, women have been found to show stronger engagement than men (Zelezny, Chua, Aldrich, 2000). Finally, Ajzen (1991) suggests including a measure of past behavior in order to assess the sufficiency of the theory of planned behavior. To further investigate these variables in the context of organic cotton, it is proposed that:

**H6a:** There is a significant relationship between gender and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

**H6b:** There is a significant relationship between age and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

**H6c:** There is a significant relationship between educational level and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.

**H7:** There is a significant and positive relationship between past behavior and behavioral intention (BI) to purchase organic cotton clothing.
RESEARCH METHOD

In order to explore the role of anticipated emotions in organic clothing purchase intentions, a quantitative approach was chosen for three reasons. Firstly, the TPB is mostly used quantitatively when studying consumer behavior (Renzi and Klobas, 2008). Secondly, quantitative research methods attempt to maximize objectivity and generalizability of findings, and are typically interested in prediction (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Thirdly, as the motive of this research is to explore relationships between the chosen variables rather than pursuing a deeper understanding of a specific phenomenon as is the case in qualitative research. This research uses regression analysis to predict relationships between independent variables that are thrived from theory, and the dependent variable, purchase intention. Multiple regression is a useful method to analyze how well a model fits with gathered data (Field, 2013).

Construct conceptualization and measurement

In order to develop the questionnaire, the target behavioral intention was defined as ‘purchase intention of organic cotton clothing when shopping for clothes’. The indicators of the TPB constructs were formulated accordingly, and the scales were adapted from previous studies in order to ensure validity and reliability (Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson, 2010). All items in the survey were measured using a 7-point Likert scale with different ranges depending on the question as well as modified in their phrasing to fit the setting of sustainable clothing. A pilot test was sent to small group of students in order to make sure that the constructs and wording were understood as intended. This is important to ensure accurate results (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Presser and Blair, 1994).

The anticipated guilt construct measured the degree to which a consumer would experience the feeling of guilt conceptualized as “state guilt”, when s/he adopted the practices listed in the question (see appendix 2). The scale with three items ranged from ‘Not at all’ to ‘Very much’, and was adapted from Elgaaied (2012), who used the work of Hunecke et al. (2001).

Anticipated pride was measured using ‘Proud’, ‘Exceptionally good’ and ‘Satisfied’ (See Appendix 1). The three items ranged on a scale from ‘Not at all’ to ‘Very much’. The ‘Satisfied’ item was adapted from Onwezen et al. (2013) and ‘Proud’ and ‘Exceptionally good’ items from Onwezen et al. (2014) who had selected the items from Holbrook and Batra’s guilt scale (1987). The combination of the two scales was chosen in order to avoid wording of items that was difficult to understand for the respondent,
which was revealed when distributing a pilot survey for comments. Attitude was measured by three items adapted from Taylor and Todd (1995). The first two items (see appendix 2) were scaled ranging from ‘Bad’ to ‘Good’ as suggested by Ajzen and Fishbein (1974), and the third item measuring attitude used a scale ranging from ‘Dislike’ to ‘Like’.

Perceived behavioral control was measured with six items (see appendix 2) adapted from Kang et al. (2013), who followed the work of Ajzen and Fishbein (1974) and of Shaw, Shiu and Clarke (2000). The items were modified by omitting the word “might” and hence removing the conditional sentence in order to capture the respondent’s “real” perceptions. The scale ranged from ‘Always a problem’ to ‘Never a problem’, and therefore a higher score of perceived behavioral control implies higher control over the difficulties or barriers to locating and purchasing organic cotton clothing products (Kang et al. 2013). This scale was chosen, since it is previously used in the context of organic cotton clothing, and therefore captures barriers related specifically to eco-clothing fashion.

Subjective norm was measured by four items (see appendix 2) adapted from Urban et al. (2012): two statements captured descriptive norms and two indicated injunctive norms, as Ajzen (2002) recommends. SN1 and SN2 were measured with a range of ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’, whereas the scale for SN3 ranged from ‘Should not’ to ‘Should’. Finally, for SN4, the scale run from ‘Disapprove’ to ‘Approve’.

