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ABSTRACT

The South African eco-friendly products industry is still growing. With the growth potential existing in this industry, it is evident that marketing practitioners and producers alike need to understand the consumer dynamics involved in order to ensure that the sales of eco-friendly products increase. The growth potential that the researcher refers to is also confirmed by other researchers in their recent work (Sonnenberg, Jacobs, and Momberg, 2014). Eco-friendly products range from eco-friendly shopping bags, green clothing, solar powered electronics, and recyclable goods to name a few. As consumers change to be more environmentally conscious, their choices in products will be influenced by various factors including their decision-making styles.

The “eco-friendly” or “going green” terms are commonly used globally for those products that consumers choose to buy because of their minimum negative impact on the environment. The decision-making styles that are most influential when South African consumers buy these products must be known by the relevant marketing practitioners within the South African context in order to ensure that they their strategies gain traction and also influence buying behaviour.

Relevant branding and positioning strategies must be implemented by the relevant organisations in order to differentiate their eco-friendly products from others that are available to consumers as the market becomes more competitive with local and international brands being sold online and in retail shops. Investment into ensuring that these products are well-known will decrease the level of impulsive and careless buying of these products as the brands are currently not highly differentiated to the South African consumers.

This study sourced primary quantitative data from consumers that buy and use eco-friendly products; a survey questionnaire was used in order to understand the influence of decision-making styles on the careless and impulsive buying of eco-friendly products. The findings of this study will enable the researcher to put forward the results that will demonstrate which decision-making styles mostly influence impulsive and careless buying
of eco-friendly products. Practitioners will be able to identify which dynamics to focus on when formulating their marketing strategies in order to effectively differentiate their respective products to consumers.
DECLARATION

I, Zamani Tshabalala, declare that this research report is my own work except as indicated in the references and acknowledgements. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management in Strategic Marketing in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in this or any other University.

Zamani Tshabalala

Signed at………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

On the……………………………………day of…………………………….20…………..
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who have contributed to the completion of this research report.

To my supervisor Professor Richard Chinomona, thank you for your invaluable advice and intellectual support throughout this journey.

Thanks are also due to my family Phumzile, Jabulani, Ntombi, Thoko, and Lindiwe Tshabalala for offering words of encouragement.

Most importantly, thank you to my Lord God Almighty.
CONTENTS
ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................. 1
DECLARATION ............................................................................................................. 3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .............................................................................................. 4
LIST OF TABLES .......................................................................................................... 9
LIST OF FIGURES ....................................................................................................... 10
CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY................................................................. 11
  1.1 INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................. 11
  1.2 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY .................................................................................. 12
      1.2.1 CONSUMER BUYING IN AF RICA .............................................................. 12
      1.2.2 ECO-FRIENDLY PRODUCTS .................................................................. 13
      1.2.3 PURPOSE OF STUDY ............................................................................. 14
  1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT ...................................................................................... 16
      1.3.1 MAIN PROBLEM ..................................................................................... 16
      1.3.2 SUB PROBLEMS ..................................................................................... 16
      1.3.3 SUB PROBLEM 1 ...................................................................................... 17
      1.3.4 SUB PROBLEM 2 ...................................................................................... 17
      1.3.5 SUB PROBLEM 3 ...................................................................................... 17
      1.3.6 SUB PROBLEM 4 ...................................................................................... 17
      1.3.7 SUB PROBLEM 5 ...................................................................................... 17
      1.3.8 SUB PROBLEM 6 ...................................................................................... 17
      1.3.9 SUB-PROBLEM 7 ...................................................................................... 18
  1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY ....................................................................... 18
  1.5 DEFINITION OF TERMS .................................................................................... 19
  1.6 ASSUMPTIONS .................................................................................................... 20

