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Abstract

Background: Ethical consumerism is no longer a niche market and consumers are increasingly aware of the power they have when purchasing ethical and believe they can make a change. Most corporations have realized the importance of being ethical and incorporate it into their business strategies. Therefore, it is important to study consumers’ ethical purchasing patterns and which factors affect their intentions to purchase.

Purpose: The purpose of this thesis was to test which of the following factors: social media, attitude, altruism, environmental knowledge, and financial factors, has a positive influence on female millennials, in Jönköping, purchasing intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.

Method: This study was based on a conceptual framework which intended to test the most relevant constructs influencing ethical purchase intention, as proposed by previous researchers and theory. Hence, this paper follows a deductive approach which used quantitative methods to fulfil the purpose of this explanatory research. The data was gathered through a survey answered by 108 female millennials regarding their purchasing of cosmetics.

Conclusion: Both factors, attitude and environmental knowledge had a direct positive effect on consumers purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics. The study provides empirical support for an indirect effect of altruism on purchase intention since the analysis showed that altruism had a direct effect on attitude. However, social media and financial constructs did not show any significant support for its positive effect on purchase intention in the empirical findings in this study.
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1. Introduction

*In this chapter, the reader is introduced to the topic of ethical consumerism and its importance for business today. Secondly, relevant facts concerning the trend of the rising demand among consumers for cruelty-free cosmetics products is presented. Thereafter, a problem is recognized in identifying factors affecting consumers’ intentions towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products. Lastly, the purpose of this paper is presented.*

1.1 Background

Ethical consumerism is an old phenomenon, however, in the past decade it has transformed from a niche market to one of the main concerns among both consumers and corporations (Yeow, Dean, & Tucker, 2014; Sudbury-Riley & Kohlbacher, 2016; Bray, Johns, & Kilburn, 2011; Gillani & Kutaula, 2018). Consumers are increasingly aware of the power they have when making an ethical buying decision, and they believe that they can impact ethical dilemmas by altering their purchasing behaviour (Gillani & Kutaula, 2018). In the past decade, many businesses included ethicality as a key component of their business strategy as a result of the rising attitude towards ethical issues among customers (Yeow et al., 2014).

Moreover, ethics has become a regular area of focus in many companies, it is therefore natural that an increased number of studies have been conducted towards how ethical and green brands or products affect consumers purchasing intentions and behaviour. In which many of them are utilizing Icek Ajzen's theory of planned behaviour (TPB) from 1991 (e.g. Zollo, Yoon, Rialti & Ciappei, 2018; Beldad & Hegner, 2018; Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Hwang & Griffiths, 2017; Moser, 2015; Deng, 2013). There is also a great number of researchers that have identified a gap between the consumers’ attitude towards green and ethical purchasing and their actual purchasing behaviour (e.g. Boultridge & Carrigan, 2000; Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2014; Johnstone & Tan, 2014; Shaw, McMaster, & Newholm, 2016). However, in the TPB-model there are several motivational factors that capture an individual's intention to purchase which then
leads to behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Thus, these motivational factors are complex to capture and often differ between researchers studying separate topics (Carrington, Neville & Whitwell, 2010).

1.2 Problem Discussion

Most corporations have realized that it is mandatory to not only be perceived as sustainable and ethical but to genuinely practice it in order to avoid scandals and to satisfy stakeholders (Ojasoo, 2016). Furthermore, ethical consumers increase in number and their awareness of the impact of their consumption will likely affect corporations’ strategies (Sebastiani, Montagnini & Dalli, 2013). In other words, if more consumers are aware of the impact that their consumption has, it is then more likely that they would drive the market towards becoming significantly more ethical (Gillani & Kutaula, 2018; Sebastiani et al., 2013).

Research within the field of cosmetics shows that natural cosmetics, which contains natural ingredients and processing (Statista, 2019c), has grown to become a major trend in the past four years, due to an increased concern for health and the environment (Matic & Puh, 2016). In a survey which asked 15,000 women about their purchasing habits of cruelty-free cosmetics, 36% answered that they only buy from beauty brands that are cruelty-free (Perfect365 inc, 2018). Additionally, Min, Lee, and Zhao (2018) highlight that trends against animal testing among the younger generations increased from 31% in 2001 to 54% in 2013. The main reasons for this change were the use of social media and the internet, sideways with organizations that promote animal welfare, such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) (Min et al., 2018).

According to the U.S. Food & Drug Administration (2017), the term “cruelty-free” does not have a legal definition, which is why cosmetic companies can use this word for marketing their products that might not be fully harmless towards animals. To consumers, a “cruelty-free” product is commonly perceived as a product that does not harm or kill animals throughout the entire supply chain (Cruelty-free international, 2018). Moreover, consumers concerned for animal cruelty also use the term “vegan” for ethical products. Veganism can be defined as “A philosophy and way of living which seeks to exclude—as far as is possible and practicable—all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose” (The Vegan Society, 2019).
However, the topic of vegan and cruelty-free often evokes strong and emotional reactions and are considered to be more sensitive compared to green and organic, which are topics that have been more frequently studied previously (Knight & Barnett, 2008).

The pressure for cosmetic companies to invest in alternative methods for animal testing is being altered by many different actors such as policymakers, industry professionals, and most importantly individual consumers (Hou & Lampe, 2015). Using animals to test the safety of cosmetics is still a common practice for many companies. Additionally, Groff, Bachli, Lansdowne, and Capaldo (2014) acknowledge the implications of animal-testing on the environment. Every year millions of animal carcasses used in research laboratories are discarded and are mostly contaminated with toxic and hazardous chemicals. This waste of animal bodies and tissue has the most obvious impact on the environment (Groff et al., 2014). According to a 2016 report by PETA, over 250 cosmetics brands still use practices that harm over 27,000 animals each year (Chitrakorn, 2016). However, thanks to organizations like PETA and programmes such as Cruelty-Free International’s Leaping Bunny certification, finding products that cause no harm to animals has become easier for consumers (Chitrakorn, 2016).

In previous studies, the TPB model has been utilized and applied to predict ethical purchasing behaviour among many different industries, goods, and services (e.g. Zollo et al., 2018; Beldad & Hegner, 2018; Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Hwang & Griffiths, 2017; Moser, 2015; Deng, 2013). However, Beldad and Hegner (2018) argue that the TPB model could be further broadened to better understand more factors influencing ethical purchasing intentions. Thus, this study conducted further research within this field in order to develop a better understanding of Swedish female consumers belonging to generation Y’s behaviour when buying cosmetic products. Factors taken into consideration when studying the consumers’ ethical purchasing intention included: social media, attitude, altruism, environmental knowledge, and financial factors. Lastly, understanding and identifying consumers ethical purchase intention can be of great help for companies developing more ethical-friendly business strategies (Yadav & Pathak, 2017).
1.3 Purpose
It is evident from the sections above that previous studies have been focusing on what drives the intention to purchase ethical products among consumers. However, there is less research within the field of cosmetics, and even fewer studies on cruelty-free cosmetics in the context of purchase intention, hence, increasing the importance of such studies. Thus, the purpose of this thesis was to test which of the following factors: social media, attitude, altruism, environmental knowledge, and financial factors, has a positive influence on female millennials, in Jönköping, purchasing intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.
2. Frame of Reference

This chapter firstly presents relevant previous research within the field of ethical consumerism and purchase intention. Secondly, relevant facts concerning the cosmetic industry are presented and further elaboration on how the industry is evolving towards being more ethical. Lastly, factors driving consumers towards ethical purchase intentions are derived from recent studies and adapted into a conceptual framework consisting of motivational factors affecting consumer purchase intention.

2.1 Ethical Consumption

When a consumer actively purchases a product or service based on a corporation's social responsibility and avoids companies that are behaving unethically, this portrays an ethical consumption (Zollo et al., 2018). Deng (2013), implies that if a consumer avoids purchasing products that have a negative impact on the environment or society, he or she is considered to be an ethical consumer. Ethical consumption is no longer a niche market, but rather a market that is dramatically growing (Sudbury-Riley & Kohlbacher, 2016; Bray et al., 2011; Yeow et al., 2014). For well-known brands, ethical and legal values are not only in the interest of profitability but often also carries a sense of obligation (Davies & Gutsche, 2016). Consumers consider different ethical consumption decisions when purchasing goods or services, for example, they can be concerned for fair trade goods, environmentally friendly products, animal welfare or labour conditions (Sebastiani, et al., 2013).

A study by Davies and Gutsche (2016) explains why consumers are motivated to include ethical purchasing in their daily consumption. Their findings showed that there are three value-based factors for ethical consumption: health and wellbeing, social guilt, and self-satisfaction, while there was one non-value based factor: habit. The value-based factors propose that the consumer put thought behind it and acted upon the important values they carry, while the non-value based factors propose something the consumer did not put much thought into (Davies & Gutsche, 2016). The author's main findings behind the motivation of buying ethical products are for health reasons, even
though “ethically” does not necessarily concern health and wellbeing (Davies & Gutsche, 2016). Moreover, previous research has applied the TPB and successfully anticipated consumers green purchasing behaviour (Kim & Chung, 2011; Liobikienė & Bernatonienė, 2017). However, Liobikienė and Bernatonienė (2017) present a slightly different model to the TPB with three different determinants affecting consumers buying decisions for green products. The authors make assumptions on which factors among internal, external, and social were most important when purchasing green cosmetics, therefore their findings were not considered strong enough. Due to their unclear assumptions, it was concluded that there is limited research within the cosmetic product category (Liobikienė & Bernatonienė, 2017).

Looking further into the topic, prior researchers have identified aspects such as brand image (Chun, 2016), price, and quality (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001) to be the underlying factors that govern the purchase behaviour of ethical products. These factors are related to cosmetics in such a way that they reflect an individual’s status, lifestyle, and self-image (Thomas & Peters, 2009). Chun (2016) argues that it is becoming more common for cosmetic brands to attract customers by promoting ethical values so that they create a sense of similarity between their consumers and the brand itself. However, Chun’s research results contradict this assumption by revealing that the similarity between consumers’ self-image and the brand's core values does not significantly favour customers purchase decision. In addition, Lee, Motion and Conroy (2009) have conducted research on anti-consumption in the form of brand avoidance. They define brand avoidance as something that is altered by the incongruity between a brand's symbolic meaning and the individual consumer’s sense of self-image. Their research provided clarification as to why consumers avoid certain brands despite having the financial ability to make the purchase (Lee et al., 2009).

2.2 Purchase Intention

“Intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a behavior; they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior.” (Ajzen, 1991, p.181)
In 1991 Icek Ajzen made an extension of the “Theory of Reasoned Action” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) called the “Theory of Planned Behaviour” (TPB), which has been widely used in many different fields among researchers to explain consumers ethical purchase intentions (Zollo et al., 2018; Beldad & Hegner, 2018; Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Hwang & Griffiths, 2017; Moser, 2015; Deng, 2013). An individual's intention to purchase is captured by several motivational factors which then affects behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). In other words, attitude leads to the intention which then leads to behaviour (Zollo et al., 2018). However, many researchers have drawn conceptual frameworks based on the TPB model to understand ethical consumer behaviour. In these frameworks, the factors used differ from the original TPB, for example, personal values, moral norms, and internal ethics, etc. (Carrington et al., 2010). Other authors such as Beldad and Hegner (2018) argue that the TPB model could be further broadened by adding factors such as self-identity and moral obligation, while Hsu, Chang, and Yansritakul (2017) incorporated variables such as “Country-of-origin” and “Price Sensitivity” when studying purchase intention. Moreover, factors including self-image and convenience may impact purchase intention, if purchasing would have a negative impact on the consumer's self-image or if the effort to purchase is too complicated, the purchase intention will be low (Barber, Kuo, Bishop & Goodman, 2012).