Behavioral intention was measured with four items (see appendix 2). BI1 and BI2 were adapted from the research by Kim, Njite and Hancera (2013), who further adapted from scales by Han, Hsu and Sheu (2010) and Kim and Han (2010). The word “future” was added to the items in order to create a more realistic scenario about clothing consumption. BI3 was modified from Urban et al.’s (2012) research. All items were measured by asking how likely the respondent intends to participate in each behavior on a scale from ‘Very unlikely’ to ‘Very likely’. Finally, BI4 was an additional item considered necessary in order to make the construct more specific for the purpose of this study. Combining two different scales from previous research was regarded meaningful in order to capture actual intentions in the product category of fashion.

Data collection and sample characteristics

The sample population consisted of university students enrolled at University of Gothenburg, School of Business, Economics and Law during the spring semester 2016. Self-completion questionnaire was distributed to the target group via a private Webropol link to students’ academic emails for practical reasons. This study chose to focus on a student population, because young individuals are the “consumers of the future”, and their consumption choices will determine the course of future trends (Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006, p. 178). Further, it can be assumed that the surveyed young adults have some knowledge and awareness about the concept of sustainability, which is necessary in order to distinguish the different respondents’ attitudes and behavioral intentions (Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006). The chosen business school has a sustainability focus, and sustainable development is aimed to be integrated in all of the existing courses in the school’s programmes (Handelshögskolan Göteborg, 2016).

Two types of information were collected in the survey by sixteen mandatory questions. The first type regarded constructs in the model and the second type of information concerned subjects’ demographic information, as well as previous behavior-
al measures regarding shopping habits of clothes. The survey was sent out to 4,347 students during the period of 21.4.2016–29.4.2016. A total of 454 responses was received after two reminder emails, constituting a response rate of 10.44 per cent. The rate is considered to be acceptable in order to guarantee that the observed relationships are meaningful (Hair et al., 2010). Even though a higher response rate would have been more desirable, according to Krosnick (1999) a low response rate might not be biased if respondents’ characteristics are representative of the non-respondents. The questionnaire was sent exclusively to students enrolled at same business school, and it can therefore be presumed that the demographic characteristics are similar in both respondents and non-respondents. Finally, nine cases were removed from the final sample during detection of outliers by analysing Mahalanobis distance, Cook’s distance and leverage values with both numerical data and scatter plot information, following suggestions by Field (2013) and Pallot (2013).

**Descriptive statistics**

The survey population consisted of exactly 60 percent of female respondents and 40 percent of male respondents, and the average age of the respondents was rounded up to 26 (see table 1). The descriptive data shows that 55.7 percent of the respondents had bought a piece of organic clothing during the last year. When it comes to differences in gender, 63.7 per cent of women and 43.8 percent of men engaged into the purchase. Combining respondents’ educational level and past purchase of organic cotton, it is found that 60.3 percent of the bachelor’s students and 49.4 of the master students had engaged in a purchase. Furthermore, the respondents average shopping budget for clothes per month was about 764 Swedish crowns. The descriptive data indicated that on average, subjects scored low on subjective norm (M=2.37, SD=1.28) and anticipated guilt (M=2.66, SD=1.53), while high on attitude (M=6.08, SD=1.05) and behavioral intention (M=4.65, SD=1.39) (see table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organic cotton purchase during the past 6 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping budget for clothes/month, SEK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 99</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-499</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1999</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average budget</strong></td>
<td>763.5 SEK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Characteristics of the subjects. Note: Shopping budget is calculated with N=425, since 20 respondents did not fill in their monthly expenditure on clothing.
Reliability

EFA was first used to examine the basic structure of the constructs using a principal components extraction method (see table 3). ‘Direct Oblimin’ rotation was chosen, as advised if the constructs are likely to correlate (Hair et al., 2010), as is the case in the TPB (Ajzen, 2002). After investigating low communalities, low factor scores, and cross-loadings, six items were removed in the following order: PBC1, PBC2, SN4, SN3, PBC4, and AP3 (see appendix 2). The final result included variables with neither cross-loadings nor communalities below the cut-off line of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2010).