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW ............................................................................. 21
  2.1 INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................. 21
  2.2 EMERGENCE OF THE ECO-FRIENDLY CONSUMER ........................................ 21
  2.3 GOING GREEN: ECO-FRIENDLY PRODUCTS .................................................... 22
      2.3.1 THE GREEN REVOLUTION ..................................................................... 22
      2.3.2 GREEN MARKETING .............................................................................. 24
      2.3.3 GREEN CONSUMER .............................................................................. 25
  2.4 CONSUMER STYLES INVENTORY ..................................................................... 26
  2.5 PERFECTIONIST HIGH QUALITY CONSCIOUS DECISION-MAKING STYLE ......... 30
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ............................................. 62
  3.1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................... 62
  3.2 RESEARCH PROCESS ................................................................... 62
  3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY / PARADIGM .................................. 63
      3.3.1 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY: POSITIVIST PARADIGM ............ 64
  3.4 RESEARCH DESIGN .................................................................... 64
  3.5 POPULATION AND SAMPLE ......................................................... 64
      3.5.1 POPULATION .................................................................... 64
      3.5.2 SAMPLE AND SAMPLING METHOD .................................. 64
      3.5.3 SAMPLING FRAME ............................................................ 65
      3.5.4 SAMPLE SIZE .................................................................. 65
      3.5.5 SAMPLING METHOD .......................................................... 66
  3.6 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT ...................................................... 66
  3.7 PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION .......................................... 66
  3.8 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION ...................................... 67
  3.9 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY ...................................................... 67
  3.10 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY ....................................................... 67
      3.10.1 EXTERNAL VALIDITY ....................................................... 67
      3.10.2 INTERNAL VALIDITY ......................................................... 68
      3.10.3 RELIABILITY ................................................................. 68

CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS .... 69
  4.1 RESPONDENT PROFILE ............................................................... 69
  4.2 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENT RESPONSES ............................... 71
      4.2.1 PERFECTIONIST AND HIGH QUALITY DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ............................................. 71
      4.2.2 HABITUAL BRAND LOYAL DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ............................................................. 75
      4.2.3 BRAND CONSCIOUS AND PRICE EQUALS QUALITY DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ...................... 77
      4.2.4 INNOVATIVE AND FASHION CONSCIOUS DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ................................. 81
      4.2.5 RECREATIONAL SHOPPING DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ............................................................... 84
      4.2.6 PRICE CONSCIOUS AND VALUE FOR MONEY DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ....................... 86
      4.2.7 IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ........................................... 88
      4.2.8 CONFUSED BY OVER CHOICE DECISION-MAKING STYLE RESPONSES ....................................................... 90
  4.3 CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS (CFA): MODEL AND MODEL FIT .... 93
  4.4 SAMPLE DESCRIPTION ............................................................... 94
  4.5 MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT ...................................................... 95
      4.5.1 MEASURE VALIDATION ...................................................... 95
  4.6 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY ASSESSMENT .................................. 96
  4.7 STRUCTURAL MODEL ................................................................. 100
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.......................... 103

5.1 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERFECTIONIST HIGH QUALITY DECISION MAKING STYLE AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION...................................................................................104
5.2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRAND CONSCIOUS AND PRICE EQUALS QUALITY DECISION MAKING STYLE AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION ..............................................104
5.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HABITUAL BRAND LOYAL DECISION MAKING STYLE AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION .............................................................................104
5.4 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONFUSED BY OVER CHOICE DECISION MAKING STYLE AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION ........................................................................105
5.5 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRICE CONSCIOUS AND VALUE FOR MONEY DECISION MAKING STYLE AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION ..............................................105
5.6 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECREATIONAL SHOPPING AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION ...........................................................................................................105
5.7 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INNOVATIVE AND FASHION DECISION MAKING STYLE AND IMPULSIVE AND CARELESS BUYING DISCUSSION .............................................................................106

CHAPTER 6. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS........ 107

6.1 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY.................................................................107
6.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY.................................................................108
  6.2.1 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS ..............................................................108
  6.2.2 ACADEMIC IMPLICATIONS .................................................................109
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS .............................................................................109
6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH............................................110