2.3 Intention-Behaviour Gap

Even though purchase intention is one of the major predictors of buying-behaviour, it has been seen that intention does not always lead to behaviour (Paul, Modi & Patel, 2016; Barber et al., 2012). Many authors conclude that there is a gap between consumers’ attitude towards buying ethical and their actual purchase, more known as the “attitude-behaviour Gap” or “intention-behaviour gap” (e.g. Boulstridge & Carrigan, 2000; Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Carrington et al., 2014; Johnstone & Tan, 2014; Shaw et al., 2016). Moreover, Carrington et al. (2014), revealed four factors causing the gap; Prioritization of ethical concerns, the formation of plans and habits, willingness to commit and sacrifice, and modes of shopping behaviour.

However, Hassan, Shiu, and Shaw (2016) suggested that the extent of the gap is not analysed enough and that it lacks empirical evidence. Their research findings confirmed
that there is a large intention-behaviour gap in ethical consumption but that it needs further research. Further research by Singhal and Malik (2018) also noticed the difference between an individual’s attitude towards green products and their purchasing behaviour in the cosmetic industry. They studied the effect of different education, age and income group of females. The findings proved that age and education level does not alter the individual’s approach to green cosmetic merchandises, but income level does have an influence. Showing that there is an existing gap between the attitude and purchasing behaviour of females (Singhal & Malik, 2018).

2.4 The Cosmetics Industry

The global cosmetics market grew by 5 percent in 2017 (Statista, 2019a) and in the same year, the European market for cosmetics and personal care products was the largest in the world, valued at €77.6 billion (Cosmetics Europe, 2018). Among the world’s 50 leading cosmetic brands, 22 resides in Europe (Brand Finance, 2017), making this region the world’s largest exporter of cosmetic products in terms of Market retail sales prices (Statista, 2019b). This represents one-third of the global market and is valued at €69 billion (Fleaca, 2016). Furthermore, there has been a positive increase in the market for natural cosmetics. Between the years 2007 and 2017, the global market value for these products more than doubled, from seven to 15 billion dollars (Statista, 2019c). Dimitrova, Kaneva, and Gallucci (2009) and Dernis et al. (2015) explain this increase as a result of the modern consumers becoming more aware of environmental concerns as well as trends regarding health, quality and beauty appearance. On the other hand, Matic and Puh (2016) found in their study that health consciousness is not a significant variable for consumers who purchase natural cosmetics.

Ramli (2015) highlights that the cosmetics industry changes over time and this can be explained by factors including market fluctuations, politics, society, and increased awareness. Due to these changes, it is crucial for companies in the cosmetics industry to continuously innovate their products, sourcing and manufacturing processes to appeal to the consumers (Ramli, 2015). Recently, more than thirty countries and governments across the world have pushed the need for innovation within the cosmetics industry by
passing through restrictions and bans on animal testing in the production of cosmetics (Blumenauer & Locke, 2015).

**2.5 Factors influencing ethical Purchase Intention**

2.5.1 Social Media

Social network and media (SNM) sites faced rapid growth during the last decade, which benefits shareholders such as customers and sellers (Gunawan & Huarng, 2015). It is apparent that the younger generation’s usage of social media is comparatively high to the older generation, proving that social media is an empowering tool to spread messages (Min, et al., 2018; Hou & Lampe, 2015). Research by Internetstiftelsen (2018) proved that four out of five people in Sweden use social media. SNM sites such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter, have an impact on its users in terms of social integration and transparency about products and services (Gunawan & Huarng, 2015).

Social media platforms have benefited the cosmetics industry by connecting cosmetic brands with consumers (Statista, 2019b). Platforms such as Instagram and YouTube might not influence all age groups, yet they help generate demand for beauty products. Statistical evidence shows that more than fifty percent of videos regarding beauty posted on YouTube is makeup related (Statista, 2019b). Further supporting this argument, Shen and Bissell (2013) stated that social media benefits the cosmetics industry by spreading electronic word of mouth (eWOM) which aids the company’s product promotion and brand awareness. eWOM on social networks result in viral marketing, in which firms can take advantage of the fast and mass communication of knowledge (Gunawan & Huarng, 2015). People’s engagement on Facebook amplifies how companies interact with customers by enabling firms to respond to market changes and demands. In addition, the application of eWOM has become an important part of corporations’ marketing strategies to communicate a brand image, values and gain customers loyalty (Shen & Bissell, 2013). Previous research proved that eWOM has a significant effect on consumers purchase intention and their attitude towards a brand (Abzari, Ghassemi, & Vosta, 2014; Kudeshia & Kumar, 2017; Park & Jeon, 2018). Therefore, companies can utilize social media platforms to post and share content that generates support for their brand (Kudeshia & Kumar, 2017).
Research by Zahid, Ali, Ahmad, Thurasamy, and Amin (2018) states that individuals with high education level and income will convey a positive relationship between environmental concerns and social media publicity. Their findings proved that social media acts as an activator in raising environmental awareness, forcing managers to look at the public’s interest in ethical consumer purchasing intentions (Zahid et al., 2018). Both traditional media and social media influences people to care about their consumption and think more ethically. Continual innovation promotes modern cosmetic trends in the industry, thus it creates an incentive to buy organic and natural products (Matic & Puh, 2016). Based on the theory in this section, hypothesis 1 is derived as follows:

\[ H1: \text{Increasing Social Media usage within cosmetic shopping has a positive influence on intention towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products.} \]

Attitude

“The degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188)

Attitude can be seen as the individual's beliefs and evaluations of the consequences of behaving in a certain way (Yadav & Pathak, 2017). Besides, the attitude has a strong influence on purchasing behaviour and is therefore mandatory when studying consumers’ ethical purchasing behaviour (Barber et al., 2012). Oh and Yoon (2014) also showed that attitude towards ethical consumption positively influences ethical purchase intention. Attitude is one of the three motivational factors that affect the purchasing behaviour in Ajzen’s (1991) TPB model and it can be explained as the individuals own attitude (either positive or negative) towards a certain behaviour. It has in previous research been divided into cognitive (cost and material benefits) and affective (Good or bad feelings) attitude towards ethical purchasing behaviour (Yamoah, Duffy, Petrovici, & Fearne, 2016). In other words, an attitude is a form of reasoning whether the behaviour is good or bad, and if the consumer wants to act upon their intention or not (Paul et al., 2016; Chen & Tung, 2014).
A significant number of previous research highlights the importance of including attitude as a key factor when studying ethical purchase intention (e.g. Paul et al., 2016; Hsu et al., 2017; Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Jin Ma, Littrell, & Niehm, 2012; Yamoah et al., 2016; Ko & Jin, 2017). Ko and Jin mention in their 2017 research that an increase in knowledge often leads to a development in attitude, which will further influence behaviour. In contradiction to this, Deng (2013) believes that too much information or knowledge makes it difficult for consumers to decide, thus they might develop a negative attitude towards ethical goods. Previously, researchers believed that pro-environmental attitudes predicted ethical purchase behaviour, but as mentioned above, studies have identified an attitude-behaviour gap (Zollo et al., 2018). However, even if a consumer holds a positive attitude towards certain behaviour, it is not enough to predict that behaviour (Jin Ma et al., 2012). Therefore, additional factors are included in this paper’s conceptual framework to better predict the intention towards ethical consumption. The theory above sets the foundation of the second hypothesis:

\[ H2: \text{Increasing favourable Attitude towards cruelty-free cosmetics has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products} \]

2.5.2 Altruism

Batson (2011) defined altruism in humans as “a desire to benefit someone else for his or her sake rather than one’s own” (p. 3). Kaufmann, Panni, and Orphanidou (2012) identify altruism as a subset of pro-social behaviour that has a significant influence on consumers green purchasing behaviour. Based on the theory of altruism, Schwartz (1977) found that consumers behaviour tends to become pro-environmental when they are aware of the harmful outcomes of their actions, thus they take on a responsibility to change their unethical conduct (Schwartz, 1977). Altruism reflects a voluntary action in which an individual does good towards others without expecting to be rewarded (Oh & Yoon, 2014). Although, prosocial behaviour can sometimes affect an individual to act in an altruistic manner, making it no longer voluntary. To be truly altruistic, an individual should have a pure intention before acting upon it. Moreover, Oh and Yoon’s (2014) research paper also proved that altruism has a positive effect on both attitude towards ethical purchase intention as well as a direct effect on purchase intention. Other
researches by Ryan (2016) and Mostafa (2006), also found that altruism plays a significant role in an individual’s green consumption.

To further elaborate, Davies and Gutsche (2016) explained some motivators for consuming ethically: *social guilt*, which according to the authors either means that the consumers feel peer pressure or that they have tangibly seen poor working conditions and feel socially obliged to buy ethically. Another motivator being *self-satisfaction*, which is a desire to feel good when buying fair-trade (Davies & Gutsche, 2016). Shaw and Shiu (2002) argue that the TPB model does not include factors that are not based on self-interest and that consumers today are also influenced by ethical and moral considerations as well as a sense of obligation to others. Therefore, based on the previous research on altruism, it is included as a factor to test in this paper’s conceptual framework, with the third hypothesis:

**H3: High degree of Altruism has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products**

2.5.3 Environmental Knowledge

Previous research verified that an individual’s education level and environmental knowledge have a significant effect on customers purchase behaviour regarding environmental friendly merchandises (Mostafa, 2006; Malik & Singhal, 2017) due to their awareness of the environmental issues (Laroche, Toffoli, Chankon & Muller, 1996). Kaufmann et al. (2012) stated that “environmental knowledge involves what people know about the environment, key relationships leading to environmental aspects or impacts, and appreciation of “whole systems”, and collective responsibilities necessary for sustainable development” (p. 52). To exemplify environmental knowledge, animal research facilities use ten times more energy than one square meter office, since it requires high ventilation, and air usage that consumes a large amount of energy that contributes to carbon emissions (Groff et al., 2014).

Mostafa (2006) used perceived environmental knowledge (EK) to measure an individual’s knowledge about environmental issues, rather than factual EK. This is justified by stating that professionals could not agree on the effect caused by the
products on the environment. The findings of the paper verified the positive effect of EK on the consumer's favourable attitude and behaviour. Malik and Singhal’s (2017) findings showed that customers with adequate EK and its issues such as pollution will have a high-level of awareness concerning green products. This will result in a positive attitude towards environmentally friendly products. Nevertheless, this does not mean that customers will purchase green products, even when they have significant knowledge about the environment (Malik & Singhal, 2017). Ultimately, individuals who show a greater interest about environmental issues will purchase more cruelty-free and environmentally friendly products, comparing to those who are less concerned about ethics and the environment (Kaufmann et al., 2012). Similarly, Sebastiani et al. (2013) stated that consumers consume ethically when they have concerns about animal welfare, environmentally friendly products, or labour conditions.

Researchers suggested that marketers should make information about green products available to generate the consumer's knowledge since illustrating the safety of the product is important information for customers (Malik & Singhal, 2017; Mostafa, 2006; Kaufmann et al., 2012). Green marketers should also realize the positive effect that perceived environmental knowledge has on an individual’s intention to purchase green products (Mostafa, 2006). In contradiction to the statement above, Deng (2013) mentioned that excess knowledge might confuse the customers, leading them to develop unfavourable attitudes towards ethical products. It is evident that environmental knowledge and its impact on consumers purchase intention has been studied within green and ethical consumption. However, there is a lack of research regarding this topic in the cosmetics industry thus creating a gap for further research which this study intended to fill. In order to test the identified gap, the fourth hypothesis is as follows:

\[ \textbf{H4: High degree of Environmental Knowledge has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.} \]

2.5.4 Financial Factors

“Price sensitivity is the extent to which a customer accepts price growths for a specific product in terms of economic and psychological gains.” (Hsu et al., 2017, p. 147)
Price has proven to be significantly important to consumers when evaluating different alternatives of products, as well as for deciding upon their final purchase decision (Li et al., 2016; Moser, 2016). To consumers, price plays two different roles when deciding between products. Firstly, it is a measure of money that the consumer needs to spend, and secondly, it refers to the quality and status that the product brings to the purchaser (Völckner, 2008). Hsu et al. (2017) highlight that understanding influential factors for price sensitivity is essential for academics. However, it is equally important for retail managers, since their pricing strategies might be based on consumers’ price sensitivity.