The reliability of the scales (see table 2) was confirmed by looking at the Cronbach alpha (α) values of A (α=0.77), SN (α=0.84), PBC (α=0.59), AG (α=0.95), AP (α=0.83), and BI (α=0.84). As shown in table 2, all the values except the one of PBC exceeded the advised value of 0.7, which assures an adequate reliability (Field, 2013). Even though a higher value would have been more desirable for PBC, it is common to receive lower Cronbach alpha values such as 0.5 with short scales (Pallot, 2013). Further, a value lower than 0.7 can even be expected, when the research is dealing with psychological constructs (Kline, 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated guilt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral intention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics.
### Table 3. Results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis, KMO = 0.764, df = 78, p = 0.000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I did not purchase clothes made of organic cotton, when shopping for clothes (AG1)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My conscience would bother me if I did not purchase clothes made of organic cotton when shopping for clothes (AG2)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have a bad conscience toward the environment or/and the cotton farmers, if I did not purchase clothes made of organic cotton when shopping for clothes (AG3)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing made of organic cotton is not readily available (PBC3)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to obtain information regarding what products are made of organic cotton (PBC5)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no way for me to ensure it is genuinely ‘organic’ even if it says it is organic cotton clothing (PBC6)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing clothing made of organic cotton is a (bad/good) idea (AT1)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a (bad/good) attitude toward purchasing clothes made of organic cotton (AT2)</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (dislike/like) the idea of consuming clothes made of organic cotton (AT3)</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people who are important to me buy clothes made of organic cotton (SN1)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people whose opinion I value buy clothes made of organic cotton (SN2)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were to buy clothes made of organic cotton, then I would feel proud (AP1)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were to buy clothes made of organic cotton, then I would feel exceptionally good (AP2)</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to choose clothing made of organic cotton, when shopping for clothes (BI)</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will make an effort in the future to select clothes made of organic cotton (BI2)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to buy clothing made of organic cotton when shopping for clothes in the future (BI3)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will, during the upcoming six months purchase at least one item made from organic cotton (BI4)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of variance explained (%)</td>
<td>33.40</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypotheses (see figure 1 above), a three-step hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. As a first step, A, SN and PBC were tested as composite constructs. Secondly, a regression model was created by adding AP and AG in the hierarchy. Finally, a third regression with demographic variables, namely, age, gender, educational level, and past behavior, was run. Viability was guaranteed after assessing the normal probability plot and the scatter plot of the standardized residuals, which showed no major deviations from normality in any of the models. Further, no multicollinearity problems were indicated by neither Tolerance nor VIF values in any of the model.

The first regression model showed that both A and SN contribute significantly to organic cotton purchase intention with a $R^2$ of 0.43 ($F=110.838$ and $p<0.001$). PBC was however not a significant predictor in the model (see table 4). Judging by the betas in the table, the highest predictor in the TPB model was attitude followed by subjective norm. Hence, $H1$ and $H2$ are supported, and $H3$ is rejected.

The second step in the regression analysis tested hypothesis 4 and 5 by adding the emotional variables into the model. Anticipated emotions were significant predictors of behavioral intention along with A and SN, but the PBC component remained insignificant (see table 4). Specifically, the highest unique predictor was anticipated guilt followed by attitude, subjective norm and anticipated pride (see table 4). Hence, $H4$ and $H5$ are supported. The results showed that the model was significant and explained 60 percent of the variance in behavioral intention of organic cotton clothing purchase. The addition of AG and AP increased the $R^2$ by 17 percent with an F-ratio of 93.5 ($p<0.001$), constituting thus a significant change. Furthermore, Field (2013) argues that the equation that SPSS derives for the adjusted $R^2$ (Wherry’s equation) does not sufficiently explain how well the regression model would predict scores from a different sample of data from the same population, and suggests therefore the use of Stein’s formula. Hence, to test how well the model cross-validates, Stein's formula was calculated and no major differences were found (see table 4).

Lastly, the third step aimed to explore whether demographic characteristics were relevant in predicting purchase intentions of organic cotton clothing. The results indicated that neither gender, age, nor educational level were significant predictors of behavioral intention. However, past purchase behavior significantly predicted students’ intentions. The model yielded an $R^2$ of 0.628 ($F=81.539$ and $p<0.001$), in other words, a 2.8 percent increase from the second regression model (see table 4). Hence, $H6a$, $H6b$ and $H6c$ are rejected and $H7$ is supported.
Table 4. Regression models.
Dependent variable Behavioral intentions in organic cotton clothing purchase.
R² change: model 1 0.430, model 2 0.170, model 3 0.028.
Significance level at: * P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01, *** P ≤ 0.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Stein’s adj. R²</th>
<th>Wherry’s adj. R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>110.84</td>
<td>110.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated guilt</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated guilt</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated guilt</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated pride</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past behavior</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>-5.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable Behavioral intentions in organic cotton clothing purchase.
R² change: model 1 0.430, model 2 0.170, model 3 0.028.
Significance level at: * P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01, *** P ≤ 0.0
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The main objective of this study was to explore how anticipated emotions and the TPB constructs predict purchase intentions of organic cotton fashion among Swedish students. The findings contribute to the theoretical understanding of anticipated emotions in pro-environmental purchase intentions, and the purpose has hence been fulfilled.