REFERENCES ..........................................................................................111

APPENDIX A ...........................................................................................132

APPENDIX B ...........................................................................................133
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Consumer Confusion's Relationship to Involvement ........................................45
Table 2: Elements of theoretical contribution ................................................................50
Table 3: Respondent profile ......................................................................................69
Table 4: Marital Status ............................................................................................69
Table 5: Age ...........................................................................................................70
Table 6: Occupation ...............................................................................................70
Table 7: Qualification ..............................................................................................71
Table 8: Sample profile ..........................................................................................94
Table 9: Scale accuracy analysis .............................................................................96
Table 10: Correlation between the constructs .........................................................98
Table 11: CFA Model Fit .........................................................................................101
Table 12: (PHQ) Hypothesis testing results ..........................................................102
Table 13: Results Structural Equation Model Analysis ........................................107
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Model of Loyalty ..............................................................38

Figure 2: A conceptual model of the decision making styles that influence consumers buying eco-friendly product brands ..................................................55

Figure 3: Diagrammatic Representation of the Research........................................63

Figure 4: Structural model ........................................................................100

Figure 5: Conceptual Model ...................................................................103
CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

This research will aim to identify how psychological decision-making styles influence the buying decision of South African consumers towards eco-friendly products. More specifically, this research aims to identify how much of an influence each decision-making style has on impulsive and careless buying. As the study focuses on "eco-friendly" products, "eco-friendly" for purposes of this study is understood as the products that are environmentally-friendly or do not cause any hazard to the environment (Chen and Chai, 2010). Eco-friendly is a term used to describe the products that consumers buy which contribute to green living or practices that help protect important resources like water and energy (Chen and Chai, 2010). Other benefits to the environment include the prevention of air, water and land pollution (Chen and Chai, 2010) and this is what has led to the "green consumerism" movement (Moisander 2007; Peattie 1992). The term "green consumerism" refers to the consumers that are aware of the destruction of the earth’s natural resources and these consumers raise their concern of environmental protection which has resulted in the birth of green consumerism (Moisander, 2007). The term is further described as “the purchasing and non-purchasing decisions made by consumers, based at least partly on environmental or social criteria” (Peattie, 1992, p. 118).

There have been various studies conducted in the past investigating the influence of the decision-making styles on consumers and their behaviour, and these studies were researching the influence of decision-making styles on consumer choices in different contexts such as multi-country investigations, imported brand clothing, global brands, the shades of products, fashion, local brand biases and casual wear clothing (Lyonski and Durvasula 1995; Wang, Siu and Hui 2002; Butkevien and Stravinskientelion 2008; Lee 2012; Patil 2012; Watson and Yan 2013; Bandara 2014; Dubey 2014). The research studies were conducted in different countries such as China, New Zealand, Korea, Greece, India and the USA. The review of literature that is conducted for purposes of this study revealed no evidence of any research focussing on the influence of decision-making styles on consumers buying eco-friendly products, more specifically in South Africa and this
represents the gap identified by the researcher as an area that can be researched further within the South African context. The research has value in identifying the priorities and characteristics that South African consumers bring to their decision-making process when they select an eco-friendly product. The consumer decision-making studies noted above are non-African samples or have a specific focus on a particular product that is bought (Lyonski and Durvasula 1995; Wang, Siu and Hui 2002; Butkevien and Stravinskientelion 2008; Lee 2012; Patil 2012; Watson and Yan 2013; Bandara 2014; Dubey 2014). The results from these studies may have little or no relevance within the African context and consequently South African context. As a result, these studies may not be useful to South African markets, retailers, marketers and researchers.

1.2 Context of the study

1.2.1 Consumer buying in Africa

A research study conducted by McKinsey (2012) shows that by 2020, Africa’s consumer-facing industries are expected to grow by more than $400 billion. The continent’s economic growth accelerated post the years 2000, and this resulted in Africa becoming the fastest growing region following emerging Asia and equal to the Middle East (McKinsey, 2012). South African consumers are exposed to various products available to them in the market such as cellphones, tablets, laptops; automobiles; clothing; furniture; or various types of retail products (McKinsey, 2012; Sonnenberg, Jacobs, and Momberg, 2014).