Furthermore, Andorfer and Liebe’s (2015) study on factors affecting Fairtrade coffee consumption revealed that reduced price for such products and financial situation has a positive effect on the consumption. Thus, they concluded that consumers who perceive their financial situation as positive are more likely to purchase ethical products. Similarly, Carrigan and Attalla (2001) found, if consumers felt that they had the financial ability to discriminate against unethical companies, they would be willing to pay a premium price for ethically produced products. They also concluded that consumers who purchase ethically, do so when it does not require them to pay more, suffer a loss of quality, or make a special effort (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001). Findings from Bray et al.’s (2011) study on factors affecting ethical consumption suggest that consumers care more about financial than ethical values. Participants in their study were concerned about ethical issues but felt reluctant to pay a higher price for products with no significant tangible reward (Bray et al., 2011). Afzaal, Athar, Israr, and Waseem’s (2011) paper on green consumer behaviour in the aspect of a developing country, found that due to high prices and lower quality, consumers do not buy green products despite their positive intention towards them. Thus, the authors of this paper assumed in the fifth hypothesis that financial factors positively affect consumers’ intention to purchase ethically.

**H5: Increased Financial sensitivity has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.**
2.6 Conceptual Framework

Based on thoroughly researched theory and secondary data, this paper suggests a conceptual framework integrating the important factors influencing ethical purchase intention, proposed by previous authors. Figure 1 introduces the conceptual model developed from factors that hypothetically drive purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products. The proposed factors have been frequently mentioned throughout studies within the field of ethical consumption (Zahid et al., 2018; Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Ajzen, 1991; Oh & Yoon, 2014; Mostafa, 2006; Andorfer & Liebe, 2015) and are combined to fit the purpose of this study.

As previously mentioned, Sebastiani et al. (2013) stated that consumers consider different ethical consumption decisions when purchasing goods or services. In this study, the focus area was animal welfare when consumers make ethical purchase decisions. In other words, ethical purchasing is defined as consuming cruelty-free and vegan cosmetic products. This definition along with the five factors in the conceptual framework allowed the authors to analyse if there is a favourable effect on the consumer purchase intention in cosmetics, inattentive of external market factors.

In prior research, the chosen five factors were studied by either combining some factors or testing them separately. For instance, Mostafa (2006) studied three of the factors: knowledge, altruism, and attitude, Singhal and Malik (2018) researched price and education, meanwhile Andorfer and Liebe’s (2015) paper analysed the effect of the price when consuming Fairtrade coffee. What the majority of previous studies have in common is their interest in what affects consumers’ ethical or green consumption in other industries than the cosmetics industry. However, the research by Singhal and Malik (2018) was conducted on the cosmetics industry, but was limited to India and solely a couple of factors were included. Furthermore, social media was not studied in the context of purchase intention together with other factors affecting the customer's decision, but rather its effect on consumers’ knowledge (Zahid et al., 2018). Thus, the conceptual framework used to examine the factors is up to date, designed to fit the intended field of study.
2.7 Method for the frame of reference

The frame of reference was constructed by reviewing relevant and peer-reviewed literature within the field of ethical consumption and purchase intention. Databases such as JU-Primo, Google Scholar, and Scopus were utilized as search engines for peer-reviewed articles of relevance for this study. Applicable keywords were used in order to receive search-hits with important studies to the research topic. The search words initially included the topic of cruelty-free cosmetics, but as mentioned in the background it is still a new and niche concept. Hence, there were only a few hits with relevant research to fulfil the purpose of this study. Therefore, the keywords had to be further broadened to other contexts than cosmetics but still remained within the concept of consumer purchase intention. Ultimately, the most important key-words applied included: Ethical consumption, purchase intention, consumer behaviour, attitude-behaviour gap, cruelty-free, cosmetics, and Theory of Planned Behaviour. The references of the most significant articles were then thoroughly extracted from other relevant sources. This was followed by deeply analysing and finding recurring patterns.
from relevant research where mainly five factors affecting purchase intention were identified.

The focus of relevant articles mainly included as recent ones as possible and since the topic of ethical consumption is rapidly changing, a preferred span of six years was chosen. However, older literature did also fulfil an important purpose since there are still classic concepts and models that inspire recent studies. Therefore, the relevant articles for the topic of this study were analysed and applicable information that fulfilled the purpose was derived into the frame of reference. To conclude, the frame of reference served as the base for the theory utilized to develop the conceptual framework that was applied to fulfil the purpose of this study.
3. Methodology

The methodology section of this paper describes and justifies the research philosophy, approach, and purpose. Furthermore, it presents and describes the methods used for the collection of empirical data and its sampling. Moreover, a description of the questionnaire used to collect the primary data is provided along with justification for its design. Lastly, this section includes the methods used for analysing data, followed by its reliability and validity, and finally ethical considerations for the study.

3.1 Research philosophy

When conducting research, choosing a fitting research paradigm is crucial in order to have a philosophical framework to act as a guide throughout the research process. These frameworks are often based out of human’s world views, and two frequently appearing paradigms within research include positivism and realism (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Positivism is originating from natural science, which means humans social reality is objective and solely logic reasoning is applied in order to find proof for a theory (Greener, 2008; Collis & Hussey, 2014). On the contrary, critical realism which is one of two forms of realism argues that people's experiences are sensations that are merely representations of reality. Thus, our knowledge of reality is a result of social conditioning (Saunders et al., 2009). Furthermore, critical realists argue that the intransitive nature of reality provides a point of reference, in which theories can be tested against this reality (Rolfe, 2006).

In order to develop a hypothesis for research, the usage of existing theory is important guidance for the task. With a positivist research philosophy, the hypothesis can be confirmed or neglected statistically when analysing the collected empirical data (Saunders et al., 2009). However, instead of making empirical generalizations like the positivist, the basis of generalizing results within the realistic paradigm relies on the contextual impacts that are made explicit. Thus, researchers are able to arrive at general theoretical constructs which can be suitable in other contexts as well (Rønning, Ljunggren & Wiklund, 2010).
Realism can be identified within this research because the main idea behind realism is that what is seen is the truth, independently of what the mind tells us (Saunders et al., 2009). Thus, research with this approach aims at understanding the common reality of this “external reality” which can be described as an economic system in which many people operate interdependently (Sobh & Perry, 2006). This paradigm also acknowledges, how causal mechanisms exist under a specific pattern of conditions, in which quantitative methods are needed to examine theories about these phenomena (Rolfe, 2006).

Moreover, even though the positivist paradigm has many overlaps with the realistic philosophy, Sobh and Perry (2006) argue that positivism has not been a very successful paradigm to use within research in the field of marketing and social sciences and therefore suggest that research within this field adopts realism as the research philosophy (Sobh & Perry, 2006). Based on the information above, critical realism fits to analyse the quantitatively collected data of this study, keeping in mind that the situational context plays an important role when the data is to be examined statistically. Hence, this paper followed realism as a research philosophy when studying the purchase intentions for female consumers purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products.

3.2 Research Approach
A valuable frame of reference should be concluded with a direction for the primary research, which is elevated in the research method section (Greener, 2008). An inductive research approach begins by identifying a particular target fit for the research and during the process of an investigation a theory would be generated with the help of distinct research methods (Greener, 2008). The deductive research approach, on the other hand, is used in studies where a conceptual and theoretical framework is developed (Collis & Hussey, 2014). The hypothesis is then derived from the theory in order to test the empirical observations (Greener, 2008). This implies that specific occurrences are deducted from general interpretations and the insights move from being general to particular (Collis & Hussey, 2014).
Quantitative methods are emphasizing data integrity more than qualitative methods (Bonoma, 1985; Creswell, 2014). Data integrity involves attributes of research that alter bias and faulty results. Creating and deciding the overall design of a quantitative study can be somewhat difficult compared to the qualitative approach. However, it is easier to analyse the result section of the research when it follows a quantitative approach (Collis & Hussey, 2014). Furthermore, the quantitative research method can contribute to developing reliable descriptions and aid in making comparisons that are accurate. Therefore, this research paper used a quantitative method which complements the realism research philosophy where statistical data is analysed and hypothesis are tested.

According to critical realism, the nature of the research question is the main indicator for the choice of methods (Rolfe, 2006). Therefore, a quantitative approach has been adopted in this research which is associated with the deductive approach, since this research paper contains a conceptual theoretical framework which aims at fulfilling the purpose of the study and test the validity of its theory. The conceptual framework was generated from previously studied factors that have an effect on the consumer's ethical purchase intentions. Consistent with the realistic approach, two major parts of the paper were derived from existing research, the hypothesis and the conceptual framework.

3.3 Research Purpose

Literature on research methods primarily acknowledges three different forms of purposes that can be used to answer the research question. An exploratory purpose is practiced to explore and seek new insights and appraise the phenomenon from a different viewpoint. Descriptive purpose describes an individual’s or an issue’s phenomenon as they exist (Saunders et al., 2009). Explanatory research, also known as analytical, is a continuation of descriptive research and goes beyond explaining the characteristics of a phenomenon (Collis & Hussey, 2014). With an explanatory purpose, the researcher studies a situation or a problem to understand the relationships between variables (Saunders et al., 2009). Similarly, the purpose of this research was to study which factors have a positive influence on consumers intentions towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products, thus the studied relationships are from the factors that drive consumers purchase intention.
Researchers should define the time period of their research, whether it should be conducted at a particular time or a series of different time periods. The choice depends on the purpose of the research, knowing that it can adopt either a cross-sectional or longitudinal time frame (Saunders et al., 2009). Most research undertakes a cross-sectional format due to time constraints. While longitudinal research studies the development and change of a certain phenomenon, which demands time (Saunders et al., 2009). Adopting a cross-sectional time frame implies that the study will be conducted around a certain phenomenon at a particular point in time (Saunders et al., 2009). Due to time constraints, the cross-sectional time frame has been used in this research. Keeping in mind, the purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of the different factors’ impact on purchase intention, thus it was conducted with the survey strategy which is further elaborated on in the following section.

3.4 Data Collection

As part of developing and finding an answer to the research question, it is fundamental to analyse data that already exists. This is identified as secondary data and is commonly gathered with other researchers’ objectives and purpose in mind (Greener, 2008). In contradiction to secondary data, new data collection or primary data is specifically collected for the research purpose. The possibility to obtain relevant secondary and primary data depends on the access to appropriate sources. This access will provide the study with the capability to pick a representative sample, answer the research question without bias and to present valid and credible data (Saunders et al., 2009). Both quantitative and qualitative data can be considered secondary data and is used in exploratory and descriptive research. Secondary data can either be raw data (with no or some processing) or compiled data (data that has been selected or summarized). Lastly, secondary data can be utilized in many ways, such as contributing longitudinal data due to time constraints and to provide related data to the study that is comparable to the research finding of the paper (Saunders et al., 2009).