The results show that attitude and subjective norm explain 40 percent of the variance in behavioral intention, attitude being a better unique predictor than subjective norm. This result brings some light into the debate about attitudes’ effectiveness in explaining consumer behavior, since it is presumed that purchase intentions will lead to actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Attitudes are highly relevant in explaining organic cotton purchase intention, with a beta value of 0.506 in the first TPB regression model, compared to subjective norm’s value of 0.317. This contradicts the findings of Han and Chung (2014), whose study in Korea revealed that subjective norm played a more crucial role than attitude in purchase intention of organic cotton apparel. In contrast to a collectivist country, such as Korea (Lee and Green, 1991), Sweden is a highly individualistic society, where people perceive themselves as autonomous and independent of the group, and give hence priority to personal goals over collective ones (Hofstede, 1983). This leads to higher relevance of personal attitudes compared to subjective norms in behavioral decisions (Lee and Green, 1991; Shah Alam and Mohamed Sayuti, 2011), which might explain the contradicting results.

Organic cotton is still rather a niche market (Beard, 2008), and the current results in fact show that about 44 percent of the sample population had not purchased an organic cotton clothing piece during the past year. For this reason, respondents might have had difficulties in rating other people’s approval and disapproval on one’s own consumption. This argumentation is supported by the results of the exploratory factor analysis, which suggested the exclusion of injunctive norms.

To continue with the review of the findings, perceived behavioral control is not a significant predictor of behavioral intention. This result was also found in Kang et al.’s (2013) study of organic cotton clothing and Kim et al.’s (2013) research on selection of green restaurants. However, the result differs from, for example, the study of green hotel setting (Kim and Han, 2010). The present study used the PBC conceptualization and scale from Kang et al. (2013), who suggest that the operationalization of the construct might have been confusing to the respondents due to country to country differences of their sample population, although the scale’s reliability and validity were satisfactory. Kang et al. (2013) call hence for future research to determine whether culture plays a role in determining the significance, or whether PBC is in fact an inadequate way to predict sustainable clothing purchase intention. In this study, the sample population shares the same nationality, which indicates that the lack of predicting power of PBC is not associated with cultural differences; rather PBC is ineffective in explaining organic cotton clothing purchase intentions.
Moreover, as Notani (1998) argues, individuals can find it difficult to predict their PBC related to future behaviors. Altogether, due to the ineffectiveness of the PBC in behavioral prediction, the TRA might be a more appropriate framework in future studies of organic cotton clothing, as it includes attitude, subjective norm and behavioral intention but omits perceived behavioral control.

Overall, the extended TPB model with anticipated emotions explains 60 percent of the variance in purchase intention of organic cotton clothing. Comparing this percentage with previous research, the proposed model successfully helps to predict behavioral intentions. As the meta-analysis of Armitage and Conner (2001) reported, the TPB constructs together accounted for 39 percent of the variance in intention, and hence it can be argued that adding the emotional constructs to the TPB significantly increases the prediction power of the model. This study thus supports previous research, which has stated that emotional aspects help improving the predicting power of the TPB in a green setting (see e.g. Kim et al., 2013). Moreover, these findings also follow Ajzen’s (1991) claim that the model is open for additional predictors if only they increase the variance explained in behavioral intention. The present results also support previous research about the importance of self-conscious emotions in ethical decision-making (Elgaaied, 2012; Onwezen et al. 2013, 2014). Likewise, the current findings provide further insight into the role of anticipated self-conscious emotions in the decision-making process of sustainable fashion. Both anticipated guilt and anticipated pride contribute to explaining behavioral intentions of organic cotton purchase, however guilt plays a more decisive role than pride does, picturing guilt as a succulent mechanism for marketers to stimulate behavior. However, using guilt feelings in marketing messages should be done responsibly and cautiously, since efforts to evoke guilt can backfire if the consumer perceives that the marketer is trying to turn his/her guilt feelings into profits (Lascu, 1991). O’Keefe (2000) shows that although more explicit guilt appeals are more effective in arousing guilt, they are also less persuasive than less explicit ones. The rationale is that along with guilt, more explicit guilt appeals can also evoke other emotions such as anger, irritation, or annoyance (O’Keefe, 2000). Finally, the ethical side of marketing with the use of negative emotions, including guilt, can be debated (Hastings, Stead and Webb, 2004). According to Gregory-Smith et al. (2013) negative emotions hinder or delay consumers from making unethical choices, whereas positive emotions encourage them to make future ethical consumption choices. Therefore, despite its lower predictive power, evoking positive feelings of pride could be beneficial. As individuals strive to get and to maintain an end-state of being proud (Onwezen et al., 2014), combining organic cotton purchase with feelings of pride could be an avenue to promote sustainable fashion consumption.