The statistics that are released by the United Nations reveal that Africa has the fastest growing population in the world and it is predicted that the population will account for more than 40% of the population growth globally by 2030, (McKinsey, 2012). With these growth statistics being available to international brands, it is likely to lead to an influx of more goods being imported into South Africa (McKinsey, 2012), and as a result, the view of the researcher is that this increase in brands offers consumers more options of goods to buy.

McKinsey (2012) found that over a half of African households will have discretionary income, which will rise from 85 million to 130 million in 2020. The economic forecast was
similar to the Africans responses: 84% of the respondents said that they anticipate their household will have an increased discretionary income by 2012 (McKinsey, 2012). The McKinsey (2012) research showed that almost 30% of optimistic consumers in some African nations responded that they are buying more frequently and purchase new and highly expensive products, even though inflation may also be a factor in buying behaviour.

The increase in international and regional products indicates the level of competitiveness in the market as alluded to earlier (McKinsey, 2012), as retailers grow, competition intensifies and the growth in competitors results in consumers that are less loyal (Assael, 1998). As consumers are exposed to more options, marketing practitioners have to be able to conceptualise their marketing strategies and thus have to understand all possible aspects that influence the consumer’s decision to buy eco-friendly products and this notion is supported by other researchers (Chen and Chai, 2010; Soonthonsmai, 2007; Polonsky, 2011).

### 1.2.2 Eco-friendly products

The purchase of eco-friendly products can range from buying tea bags to buying organic meat (Chen and Chai, 2010). There has been considerably less work undertaken on the social and psychological bases of green consumption within developing countries (Chen and Chai, 2010). Studies of eco-friendly products consumption have been conducted in the developed countries such as Australia, (Lockie, Lyons, Lawrence and Mummery, 2002) the UK (Gilg, Barr and Ford, 2005), Switzerland (Tanner and Kast, 2003) and the US (Brosdahl and Carpenter, 2010). There are fewer studies conducted within the developing countries, especially in Africa.

A growing interest towards environmental protection and sustainable development globally has emerged due to increased knowledge of global warming and hostile environment circumstances (Polonsky, 2011). Consumers are increasingly becoming worried about the environment; the worry that the consumers display influences the buying behaviour of the consumer to an extent; this will thus result in consumers buying eco-friendly products and
this trend is supported by other researchers (Datta, 2011; Kassaye, 2001). Green buying refers to consumers that buy eco-friendly products.

The marketplace has become increasingly environmentally conscious as concern for this environment has grown (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). The environmentally conscious consumers have become more aware that their purchasing trends have an effect on ecological problems (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). With the growing preoccupation with eco-friendly products or "going green" products; marketers must now have a focus into what the South African consumer is interested in buying as most studies have been conducted in developed markets (Lyonski and Durvasula 1995; Wang, Siu and Hui 2002; Butkevien and Stravinskientelion 2008; Lee 2012; Patil 2012; Watson and Yan 2013; Bandara 2014; Dubey 2014). The view of the researcher is that marketers will have to create marketing strategies that will be used to attract and retain consumers that purchase eco-friendly products.

1.2.3 Purpose of study

This study aims to identify the psychological decision-making considerations that influence consumers when purchasing eco-friendly products within South Africa. Consumers undergo a consumer decision-making process when they need to purchase any goods or services; this decision-making process is when a consumer has a choice between two or more alternatives (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010). The decision-making process is conducted in the following sequence: problem identification, information search, alternative evaluation, purchase and purchase evaluation (Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard & Hogg, 2010). The basis of this research study will focus on the purchase stage of the decision-making process. The research will provide the relevant practitioners with an understanding of how the consumer decision-making styles have an influence towards the decision to buy eco-friendly products. The research will discuss these psychological influential factors that a consumer experiences during the decision-making process.