This paper followed a single data collection technique, also known as the mono method, which implies that the data has been derived from a single quantitative data collection process (Saunders et al., 2009). In the case of this research, a survey was conducted to gather the primary data, since it is a realist study the survey aimed to define the
underlying pattern of practice backing it up with a statistical analysis of the data (Rolfe, 2006). Once the survey method is chosen as the method of empirical data collection, it is necessary to decide if the survey should be descriptive or analytical. For this study, an analytical survey was considered the best fit, since the purpose was to find out if there is a relationship between multiple variables. Hence, the theoretical framework was developed in order to find the relationship between the dependent and independent variables (Collis & Hussey, 2014). Investigating multiple factors is one of the advantages of conducting a quantitative study since it allows the researcher to analyse how the factors relate to the research question (McCusker & Gunaydin, 2014).

Moreover, in order to avoid problems during the data collection, a pilot survey was run prior to the final survey. This enabled the possibility of validating the questions, as well as conducting a preliminary analysis (Saunders, 2009). According to Bell (2018), the pilot survey should be conducted on the same or a similar population to the main study to generate the best results. Fink (2003), argues that at least 10 respondents are required for a pilot survey in the pursuance of any problems with the questionnaire. Thus, the pilot survey conducted in this paper included 13 respondents from the same population that this paper intended to study.

3.5 Sample

When conducting a survey, data is collected from a sample in order to be able to generalize the findings towards a population at a lower cost, rather than gathering data from that entire population (Collis & Hussey, 2014; Saunders et al., 2009). A population is a group of individuals of which the researchers are interested to draw a generalization. However, it is challenging to attain the whole population, thus researchers study a representative subset of the population known as a sample (Kazerooni, 2001). If the sample is randomly picked from within the population the findings will then be able to represent the entire population (Bell, 2018).

Moreover, due to limited resources and time, convenience sampling and self-selection sampling were chosen as the sampling methods when conducting this study. Convenience sampling implies that the targeted population meets the researcher's practical criteria of accessibility, such as: geographically available, available at a certain
time, and willingness to participate (Etikan, 2016). However, the downside of convenience sampling is that it lacks the ability to accurately generalize the target population, and the findings of the research will be limited to the studied sample (Bornstein, Jager, & Putnick, 2013). Self-selection sampling is a type of non-probability sampling, it occurs when individuals have the enthusiasm to be a contributor to the study (Saunders et al., 2009; Etikan, 2016). In this study, the researchers approached individuals and asked if they would want to contribute to the research with no pressure imposed by the researchers.

The sample from this study was picked from a population consisting of female millennials in the Jönköping Region. According to Muskat, Muskat, Zehrer and Johns (2013), people born between the early 1980s and early 2000s are categorized as millennials. The millennial generation, also known as generation Y, are approximately two billion people which accounts for more than a quarter of the world's population (Arli, Tjiptono, Lasmono & Anandya, 2017). Hence, the millennials are undoubtedly one of the most powerful groups of consumers (Arli et al., 2017), with sufficient purchasing power to impact world economies (Bucic, Harris & Arli, 2012). This generation also tends to be more receptive to ethical issues (Smith, 2011) and according to Hing (2017), the demand for ethical cosmetics is growing every year and the millennials are the ones driving the trend. Thus, this study is conducted with the millennial generation as the population, since it was best fit to investigate the purpose. Lastly, this study was carried out on females for convenience purposes since previous research shows that females are using cosmetic products much more frequently than males (Biesterbos et al., 2013). Hence the study was carried out solely on female millennials.

3.5.1 Sample Size

Both convenience and self-selection sampling are part of the non-probability sampling technique. In the case of non-probability sampling, there are no rules regarding the preferred sample size (Saunders et al., 2009). Hence, how the sample selection technique relates to the purpose and focus of the research becomes important. With this approach, the sample size in this study was based on the research question, the available resources and the time constraints (Patton, 2001). According to Bell (2018), a larger
sample size will mean that the distribution will be closer to a normal distribution and this phenomenon is better known as the central limit theorem.

In VanVoorhis and Morgan’s paper from 2007 about “understanding power and rules of thumb for determining sample sizes”, a general rule of thumb is presented that estimates the number of participants needed in order to examine relationships statistically. The rule implies that at least 50 participants are necessary to establish a correlation or regression analysis and the more independent variables the larger the sample. Hence, the formula is presented as follows: \( N > 50 + 8m \), where \( m \) represents independent variables and \( N \) is the sample size (VanVoorhis & Morgan, 2007). Applying the above formula to this research where \( m=5 \), the minimum sample size is equal to 90 respondents. Hence, the sample size in this research consisted of 108 female millennials in Jönköping, Sweden, who were picked with the self-selection sampling technique. Lastly, in order to reach out to a variety of participants within the population, this research took place in three different locations in Jönköping: A6 shopping centre, Jönköping University, and downtown.

3.6 Questionnaire Design

This study gathered the primary data via a questionnaire, considering that it is a widely used data collection technique within the survey strategy. By using a questionnaire, each respondent is asked to answer the same set of questions which makes the data collection process efficient when gathering responses from a large sample (Saunders et al., 2009). At the same time, some authors highlight that there are difficulties involved when designing a good questionnaire, for instance, the researcher has to ensure that the questionnaire will collect the exact data that is needed to answer the research question and fulfil the overall objective of the paper (Bell, 2018, Saunders et al., 2009). Moreover, using an online survey platform rather than a traditional paper survey facilities the primary data collection (Regmi, Waithaka, Paudyal, Simikhada, & Van Teiljlingen, 2016). Hence, the survey was developed via Qualtrics an online data collection and analyzing platform.

According to Saunders et al. (2009), there are different ways to design a questionnaire, depending on how it will be administered and the degree of contact with the
participants. Questionnaires can either be self-administered or interviewer-administered. Since the questionnaire of this paper was not distributed electronically through the internet, the self-administered approach was not applied (Saunders et al., 2009). Therefore, the questionnaire of this study followed the interviewer-administered approach, in which the interviewer accompanied participants to provide guidance, elaborate on the topic and answer questions when needed (Saunders et al., 2009; Rea & Parker, 2014). The advantages of the interviewer-administered approach are the interviewer or researcher’s involvement to ensure that none of the questions are skipped and that the survey is completed (Rea & Parker, 2014). Observed data by the researcher is also an advantage, this data is the personal characteristic of the participants such as gender and estimated age. However, the lack of anonymity is a major disadvantage, since the researcher will have an interaction with the participants (Rea & Parker, 2014).

3.6.1 Designing Questions

When collecting primary data via a survey it is important that the design of the questions correspond to the type of data that the researcher aims to collect. Hence, the questions asked in the survey of this study were mainly closed questions, meaning that the respondent was forced to pick one of the provided answers, thus enhancing the ability to quantify the data (Fink, 2003; Saunders et al., 2009). Closed questions are commonly divided into different types of questions, such as list, category, and ranking questions. In order to collect data on the respondents’ occupation, gender, age-group, and education, list questions were utilized with the most common options pre-written along with an option for “other”. Moreover, for the sake of finding out which factors were most important to the participants purchasing cosmetics, a ranking question was asked to highlight differences in the importance to the buyer (Saunders et al., 2009).

According to Weijters, Cabooter, and Schillewaert (2010), researchers who aim to relate variables and estimate linear relations, prefer to use a Likert scale with extreme labels on the endpoints. Many researchers use either five or seven responses on their scales and they are often used in questionnaires to measure attitude (Jamieson, 2004). However, Preston and Colman’s study from 2000 indicates that respondents generally prefer indices with higher scales (Preston and Colman, 2000). Thus, the most frequently asked questions throughout this survey required a ranked answer applying the “Likert
“scale”, with the scale ranging between 1 (e.g. strongly disagree) to 7 (e.g. strongly agree). Questionnaires are most suitable for descriptive or explanatory research. Since the latter has been adopted in this study, which aims to examine relationships between variables, the design of the questionnaire was based on this research purpose (Saunders et al., 2009).

Lastly, the authors of this paper were inspired by existing articles that supported the formation of the conceptual framework. The table below (Table 1) displays which question from the survey relates to the factors which have been presented in the theoretical framework and the authors who inspired the formation of these questions. The importance of deriving the questions from previous authors studying the same construct is further elaborated on in section 3.8, Reliability and Validity.

*Table 1: Questionnaire formulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Questions Inspiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Social Media**| Gunawan & Huang, 2015; Shen and Bissell, 2013                                                                                                                                                       | ➢ I use social media  
➢ I follow makeup related content on social media  
➢ My engagement on social media influence your cosmetic purchases  
➢ Social media increased my awareness of animal testing |
| **Attitude**    | Beldad and Hegner (2018); Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Mostafa (2009)                                                                               | To what extent do you:  
➢ I think it is important to buy cruelty-free cosmetic products?  
➢ I intentionally look for cruelty-free cosmetic products?  

Purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products to me is:  
➢ Important  
➢ Desirable  
➢ Favourable  
➢ Pleasant |
3.7 Data Analysis Method

The collected data in this study has been processed and turned into useful information through statistical analysing. There are various forms of analysing quantitative data such as through tables and graphs that show frequency of occurrence, and hypothesis testing for testing and examining relationships and trends within the data (Saunders et al., 2009). However, for this study descriptive statistics were implemented since it facilitates comparing different variables numerically and is generally done so via central tendency and dispersion. The central tendency was utilized as it implies general values that can be identified from the sample as averages in the form of either, median, mode, or mean. While dispersion is covering the data around the central tendency and how it is dispersed, and in this research, it was measured with standard deviation. Where,
standard deviation essentially describes the spread of the numerical data and how it differs from the mean (Saunders et al., 2009).

In order to analyse the relationships between the independent and dependent variables, a regression analysis is necessary. Multiple linear regression analysis shows how one dependent variable is related to two or more independent variables (Anderson, Sweeney, Williams, Freeman & Shoesmith, 2014). In this study, a multiple regression analysis was conducted since there was more than one independent variable. In a multiple regression analysis when testing for significance, t- and F-tests fulfil different purposes compared to a simple linear regression. Where the F-test shows if there is a significant relationship between any of the independent variables and the dependent variable (Purchase Intention). While the t-test shows the significance of the independent variables individually (Anderson et al., 2014). Hence, both F-test and t-test respectively were conducted to test if the independent variables showed any individual significance. The analysis was conducted via SPSS, which is a computer software for statistical data analysis often used in social science and therefore seemed fit to fulfil the task of this study (Bala, 2016).

The strength of a linear relationship between two variables (one of the independent variables and the dependent variable) were measured by using the correlation coefficient. It is also known as Pearson product moment correlation, were the correlation can range from +1.0, which represents a perfect positive correlation, to -1.0 which represent a perfect negative correlation (Groebner, Shannon, & Fry, 2014).

**3.8 Validity**

Validating and ensuring the reliability of the data was of great significance in this study since if the data would provide faulty information, the findings for the research question would be rendered false (Saunders et al., 2009). There are different ways to validate research, e.g. internal validity, external validity, construct validity, face validity, and content validity, and in this study, the last three methods were utilized (Saunders et al., 2009). Content validity includes how well the survey questions measure the content intended to be studied (Creswell, 2014). In this study, content validity was ensured by asking peers to validate it as well as basing the initial questions on peer-reviewed...
researchers’ similar questions. Face validity, on the other hand, means ensuring that the respondents are not confused by any question in the questionnaire (Saunders et al., 2009). Hence, naturally face validity was confirmed during the pilot test of the survey, which is covered in section 3.6.

Lastly, construct validity essentially indicates if the theoretical constructs related to the survey questions capture the correct measurements of what it is intended to measure (Saunders et al., 2009). In this study, construct validity was tested through an Inter-Item Correlation analysis via SPSS. If there is a positive relationship between two variables, which means that the correlation is between 0 and 1, and one variable increase in value, the other one will also follow (Saunders et al., 2009). According to Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010), a general rule of thumb is that two items correlation should exceed 0.30 but not exceed 0.8 in order to show correlation without being too similar which means it would be measuring the same thing and lose construct validity (Hair et al., 2010).