Finally, the results indicate that neither gender, age, nor educational level significantly predict intentions to buy organic cotton clothing among students. When it comes to age, the results are in line with the meta-analysis conducted by Wiernik, Ones and Dilchert (2013), which shows that most pro-environmental variables displayed insignificant or non-existing relationships with age. It however contradicts the findings of for example, Zelezny, Chua and Aldrich (2000) that show a connection between age groups and
environmental behavior. The authors (2000) also found that women tend to report stronger environmental behavior, contrary to the results of this study. Moreover, according to Kollmuss and Agyeman (2010) more education does not necessarily result into higher levels of sustainable behavior, which supports the findings of this research. Finally, Ajzen (1991) suggests including a measure of past behavior to assess the sufficiency of the theory of planned behavior. Indeed, the results of the present study show that past purchase behavior significantly explains the variance in sustainable clothing purchase intentions.

CONCLUSIONS

In the words of Peattie (2010, p. 220): “The potential influence of emotional responses in shaping green consumption behaviors may provide new avenues for research and allow for new approaches to influencing consumer behavior”. This quote inspired the researchers of this study to explore the previously unknown roles of anticipated emotions of guilt and pride in purchase intentions of sustainable fashion. This study was, as long as the authors are aware, the first to quantitatively investigate the role of anticipated guilt and pride in the context of organic cotton clothing.

Considering that the global fashion industry is one of the most polluting industries in the world (Sweeny, 2015) and that traditionally grown cotton accounts for over half of the fibres used in the global fashion industry (Ha-Brookshire and Norum, 2011), new possibilities are necessary in order to challenge the current production processes (Niinimäki, 2015). As Niinimäki (2015, p. 11) puts it “we need more knowledge about consumers and the consumption side to create a sustainable transformation process inside the fashion industry and business that leads to sustainable consumption practices”. To tackle this, the current study aimed to understand the emotional side of consumer decision-making of organic cotton clothing consumption. The results showed that in addition to attitude and subjective norm, anticipated guilt and pride predict consumers’ purchase intentions. With the help of findings of this study, better marketing communication strategies of sustainable clothing can be developed for young target groups.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The limitations of this study are mainly related to time, and the generalizability of the population. First, respondents who had an interest in sustainability issues may have been more prone to answer the questionnaire, possibly skewing the findings. Second, the study population is limited to one university business school in Gothenburg, which might circumscribe the generalizability of the results to concern students in Sweden, and therefore jeopardize their inference to a larger population. Finally, it is necessary to bear in mind that this study did not explore actual behavior but rather behavioral intentions, which are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Altogether, the findings of this research should therefore be interpreted with caution.

The TPB model along with anticipated guilt and anticipated pride explained 60 percent of the variance in intentions. Thus there is still room for an increased amount of variance in behavioral intentions. Hence, other variables could also be included in the TPB in order to improve the predictive power
of the results. Many researchers, including the initial author of the theory (Ajzen, 1991; Conner and Armitage, 1998), suggest adding other variables in the model if it is presumed that they will capture a significant amount of variance in behavioral intention. Further, measures of behavioral intention tend to show a higher percent of variance than those of actual behavior (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002); thus another possibility for future research is to conduct this research by studying actual behavior.
Appendix 1. Previous quantitative literature of emotions in social and pro-environmental context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Emotions affecting behavior</th>
<th>Field product/Context</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonetti and Maklan (2014b)</td>
<td>Post-consumption guilt and pride</td>
<td>Sustainable tea</td>
<td>Guilt and pride are significant predictors of consumers’ future intentions to purchase the sustainable product in case, regardless whether intentionally or unintentionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrus, Passafaro and Bonnes (2008)</td>
<td>Groups of different emotions including regret, guilt and sadness</td>
<td>Pro-environmental behavior</td>
<td>Negative anticipatory emotions influence intentions related to pro-environmental behavior through the mediation of desire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgaied (2012)</td>
<td>Anticipated guilt</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Anticipated guilt influences behavior more directly than concern and awareness, and it mediates the relationship between environmental concern and intention to recycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grob (1991) cited in Kollmuss and Agyeman (2010).</td>
<td>Emotional involvement</td>
<td>Pro-environmental behavior</td>
<td>The stronger one’s emotional reaction the more likely he/she is to engage into pro-environmental behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kollmuss and Agyeman (2010).