3.9 Reliability
Reliability measures the extent to which the data collection techniques and analysis procedures contribute to persistent findings (Saunders et al., 2009). Since this paper was conducted by collecting data through interviewer-administered surveys under somewhat different times and conditions, such as different interviewers, there are potential threats to its reliability. For example, participant bias in which respondents might have answered the survey how they think that the interviewer would want them to answer (Saunders et al., 2009). However, while collecting the data the authors of this paper ensured their objectiveness by only answering questions regarding confusion about the language and wordings of the survey.

Moreover, to further ensure the reliability of the questionnaire, an assessment of the consistency between the different measurements is one way to ensure intermediate internal consistency (Hair et al., 2010). Hence, in this study, the most widely used measurement of consistency, the Cronbach Alpha, was used to identify the level of reliability of the collected data which was done in SPSS (Graziano & Raulin, 2004; Hair et al., 2010). A Cronbach alpha analysis generates a number between 0 and 1, where a
high number indicates strong reliability and a low number indicates the opposite (Hair et al., 2010). Cronbach’s alpha value’s above 0.90 demonstrates excellent internal consistency whereas the range between 0.70 and 0.90 indicates high consistency. Alphas between 0.50 and 0.70 show intermediate consistency. Lastly, any alpha below 0.50 is referred to as inferior (Hinton, McMurray, & Brownlow, 2004).

3.10 Ethical Consideration

When conducting research, ethical issues will arise and it is necessary that the researchers take this into consideration during the entire process of the study (Saunders et al., 2009). The research topic in this paper touches a sensitive topic within the field of social science, and in order for the respondents of the survey to not feel that their integrity was compromised, several aspects of research ethics were applied. These aspects relate to the research topic itself, the design of the research, the collection of data, how respondents were accessed, processing and storage of the data, analysing of the data and formulating the findings in a moral and responsible way (Saunders et al., 2009).

Informed consent is standard practice when researching and involving humans when collecting data, it includes informing the respondents to the purpose and risks of the study and gaining their consent to participate (Perrault & Keating, 2018). Hence, the questionnaire of this study was introduced with a section that explains: why the respondent had been invited to participate; what the research purpose was; that the participation of the survey was completely voluntary and anonymous; that the data would be stored safely, and lastly a checkbox with consent to the information presented above it. Moreover, since the majority of the population of this study are fluent in Swedish, but not everyone, the option of taking the survey in either Swedish or English was available in order for it to be appropriate, understandable and interesting to each respondent.

Another important ethical consideration includes objectiveness when accessing, collecting and handling the data. Being selective of which participants to choose, misinterpreting or deleting data will greatly decrease the chance of your data analysing to be accurate. A researcher has an ethical duty to at his or her best ability represent the
data reported (Saunders et al., 2009). Hence, this research has accessed respondents in multiple locations and of different backgrounds and analysed the data professionally and as objectively as possible for the researchers of this study to best represent the reported result.
4. Empirical Findings and Regression Analysis

The following chapter presents the empirical findings and regression analysis from the data gathered through the survey as well as the results when analysing it via SPSS. The results are divided into sections as follows: reliability and validity analysis, descriptive statistics, multiple regression analysis, and lastly the hypotheses testing.

4.1 Reliability Testing

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the authors of this study tested the reliability of the questionnaire consistency via a Cronbach alpha analysis. The result of the test that were conducted via SPSS is demonstrated in the proceeding section with the values presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Cronbach Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Knowledge</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As argued by Hair et al (2010), the standard lower level limit for a Cronbach alpha value was 0.70. Hence, a value above 0.7 indicates that all the items in the constructs accurately measured what they were intended to measure. As seen in Table 2, four of the constructs (Attitude, social media, altruism, and environmental knowledge) had a value exceeding 0.7 which indicates high reliability of these constructs. However, the coefficient for the financial construct did not exceed 0.5 and was therefore inferior. Due to this construct being inferior, an inter-item correlation matrix was derived via SPSS for each item in the financial construct in order to establish which survey-question failed to measure this factor. In Table 3, “Financial_Item 1” represents question 1 in the
survey from the financial construct, while “Financial_Item2” represents financial question 2 from the survey and so forth (Table 4 for abbreviation). As presented below, “Financial_Item3” along with “Financial_Item4” in correlation to “Financial_Item2” had correlation coefficients below 0.3 and therefore the questions did not measure the financial construct sufficiently.

Table 3: Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financial_Item1</th>
<th>Financial_Item2</th>
<th>Financial_Item3</th>
<th>Financial_Item4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial_Item1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial_Item2</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial_Item3</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial_Item4</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude the results of the Cronbach Alpha analysis, all constructs except the financial were considered reliable as their respective Cronbach alpha coefficient exceeded 0.7. Indicating that the questions of the survey were reliably measuring the respective factors and the produced results can hence also be reliable (Hair et al., 2010). Therefore, the authors of this study deemed them fit for further analysing. While the financial constructs Cronbach value did not even exceed 0.5 and hence needs to be more carefully analysed in depth in order to remain purposeful to the study.

4.2 Descriptive Statistic
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The total number of participants in this research was 108 females who were asked to answer the survey via Qualtrics in the Jönköping region. Qualtrics enabled the process of gathering the descriptive statistics presented in this section. The year of birth of the respondents ranged between 1981 and 2001, showing that there was a wide range of millennials (Muskat et al., 2013) represented in this sample. As Figure 2 shows, the majority (~20%) of the respondents were females born in 1997 followed by participants born in the years 1998 (~14%) and 1994 (~12%).
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Figure 3: Occupation Status

Furthermore, 75% of the respondents were students of which ~60% has a high school degree or equivalent, and ~32% answered that their highest level of completed education is a bachelor's degree. Respondents who are full-time employees and employed 1-39 hours per week both accounted for ~12% each, out of the 108 participants.
The most dominant response (~43%) regarding approximate monthly income among the females who participated in this study, was an income of less than 10,000 SEK per month. Whereas the second most common answer was between 10,001-20,000 SEK per month and amounted to ~39% of the participants.

4.2.1 Constructs

Table 4 shows the Mean (\(\bar{x}\)) and Standard deviation for each construct item and average, including both independent and dependent variables. The construct items refer to the question that was asked in the survey with corresponding factor and number, for instance, “Financial_Item1” refers to the first financial question in the survey. Both the question and abbreviation with their respective means and standard deviations are shown in Table 4 in order to ease the flow of the results. As mentioned in the methodology, the questionnaire was mainly designed with 7-point Likert scale questions which means the minimum value of response equals 1 and the maximum equals 7. In other words, all respondents answered the questions for each construct with a value between 1 and 7. Hence, the mean represents the average response for that item and when comparing the means for the construct averages, altruism scored highest (\(\bar{x}\))
=5,170) while environmental knowledge scored lowest (\( \bar{x} = 4,315 \)). However, since 4 is a neutral standpoint on a 7 point Likert scale and each individual construct mean scores higher than 4, the averages of the respondents had a positive impression towards the questions. Moreover, the standard deviation derived from the construct averages of this paper ranged from 0,999 to 1,755 and therefore it was concluded that there was no extreme spread or disperse around the means.

*Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of the Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Mean (( \bar{x} ))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I base my purchase decision on the price of the product</td>
<td>Financial_Item1</td>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>1,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think cruelty-free products are expensive compared to other products</td>
<td>Financial_Item2</td>
<td>4,30</td>
<td>1,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would pay considerably more for a product I know is Cruelty-free</td>
<td>Financial_Item3</td>
<td>4,57</td>
<td>1,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My financial status affects my purchasing habits of cosmetics</td>
<td>Financial_Item4</td>
<td>5,32</td>
<td>1,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial_AVG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important to buy cruelty-free cosmetic products</td>
<td>Attitude_Item1</td>
<td>5,28</td>
<td>1,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intentionally look for cruelty-free cosmetic products</td>
<td>Attitude_Item2</td>
<td>3,94</td>
<td>2,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products to me is: Important</td>
<td>Attitude_Item3</td>
<td>4,90</td>
<td>1,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Attitude_Item4</td>
<td>5,63</td>
<td>1,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Attitude_Item5</td>
<td>5,50</td>
<td>1,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Attitude_Item6</td>
<td>5,70</td>
<td>1,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude_AVG</td>
<td>Social Media_AVG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media</td>
<td>Social Media_Item1</td>
<td>5,94</td>
<td>1,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I follow makeup related content on social media</td>
<td>Social Media_Item2</td>
<td>4,45</td>
<td>2,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My engagement on social media influences my cosmetic purchases</td>
<td>Social Media_Item3</td>
<td>4,34</td>
<td>1,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media increases my awareness of animal testing</td>
<td>Social Media_Item4</td>
<td>4,58</td>
<td>2,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media_AVG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>1,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I buy/would buy cruelty-free cosmetic products because of:</td>
<td>Social Media_Item5</td>
<td>5,28</td>
<td>1,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environment</td>
<td>Social Media_Item6</td>
<td>6,22</td>
<td>1,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td>Social Media_Item7</td>
<td>4,60</td>
<td>1,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction</td>
<td>Social Media_Item8</td>
<td>4,70</td>
<td>1,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social guilt</td>
<td>Social Media_Item9</td>
<td>5,05</td>
<td>1,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Social Media_Item10</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruism_AVG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of which cosmetic brands that test their products on</td>
<td>Social Media_Item11</td>
<td>3,87</td>
<td>1,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td>Social Media_Item12</td>
<td>4,21</td>
<td>2,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the negative effects of animal testing on the</td>
<td>Social Media_Item13</td>
<td>3,96</td>
<td>1,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>Social Media_Item14</td>
<td>5,21</td>
<td>1,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to select products that does not harm the environment</td>
<td>Social Media_Item15</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Multiple Linear Regression

To test the reliability and validity of the studied constructs a number of diagnostic tests were run prior to the multiple linear regression analysis (Hair et al., 2010). The tests included correlation, normality and multicollinearity and are presented in this section. This provided a reliable foundation to further evaluate the conceptual framework presented in the study.

4.3.1 Pearson Correlation Analysis

Table 5: Pearson Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Purchase Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>0,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0,695**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>0,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>0,501**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Knowledge</td>
<td>0,499**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In order to measure the relationship between each of the independent variables and the dependent variable, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted (Duignan, 2016). Pearson correlation measures the linear relationship between two variables where the sample data is measured at an interval or ratio scale. This correlation coefficient can take on values from -1.0 through 0 to +1.0 (Duignan, 2016). A positive sign of the coefficient indicates a positive relationship, whereas a negative sign implies the contrary. If the correlation coefficient takes on a zero, it represents no linear relationship...
between the two variables, thus they are uncorrelated (Sedgwick, 2012). As Table 5 shows, there was a positive linear relationship between purchase intention and the independent variables: financial, attitude, altruism and environmental knowledge. For the variable social media, the Pearson correlation coefficient was closer to zero (0.023) which indicates that social media and purchase intention were uncorrelated. Furthermore, attitude scored the highest Pearson correlation coefficient (0.695) in this research, followed by altruism and environmental knowledge. However, Sedgwick (2012) highlights that a significant correlation does not mean that it can be implied that there are a cause and effect relationship between the variables.

4.3.2 Normality of the Residuals Diagnostic
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*Figure 5: Normality Plotted and Histogram*

Normality of the residuals was tested by the help of normal probability plot which yields a graphical demonstration of the level of normality. In order to use F and t statistics, normality for the residuals is a requirement otherwise the statistical tests are invalid (Hair et al., 2010). The distribution of the residuals is normal when the points are as close as possible to the diagonal line (Kayıkçı & Sopacı, 2015). Based on the Normal P-P Plot of the Regression Standardised Residual in Figure 5, normality was confirmed since the points are close to the whole stretching diagonal line. Therefore, it could be assumed that the error terms are normally distributed, making the data reliable.
According to Hair et al. (2010) using a histogram that compares the data values to approximate the normal distribution is a very simple test to see if there is a normal distribution. By looking at Figure 5, it is obvious that the data in this research followed a normal distribution since it takes on the bell shape.