Emotional involvement

Pro-environmental behavior

Collection of studies about consumers’ pro-environmental decision-making and behavior.

Onwezen et al. (2013)

Anticipated guilt and pride in the NAM-model

Pro-environmental behavior

Anticipated emotions affect behavior via behavioral intentions.

Onwezen et al. (2014)

Anticipated guilt and pride

Organic food and Fair Trade food

Mediating effects of anticipated pride and guilt significantly improve the explanatory power of the extended TPB framework in all studied contexts.

Steenhaut and Van Kenhove (2006)


Ethical decision-making

The relation between a consumer’s ethical beliefs and ethical intentions found to be partially mediated by anticipated guilt. Emphasizing the interpersonal consequences lead to guilt and to behavior intentions.

Appendix 2. Measurement constructs and their items. * Indicates that the item removed after the exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Pride (AP)</strong></td>
<td>If I were to buy clothes made of organic cotton, then I would feel proud.</td>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>Onwezen et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I were to buy clothes made of organic cotton, then I would feel exceptionally good.</td>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>Onwezen et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I were to buy clothes made of organic cotton, then I would feel satisfied.</td>
<td>AP3 *</td>
<td>Onwezen et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Guilt (AG)</strong></td>
<td>I would feel guilty if I did not purchase clothes made of organic cotton, when shopping for clothes.</td>
<td>AG1</td>
<td>Elgaaied (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My conscience would bother me if I did not purchase clothes made of organic cotton when shopping for clothes.</td>
<td>AG2</td>
<td>Elgaaied (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I would have a bad conscience toward the environment or/and the cotton farmers, if I did not purchase clothes made of organic cotton when shopping for clothes.</strong></td>
<td>AG3</td>
<td>Elgaaied (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude (A)</strong></td>
<td>Purchasing clothing made of organic cotton is a (bad/good) idea.</td>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Taylor and Todd (1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a (bad/good) attitude toward purchasing clothes made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>Taylor and Todd (1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (dislike/like) the idea of consuming clothes made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>Taylor and Todd (1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Behavioral control (PBC)</strong></td>
<td>Clothing made of organic cotton have a limited range of design, style, and/or colour.</td>
<td>PBC1*</td>
<td>Kang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing made of organic cotton is expensive.</td>
<td>PBC2*</td>
<td>Kang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing made of organic cotton is not readily available.</td>
<td>PBC3</td>
<td>Kang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The retail outlets of clothing made of organic cotton are located far away from where I live</td>
<td>PBC4*</td>
<td>Kang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is difficult to obtain information regarding what products are made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>PBC5</td>
<td>Kang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no way for me to ensure it is genuinely ‘organic’ even if it says it is organic cotton clothing.</td>
<td>PBC6</td>
<td>Kang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective norm (SN)</strong></td>
<td>Most people who are important to me buy clothes made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Urban et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most people whose opinion I value buy clothes made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Urban et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most people who are important to me think that I … (should not/should) buy clothes made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>SN3 *</td>
<td>Urban et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People whose opinion I value would… (disapprove/approve) of me buying clothing made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>SN4 *</td>
<td>Urban et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Intention (BI)</strong></td>
<td>I am willing to choose clothing made of organic cotton, when shopping for clothes.</td>
<td>BI1</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will make an effort in the future to select clothes made of organic cotton.</td>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to buy clothing made of organic cotton when shopping for clothes in the future.</td>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>Urban et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will, during the upcoming six months, purchase at least one item made from organic cotton.</td>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>Added item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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