4.3.3 Multicollinearity Diagnostics

*Table 6: Multicollinearity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>1.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>1.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>1.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Knowledge</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multicollinearity is a term that describes the correlation and relationship between two or more independent variables (Alin, 2010). Variance inflation factors (VIFs), and tolerance are highly relevant quantities that act as estimators of the degree of relationship between independent variables (O’Brien, 2007) and detects whether there is a risk of multicollinearity (Marcoulides & Raykov, 2018). The rule of thumb argues that a tolerance less than 0.10 and a VFI greater than 10 indicates a multicollinearity issue (Marcoulides & Raykov, 2018). Table 6 displays the results that were derived with SPSS to check if the constructs have issues or risks of multicollinearity. The results above align with the rule of thumb, proving that there were no issues of multicollinearity in the studied data.
4.4 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

4.4.1 Testing for purchase intention as the dependent variable

*Table 7: ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>184,751</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36,950</td>
<td>26,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>144,685</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of this research was to analyse if the constructs drive purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products. A single independent variable is rarely enough to explain the behaviour of the dependent variable, thus multiple variables are needed to display valid results (Anderson et al., 2014). To identify if any of the independent variables had a significant prediction of the dependent variable, ANOVA was used to test the overall fit of the regression model (Hair et al., 2010). The ANOVA test yields an F-ratio value and a p-value which can either support or reject the null hypothesis (Hair et al., 2010).

The chosen significance level in this study was 0.05 because it is commonly used in research (Torbeck, 2010). As the ANOVA table shows (Table 7), the p-value (Sig) was 0.000, thus this shows that at least one of the independent variables had an influence on purchase intention. Furthermore, from the ANOVA table, the F-ratio was 26,049, with a significance of 0.000, which indicates that the independent variables significantly predicted the dependent variable (Hair et al., 2010) and hence the authors could proceed to test the hypotheses individually.

When conducting a multiple linear regression model, a coefficient of determination, also known as R², explains how much of the dependent variable that is measured by the independent variables (Hair et al., 2010). However, if taking the number of independent
variables into account a slightly different coefficient is used called the adjusted coefficient of determination, also known as adjusted $R^2$ (Hair et al., 2010; Saunders et al., 2009). Looking at the adjusted $R^2$ value which was 0.539 (see Appendix II), it could be seen that the independent variables explained 53.9% of the dependent variable. As mentioned above the adjusted $R^2$ takes into account the number of independent variables when indicating how good predictor the regression analysis is (Saunders et al., 2009; Hair et al., 2010).

4.4.2 Evaluation of each independent variables for the purchase intention

*Table 8: Construct Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient Beta</th>
<th>Sig (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Knowledge</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standardized beta coefficient was utilized in order to directly compare the different factors exploratory power of the dependent variable. Since the beta coefficients are standardized it makes it possible to compare each independent variable directly to the dependent variable (Hair et al., 2010). The results above (Table 8) were calculated by SPSS and it can be seen that attitude had a beta coefficient value of 0.581. This essentially means that if the other independent variables were held constant and attitude would rise by 1, then purchase intention would rise by 0.581. Similarly, environmental knowledge was able to explain a change in purchase intention by 0.292 per 1 change in environmental knowledge. As seen in Table 8 social media had a negative beta coefficient value of (-0.099) this shows that an independent variable with a coefficient value between 0 and -1, portrays a negative effect on the dependent variable (Berenson, Levine, & Krehbiel, 2012).
4.5 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is used to make assertions on whether a claim regarding the value of a population parameter can be rejected or not (Anderson et al., 2014). When testing for this, the researcher starts by making an unsettled assumption about a population parameter, which is called the null hypothesis ($H_0$). Then another hypothesis, called the alternative hypothesis ($H_1$), is derived and this represents the research claim that the researcher would like to prove (Berenson et al., 2012). To test the hypothesis that was derived from the conceptual framework in this study the p-value approach was adopted. This approach was used by comparing the p-value to the chosen significance level of 0.05, denoted as alpha ($\alpha$), where the null hypothesis could only be rejected if the p-value < $\alpha$ (Hair et al., 2010). In other words, a small p-value typically less than 0.05 indicates strong support to reject the null hypothesis and a large p-value indicates the opposite.

Table 9: Hypothesis Test Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported/Not supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H1_1$: Increasing Social Media usage within cosmetic shopping has a positive influence on intention towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H2_1$: Increasing favourable Attitude towards cruelty-free cosmetics has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H3_1$: High degree of Altruism has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H4_1$: High degree of Environmental Knowledge has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H5_1$: Increased Financial sensitivity has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H1_0$: Increasing Social Media usage within cosmetic shopping does not have a positive influence on intention towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products.
**H1**: Increasing Social Media usage within cosmetic shopping has a positive influence on intention towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products.

Social media’s p-value was (0.151) with a significance level of α (0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis was supported. This explains that the social media construct did not have a positive influence on purchase intention, thus the alternative hypothesis did not hold for this study. The standardized Beta coefficient value of social media was (-0.099), which signify that social media had a slightly negative effect on purchase intention.

**H2**: Increasing favourable Attitude towards cruelty-free cosmetics does not have a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products

**H2**: Increasing favourable Attitude towards cruelty-free cosmetics has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products

Attitude’s p-value was (0.000) with a significance level of α (0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis was not supported. This explains that Attitude construct had a positive influence on purchase intention, thus the alternative hypothesis holds for this study. The standardized Beta coefficient value for Attitude was (0.581), which signify that attitude had an effect on purchase intention.

**H3**: High degree of Altruism does not have a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products

**H3**: High degree of Altruism has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products

The altruism factor’s p-value was (0.668) with a significance level of α (0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis was supported. This explains that altruism construct did not have a positive effect on the purchase intention, thus the alternative hypothesis did not hold for this study. The standardized Beta coefficient value of Altruism was (0.038), which signify that altruism had no effect since the Beta value was close to zero.

**H4**: High degree of Environmental Knowledge does not have a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.

**H4**: High degree of Environmental Knowledge has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.
Environmental knowledge’s p-value was (0,000) with a significance level of $\alpha$ (0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis was not supported. This explains that EK construct had a positive effect on the purchase intention, thus the alternative hypothesis holds for this study. The standardized Beta coefficient value of EK was (0,292), which signify that EK had an effect on the purchasing intention.

$H5_0$: Increased Financial sensitivity does not have a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.  

$H5_1$: Increased Financial sensitivity has a positive influence on purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products.

Financial factors’ p-value was (0,594) with a significance level of $\alpha$ (0.05), indicating that the null hypothesis was supported. This explains that financial factors did not have a positive effect on purchase intention, thus the alternative hypothesis did not hold for this study. The standardized Beta coefficient value of the financial factor was (-0,037), which signify that social media had a slightly negative effect on purchase intention.
5. Interpretation and Further Analysis

This section establishes a deeper interpretation of the results and creates a relationship between the theory presented in the frame of reference and the empirical findings. The chapter also elaborates on the results of the hypothesis test with the purpose of finding which factors drive the purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics and why the others do not.

5.1 General Analysis

The conceptual framework of this research is a remodelled theory of planned behaviour, and it implies that if social media, attitude, altruism, environmental knowledge, and financial factors are positive, then the same should apply to purchase intention. However, the empirical findings of this study did not completely align with this assumption, since multiple construct’s hypotheses could not be supported, and hence did not prove a positive influence on purchase intention.

A significant amount of the 108 female participants in this study verbally expressed their increased awareness and interest in the studied topic. Some respondents mentioned that by answering the proposed questions it made them realize the importance of the topic and that they will be extra concerned about the source of the cosmetics they purchase in the future. At the same time, it could be seen that the respondents were more concerned about financial than ethical values as they ranked price as their second most important factor when purchasing cosmetics (see Appendix III). This goes in line with the findings from Bray et al.’s (2011) study suggesting that consumers care more about financial than ethical values. Interestingly, 60% of the females in this sample had a positive likeliness to purchase cruelty-free cosmetic products in the future (see appendix III). This highlights that the topic of cruelty-free cosmetics is still a concept that consumers are adapting to and learning about. For instance, Knight and Barnett (2008) affirmed that vegan and cruelty-free is a more sensitive topic compared to green and organic, which has been previously studied since it often evokes strong and
emotional reactions. Therefore, the authors of this study concluded that the complexity of the topic has generated some limitations when measuring the respondent's opinions.

5.1.1 Social Media

Based on the research by Kudeshia and Kumar (2017), eWOM has a significant effect on consumers purchase intention as well as their attitude towards a brand. Therefore, the expected outcome of this thesis was finding a correlation between social media and purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products. However, looking at the results from the Pearson's correlation analysis, social media and purchase intention had a correlation coefficient of 0.023 which contradicts previous research and indicates that there is no linear relationship between the variables. However, the same conclusion could not be drawn for the correlation between social media and the attitude of a brand, since this was not tested for in this study. But it is an important suggestion for further research within the field of cruelty-free cosmetics to test for social media's effect on brand attitude, and brand attitude’s effect on purchase intention since previous researchers have found that eWOM has a significant effect on brand attitude (Abzari et al., 2014; Kudeshia & Kumar 2017; Park & Jeon, 2018). Hence, the authors concluded that one reason for the uncorrelated result was due to not testing social media's effect on brand attitude.

The findings for this construct contradicts what Zahid et al. (2018) stated in regard to high education level and income having a positive relationship on social media publicity. Since neither of the factors above was fulfilled from the studied sample where 32% had completed their bachelor degree and the majority had a monthly income below 10,000. Furthermore, social media was described broadly, which might have caused participants to answer inconsistently and interpret the term “social media” in different ways. There are various SNM sites such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter, that influences users’ perception about products (Gunawan & Huarng, 2015). Additionally, there are many ways to interpret social media’s influence on purchase intention, for instance, eWOM (Kudeshia & Kumar, 2017), providing transparency about products and services (Gunawan & Huarng, 2015) and promotion of modern cosmetic trends (Matic & Puh, 2016). Taking this into consideration, it is clear that individuals are likely
to interpret social media and its effect on their intentions in various ways yielding inconsistent results.

Lastly, it is important to mention that even if the alternative hypothesis cannot be supported ($H1_1$), it does not mean that it is not true or that it can not be supported in further or has been in previous studies. It simply implies that it was not statistically proved for the sample of this study.

5.1.2 Attitude

The alternative hypothesis ($H2_1$) suggests that an individual’s attitude has a positive influence on whether they intend to purchase cruelty-free cosmetics or not. Therefore, the survey questions were intentionally designed to measure the attitude construct and its positive influence on purchase intention. Hence, by looking at the Pearson correlation results (0.695) it is evident that there is a high correlation between attitude and purchase intention. Meaning that if a respondent has a positive attitude towards cruelty-free cosmetics they are also more likely to purchase it. This aligns with previous research that has highlighted the importance of attitude as a key factor that has a strong influence on purchase intention (e.g. Paul et al., 2016; Hsu et al., 2017; Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Jin Ma et al., 2012; Yamoah et al., 2016; Ko & Jin, 2017). The same conclusion can be made in this research paper since $H2_1$ was supported after running the data through SPSS.

However, it is important to remember that having a positive attitude towards purchase intention does not automatically mean intention to purchase, solely a higher chance of intending to buy which is another indicator that there exists an attitude-behaviour gap (Zollo et al., 2018). An example of this was that many respondents thought it was important to buy cruelty-free cosmetic products ($\bar{x} = 5.28$) while it was not as important to intentionally look for them ($\bar{x} = 3.94$). However, another reason for this could be explainable by the confusion that arises when there is too much information involved when looking for cruelty-free cosmetics, which goes in line with Deng’s (2013) research that excessive information and knowledge can develop negative attitudes towards ethical goods.
Furthermore, it is to be considered that purchase intention and purchase behaviour is not equivalent. The phenomena is studied by multiple researchers who agrees that a gap between purchase intention and behaviour as well as attitude and behaviour exists (e.g. Boulstridge & Carrigan, 2000; Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Carrington et al., 2014; Johnstone & Tan, 2014; Shaw et al., 2016; Zollo et al., 2018). However, in this study, there was no focus or intention to measure this gap and it is therefore unsettled if there is a gap between purchase intention and purchase behaviour in the sample of this study.

To conclude, it can be seen that attitude is the most significant determinant for purchase intention (Yadav & Pathak, 2017). Which is further supported by the empirical findings of this study where attitude had the highest standardized beta coefficient of 0.581 which indicates that attitude has indeed the highest explanatory power of the dependent variable, purchase intention. Hence it was evident that positive attitudes are necessary for the consumer to have a purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics.

5.1.3 Altruism

Altruism is defined as “the desire to benefit someone else for his or her sake rather than one’s own” Batson (2011, p. 3). From the results of the Pearson correlation analysis, altruism and purchase intention had a correlation coefficient of 0.695 which confirms that there is a linear relationship between the variables. However, this does not entail that there is a cause and effect relationship between altruism and purchase intention. The multiple regression analysis confirmed this since it was found that the null hypothesis ($H3_0$) was supported.

These findings are contradictory to what Kaufmann et al. (2012), Ryan (2016) and Mostafa (2006) found in their research since they argue that altruism has a significant (Kaufmann et al., 2012) or important (Ryan, 2016 & Mostafa, 2006) role in consumers purchasing behaviour. A contributing factor that is important to take into account is that in order to act upon something and be truly altruistic, an individual should have a pure intention to do so (Oh & Yoon, 2014). This is something that is difficult to measure just by analysing an individual's answers in a survey, thus it might be a contributing factor as to why this study found that altruism did not positively affect purchase intention.
When the participants were asked about their reasons for purchasing cruelty-free cosmetics, the majority answered animal welfare (\( \bar{x} = 5.28 \)) and the environment (\( \bar{x} = 6.22 \)), followed by social guilt (\( \bar{x} = 4.70 \)). Which goes in line with what previous researchers Kaufmann et al. (2012) and Schwartz (1977) argued with regards to altruism being altered by an individual's environmental awareness and the outcome of their actions. Additionally, Gillani and Kutaula (2018) and Sebastiani et al. (2013) highlighted that ethical purchasing is altered by consumers increased concern for the consequences of their actions which the results of this paper also supports.

Furthermore, Oh and Yoon (2014) highlighted that altruism has a positive direct effect on attitude. The authors of this paper conducted a Pearson correlation analysis between both constructs, attitude and altruism, and found that they had a correlation coefficient of 0.632 (see Appendix II), which confirmed that there is a linear relationship between these two variables. Thus, the authors sought out to study this relationship further, by conducting an individual t-test to see if there is an indirect effect of altruism on purchase intention. The t-test (see Appendix II) showed a p-value of (0.000) with a significance level of \( \alpha \) (0.05). This indicates that Altruism had a positive influence on attitude towards cruelty-free cosmetic products. In other words, this confirms what was stated previously by Oh and Yoon (2014) regarding the indirect influence of altruism on purchase intention. The relationship between altruism and attitude can be strengthened with the findings of Yamoah et al. (2016) who stated that attitude towards ethical purchasing is partly encouraged by individual’s good or bad feelings towards acting upon their intention.

5.1.4 Environmental Knowledge

The alternative hypothesis (\( H4_1 \)) intended to test the effect of environmental knowledge (EK) on consumers purchase intention, which the survey results proved to be supported for the studied sample. From the results of the Pearson correlation analysis, EK and purchase intention had a correlation coefficient of 0.499 which confirms previous research and indicates that there is a linear relationship between the variables. Mostafa (2006) and Malik and Singhal (2017) found that both education level and EK have a positive effect on purchase intention. The same conclusion can be made in this research paper since H4_1 was statistically supported. Furthermore, by looking at the education
level of the studied sample 75% of the respondents were students and ~32% have a bachelor’s degree as their highest completed level of education. Which can be a contributing factor as to why \( H4 \) was supported and aligns with the similar results of the presented researchers.

Laroche et al.’s (1996) and Malik and Singhal’s (2017) study highlights that people’s awareness of environmental issues is the main factor to why consumers purchase environmentally friendly products. The result of the survey question “I’m aware of the negative effect of animal testing on the environment”, showed that the majority of the respondents agreed with this statement. Hence, it was confirmed that knowledge about the environment has a significant impact on people’s purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics. Looking at the result, it is evident that the studied sample possesses EK, that might have been gained from marketers (Mostafa, 2006), where this excess knowledge does not have a negative effect on the consumer purchase intention as portrayed by Deng (2013). The former statement goes in line with how EK influences the respondents of this study towards purchasing cruelty-free cosmetics, without negatively affecting their intention.

Analysing the results regarding the factor Environmental Knowledge, it proved to have a significant effect on purchase intention. A very interesting finding that the results showed was that a large number of participants were aware of the impacts of animal testing on the environment (\( \bar{x} = 4.21 \)) and also their awareness about animal testing in general (\( \bar{x} = 5.21 \)). The reason behind their extended knowledge can potentially come from worldwide organizations such as PETA, who promotes the importance of the topic and its negative side effects (Min et al., 2018). Even governments increased interest in this topic and actions have been taken to ban animal testing (Blumenauer & Locke, 2015), which can create knowledge stimulation.

5.1.5 Financial Factor

In order to conduct a relevant analysis, the authors have taken the most relevant survey questions into consideration. However, by looking at the financial factor’s Cronbach alpha coefficient, it did not exceed 0.5 and the null hypothesis \( H5_0 \) was supported based on the studied sample. This implies that neither price nor financial status impacts
consumers purchase intention positively. This result does not perfectly align with Andorfer and Liebe’s (2015) argument which states that lower price and better financial situation has a positive effect on the consumption towards ethical products.

Carrigan and Atalla (2001) stated that customers with better financial abilities are more likely to pay a premium price for ethically produced products. Likewise, when the participants were asked if their financial status affected their purchasing habits of cosmetics, the average responses were positive towards this statement ($\bar{x} = 5.32$). Since 75% of the sample were students and the majority of them had a monthly income of less than 10,000 SEK, and the average monthly salary in Sweden is 33 800 SEK (Statistiska Centralbyrån, 2019), it is evident that price is a factor that was highly considered by the studied sample.

Bray et al.’s (2011) research proved that their participants were aware and concerned about ethical issues, yet they did not believe it was worth paying a higher price for ethical products. This goes in line with the finding of this paper where the participants had environmental knowledge and were aware of the issues caused by animal testing. Additionally, when asked if they would pay considerably more when purchasing cruelty-free products, more than half of the respondents had a positive intention to pay more. However, the participants ranked price as the second most important factor when purchasing cosmetics (see Appendix III). This can simply show that there was an inconsistency in the participant's answers since they believed cruelty-free cosmetics to be expensive, but also indicated that they would pay considerably more for it when buying cosmetics.

5.1.6 Purchase Intention

Ajzen (1991) explained intentions as motivational factors that influence behaviour. By looking at the mean score ($\bar{x} = 4.88$) for the survey question “How likely are you to purchase cruelty-free cosmetic products?” it can be seen that intentions of purchasing cruelty-free cosmetics among the respondents were positive. Relating back to Ajzen's theory, this would imply that the respondents’ future purchasing behaviour would also be positive. However, this is not statistically proven within this paper, as purchase behaviour is not the purpose of this study.
Additional interesting findings include the adjusted R-square value of 0.539, which indicates that the independent variables explained 53.9% of the model's variability around the mean. Hence it is interesting to conclude that the conceptual model utilized within this framework to measure purchase intention explained 53.9% of the variance. Nonetheless, other researchers studying purchase intention in the field of ethical consumerism achieved R-square values of around 0.6-0.7 when adapting a conceptual framework based out of TPB (Yadav & Pathak, 2017; Beldad & Hegner, 2018). Therefore, it can be concluded that the independent variables of this study achieved a moderate explanation of the dependent variable, purchase intention.
6. Conclusion

This chapter reconnects the research purpose with the empirical findings analysed in the previous two chapters and concludes the main results of the paper.

Little research had previously been made on factors driving purchasing intention of cruelty-free cosmetics (Liobikienė & Bernatonienė, 2017), and because of the rising demand for ethicality among consumers (Yeow et al., 2014), it is important for companies that are developing ethical-friendly products to understand and identify these factors. Hence, the purpose of this research was to test which of the following factors: social media, attitude, altruism, environmental knowledge, and financial factors that has a positive influence on female millennials, in Jönköping, purchasing intention towards cruelty-free cosmetic products. By developing a conceptual framework derived from previous research, collecting empirical data and statistically testing it for each construct, it was possible to successfully answer the purpose.

The findings statistically proved that the factors attitude and environmental knowledge has a direct effect on consumers purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics. Interestingly, this study provided empirical support for an indirect effect of altruism on purchase intention since the analysis showed that altruism has a direct effect on attitude. However, the hypothesis for the social media and financial constructs could not be supported since the empirical findings did not show significant support for its effect on purchase intention. This contradicts what some previous researchers have said, but there are at the same time similarities in how the studied individuals related to these two factors, which was highlighted in the analysis section. Despite this, the regression analysis had an explanatory power of 53,9% which indicates that the conceptual framework explained 53,9% of the variability around the mean.

To conclude, the findings have been fruitful to the authors of this paper in order to fulfil the purpose of the study and increase the knowledge about ethical consumption in the
context of cruelty-free cosmetics. It does also include important findings for further research within the topic to take into consideration.
7. Discussion

This chapter provides an insight into the implications of the study and the revised conceptual framework is introduced and discussed, followed by the limitations of the research and its results. Lastly, the author’s suggestions for further research are presented.

7.1 Implication

The results of this study revealed that some factors driving purchase intention are more relevant and have a higher impact than others. For instance, attitude can be related to consumers concern for the consequences of their purchase and altruistic motives, where both would influence consumers to drive the market to become increasingly ethical (Gillani & Kutaula, 2018; Sebastiani et al., 2013). Sebastiani et al. (2013), further suggests that this awareness among consumers is likely to affect corporations’ strategies. Therefore, having knowledge of the studied factors in this paper can be useful for marketers and product developers within the cruelty-free cosmetics industry. Which will enable them to understand the consumer's priorities and concerns when purchasing cosmetics. Additionally, this goes in line with what Hou and Lampe (2015) emphasised on regarding the pressure for companies to invest in alternatives for animal testing and that this is to a large degree driven by individual consumers.

Environmental knowledge had a direct effect on purchase intention of cruelty-free cosmetics, which implies that awareness about the environment and ethical issues play a significant role for consumers who purchase cruelty-free cosmetics. Malik and Singhal (2017), Mostafa (2006) and Kaufmann et al. (2012) stated that the availability of information regarding the safety toward the environment should be provided by marketers since it can create a favourable attitude towards the brands. This research could be used by marketers in order to realize the positive effect that EK has on purchase intention.
Therefore, this research provides marketers with insight on factors affecting female millennials purchasing intention towards the specific category of cosmetics. Knowing these factors might provide a competitive advantage to firms within this particular industry. Since millennials are one of the most powerful groups of consumers (Arli et al., 2017) and the global cosmetics industry grew by 5 per cent in 2017 (Statista, 2019a). Ramli (2015) suggests that due to the industry changes over time it is crucial for incumbents to continuously innovate their products, manufacturing, and sourcing processes to adhere to consumers’ requirements.

### 7.2 Revised Conceptual Framework

With the help of regression analysis, this study was able to identify the supportive and non-supportive factors presented in the conceptual framework. As a result, two of the factors were forced to be removed because of their insignificant effect on purchase intention. Due to the specific and narrow topic of purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics among female millennials in Jönköping, some factors which proved to be significant in other studies were not applicable in the context of this study. Thus, the revised conceptual framework presented below includes the factors that proved to be the most significant in the studied population. As shown below, attitude and environmental knowledge have a direct effect on purchase intention. Whereas altruism has an indirect effect on purchase intention and is directly affecting attitude.

![Figure 6: A revised conceptual framework for factors influencing ethical purchase intention towards cruelty-free cosmetics products](image)
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7.3 Research Limitation

Firstly, it should be noted that this study adopted a non-probability sampling method which creates a limitation to the generalisability of the population on statistical grounds since it does not provide an equal chance for the individuals of the population to be selected (Saunders et al., 2009). Both convenience and self-selection sampling were used which increases the possibility of bias that is out of the researcher's control since participants are included in the sample based on the ease of obtaining them (Saunders et al., 2009).

Due to time limitation, the sample consisted of 108 participants, which could also be criticized to limit the research. However, this research was able to derive relevant and useful data despite the limited sample size. Patton (2001) suggests, the sample size for non-probability sampling depends on the research objectives as in: what will be of good use, have credibility, and what can be done with the available resources. This research was able to fulfil those criteria, despite being small in sample size. Furthermore, the purpose of this research was to test the theories behind the conceptual framework and thus it sought out to make generalizations about theory and not necessarily the population. Thus, using non-probability sampling in this paper is adequate for determining what factors drive the purchase intention for cruelty-free cosmetics.

Lastly, the lack of age variation could be a limitation, since 74% were in their early to mid-twenties (20-25 years old), therefore the gathered data might not be sufficient in representing the whole millennial population since the older age groups were somewhat underrepresented. This could also be followed by the fact, that the majority of the participants were students, limiting the result from representing the employed or middle to high-income millennials.

7.4 Further Research

This study examined ethical consumption within the field of cosmetics, hence further research could be niched towards other business areas to study if consumers purchase intention differs between different types of ethical products. Moreover, the population researched was millennials in, Jönköping, Sweden. Therefore, it is important for further research to test other age groups and professions to find similarities and differences to
the results of this study. More importantly, for future research is to make a cross-cultural comparison to discover differences and similarities between cultures ethical consumption patterns and purchase intentions towards cruelty-free cosmetics.

Aligning with Hassan et al. (2016), the intention-behaviour gap is not studied enough and needs empirical evidence. Hence, a relevant issue for further research is trying to identify if there is a gap between the purchase intentions and the attitudes of cruelty-free cosmetic consumers and their actual buying behaviour. This research paper has identified the factors affecting the purchase intention with no concrete proof if the participants behaved accordingly. Since previous researchers have studied a gap in other areas of consumerism, it could be of importance for future studies to see if this gap also applies within the field of purchasing cruelty-free cosmetics. Due to lack of time and other resources, it was not considered reasonable to examine such a relationship in this paper, but it is an important phenomenon to study in order to better understand the barriers that constrains consumers to purchase cruelty-free cosmetics.

The conceptual framework of this study tested what factors have a direct effect on consumers purchase intention, but the results discovered that one of these factors were indirectly affecting purchase intention. Hence, it could be of importance for further research to study factors that have an indirect or second-line effect on the dependent variable. Additionally, there is an opportunity to further study drivers for ethical consumption within the cruelty-free cosmetics market, by testing the revised conceptual framework that this paper presents.
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Appendix I

English Survey

Introduction:
You have been invited to participate in this survey because you are between 18 and 33 years old and are highly likely to be a cosmetic user. Therefore, your experience is important to our research.

The study concerns purchase intentions towards cruelty-free cosmetics, which means cosmetics that are not tested on animals nor contain any ingredients from animals.

Participation of this survey is completely voluntary and anonymous. If you decide to participate you will be given a questionnaire where you will be answering questions as truthfully as possible.

The results from this survey will be used and analysed by the authors of this research paper and will be stored safely on a secure university server unavailable to the public.

Do not hesitate to ask if you have any questions or do not clearly understand the information.

☐ I have read and understood the above information

Q1 Year of birth
Year (1)
▼ 1970 (1) ... 2019 (50)

Intro Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible

Q2 Gender
☐ Male (1)
☐ Female (2)
☐ Prefer to specify (3) ________________________________________________

Q3 What is the highest level of education you have completed?
☐ Primary School (1)
☐ High school degree or equivalent (2)
☐ Bachelor degree (4)
☐ Graduate degree or higher (5)

Q4 Which of the following categories best describes your occupation status?
☐ Employed fulltime (1)
☐ Employed 1-39 hours per week (2)
☐ Unemployed (3)
☐ Retired (4)
☐ Student (5)
☐ Other (Specify) (6) ________________________________________________

Q5 Approximately, what is your monthly income?
- Less than 10 000 SEK (1)
- 10 001 - 20 000 SEK (2)
- 20 001 - 30 000 SEK (3)
- 30 001 - 50 000 SEK (4)
- More than 50 000 SEK (5)
- Prefer not to answer (6)

Start of Block: Financial
Q6 Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible and with regards to cosmetic products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I base my purchase decision on the price of the product (1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think cruelty-free products are expensive compared to other products (2)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would pay considerably more for a product I know is Cruelty-free (3)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My financial status affects my purchasing habits of cosmetics (4)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start of Block: Attitude
Q7 Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think it is important to buy cruelty-free cosmetic products (1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I intentionally look for cruelty-free cosmetic products (2) | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Q8 Purchasing cruelty-free cosmetic products to me is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start of Block: Social Media

Q9 Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible and with regards to cosmetic products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use social media (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I follow makeup related content on</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social media (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My engagement on social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influences my cosmetic purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social media increases my awareness of animal testing (4)  

Start of Block: Altruism  
Q10 I buy/would buy cruelty free cosmetic products because of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The environment (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social guilt (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start of Block: Environmental knowledge  

Q11 Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible and with regards to cosmetic products:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am aware of which cosmetic brands that test their products on animals (1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am aware of the negative effects of animal testing on the environment (2)

I know how to select products that does not harm the environment (3)

I am aware about animal testing in the cosmetic industry (4)

End of Block: Environmental knowledge
Start of Block: rank
Q12 Out of the following factors, I believe the most important factors when purchasing cosmetics are:
(Drag to rank them from most to least important)

- Cruelty-free (1)
- Price (2)
- Quality (3)
- Brand (4)
- Availability (5)
- Social guilt (6)
- My friends/family's opinion on the product (7)

Q13 Please answer the following question as truthfully as possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely are you to purchase cruelty-free cosmetic products? (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Swedish Survey

Introduktion
Du har blivit inbjuden att delta i denna undersökning eftersom du är mellan 18 och 33 år och är högst sannolikt en användare av kosmetika. Därför är din erfarenhet viktig för vår forskning.

Studien handlar om köpintentioner mot "cruelty-free" kosmetika vilket innebär kosmetika som inte testas på djur eller innehåller några ingredienser från djur.

Deltagandet av denna undersökning är helt frivilligt och du förblir anonym. Om du bestämmer dig för att delta kommer du att få ett frågeformulär där du kommer att svara på frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt.

Resultaten från denna undersökning kommer att användas och analyseras av författarna och kommer att lagras på en säker universitetsserver som inte är tillgänglig för allmänheten.

Tveka inte att fråga om du undrar något eller om informationen är oklar.

Q1 Födelseår

Vänligen svara på följande frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt

Q2 Jag identifierar mig som:

○ Man
○ Kvinna
○ Föredrar att ange ____________________________________________

Q3 Vad är den högsta utbildningsnivå du har genomfört?

○ Grundskola
○ Gymnasieskola eller motsvarande
○ Kandidatexamen
○ Master eller högre

Q4 Vilken av följande kategorier beskriver bäst din yrkesstatus?

○ Anställd på heltid
○ Anställd 1-39 timmar per vecka
○ Arbetslös
○ Pensionerad
○ Studerande
○ Annat (Ange) ____________________________________________

Q5 Vad är din ungefärliga månadsinkomst?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Vänligen svara på följande frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt och med avseende på kosmetiska produkter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag baserar mitt köpbeslut på produktens pris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker att &quot;cruelty-free&quot; produkter är dyra jämfört med andra produkter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag skulle betala betydligt mer för en produkt som jag vet inte testats på djur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min ekonomi påverkar mina köpvanor för kosmetika</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Vänligen svara på följande frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag tycker att det är viktigt att köpa &quot;cruelty-free&quot; kosmetiska produkter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jag söker medvetet efter "cruelty-free" kosmetiska produkter

Q8 Inköp av "cruelty-free" kosmetiska produkter är för mig:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viktigt</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Önskvärt</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynnsamt</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glädjande</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start of Block: Social Media
Q9 Vänligen svara på följande frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt och med avseende på kosmetiska produkter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag använder sociala medier</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag följer sminkrelaterat innehåll på sociala medier</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min aktivitet på sociala medier påverkar mina kosmetiska inköp</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociala medier ökar min medvetenhet om djurförsök</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Altruism

Q10 Om jag skulle köpa "cruelty-free" kosmetiska produkter skulle jag göra det på grund av:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miljön</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djurskydd</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Självbelåtenhet</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skuldkänslor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvalitet</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental knowledge

Q11 Vänligen svara på följande frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt och med avseende på kosmetiska produkter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jag är medveten om vilka kosmetikamärken som testar sina produkter på djur</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är medveten om de negativa effekterna av djurförsök på miljön</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag vet hur man väljer produkter som inte skadar miljön</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jag är medveten om djurförsök i kosmetikaindustrin</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rank

Q12 De faktorer som är viktigast för mig när jag köper kosmetika är: (Dra för att rangordna från de högst till lägst relevant)

- [ ] Cruelty-free
- [ ] Pris
- [ ] Kvalitet
- [ ] Varumärke
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tillgänglighet</th>
<th>Skuldkänslor</th>
<th>Mina vänner / familjens åsikter om produkten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Vänligen svara på följande fråga så sanningsenligt som möjligt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hur troligt är det att du köper &quot;cruelty-free&quot; kosmetika produkter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td>Mean Purchase Intention</td>
<td>Mean EK Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Purchase Intention</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean EK Factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.499**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Altruism Factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.501**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Social Media Factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Attitude Factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.695**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
R Squares

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.749*</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>119100</td>
<td>1.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Mean EK Factors, Mean Financial Factors, Mean Social Media Factors, Mean Altruism Factors, Mean Attitude Factors

b. Dependent Variable: Mean Purchase Intention

Correlation between Altruism and Attitude

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Attitude Factors</th>
<th>Mean Altruism Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.632**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Altruism Factors**

| Pearson Correlation | 1                     |
| Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                  |
| N                   | 108                   |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
Individual Regression Model (Attitude as dependent variable)

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Altruism Factors</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>8,396</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Mean Attitude Factors

Appendix III

Drag and rank survey question

Purchase Intention result
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>STATSTABLE:FIELD_NAME</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How likely are you to purchase cruelty-free cosmetic products?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.04%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.59%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100