Competitors in the marketplace are competing for consumer spend on their products and consumer loyalty as the retail environment in the developing markets is becoming
increasingly competitive and crowded with products (Lyonski & Durvasula, 2010). It has become vital that companies have an increased understanding of these decision-making characteristics so as to attract the consumers to buy their products from their brands instead of the products of competing brands. The South African consumer will have various choices available and the decision-making styles that influence the consumer the most, when purchasing products, will be identified in this research study.

Consumers can be profiled into different mentalities or styles concerning the decision making process during shopping (Sproles and Kendall, 1986). The framework can be used to determine which styles South African consumers use. Sproles and Kendall (1986:286) were the first to establish the core concept of consumer decision-making styles by defining it as "a mental orientation characterizing a consumer's approach to making choices". The framework will be used to evaluate South African consumers' styles towards their buying decisions of eco-friendly products. Sproles and Kendall (1986) established the concept as a construct which they described as a “basic consumer personality” dimension not unlike the way the term “personality” is used in the discipline of psychology. Sproles and Kendall (1986) identified eight decision-making styles as the most basic decision making characteristics of consumer decision-making. These were formulated as the basis for developing a Consumer Styles Inventory. This Inventory measured the following eight decision-making styles:

(1) Perfectionist and high-quality decision making style

(2) Brand conscious and price equals quality decision making style

(3) Novelty and fashion conscious decision making style

(4) Recreational and shopping conscious decision making style

(5) Price conscious and "value for money" decision making style

(6) Impulsive and careless decision making style

(7) Confused by over-choice decision making style
1.3 Problem statement

1.3.1 Main problem

The main problem to be addressed by the research is to identify the extent to which decision-making styles influence impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly or "green products". There is a gap identified within literature to address the psychological influences within the South African context towards the purchase of eco-friendly products. It is not clear what decision making styles South African consumers use the most in the process of purchasing eco-friendly items that are available, thus, research in this field is imperative. There are a lot of differences in the extent of diversity of consumer profiles; this makes it difficult for marketers to create appropriate marketing strategies that will result in high sales of their products (Kassaye, 2001). This problem can be researched in this report in providing information for marketers to know what decision making styles most influence the consumers they target for their brand's product.

Consumers have more access to information through various sources such as the internet or magazines about products offered by different brands. As consumers are now exposed to a greater variety of products that are available, it has made the decision-making process more complex for consumers (Datta, 2011). There are limited studies that have been conducted which investigate the extent to which the decision making process for consumers of developing countries has advanced (Lyonski & Durvasula, 2010).

1.3.2 Sub problems

The sub-problems to this research are to identify the extent to which each of the following decision-making styles influences the impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products in Johannesburg.
1.3.3 Sub Problem 1

Identifying how much of an influence the perfectionistic and high-quality conscious decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.

1.3.4 Sub Problem 2

Identifying how much of an influence the brand conscious and price equals quality conscious decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.

1.3.5 Sub Problem 3

Identifying how much of an influence the novelty and fashion conscious decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.

1.3.6 Sub Problem 4

Identifying how much of an influence the recreational and shopping conscious decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.

1.3.7 Sub Problem 5

Identifying how much of an influence the price conscious and “value for money” decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.

1.3.8 Sub Problem 6

Identifying how much of an influence the confused by over-choice decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.
1.3.9 Sub-Problem 7

Identifying how much of an influence the habitual brand loyal decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying.

1.4 Significance of the study

Application of the Consumer Styles Inventory model in South Africa has not been done through focussing specifically on consumers within the Johannesburg region. This research will add new insights into untapped consumer decision-making styles that could inform what drives purchasing choices towards eco-friendly products.

The Consumer Styles Inventory was explored by Sproles and Kendall in 1986 through researching the influence of the eight decision-making styles on American college students. The decision-making styles results were furthermore based on the responses from the questions that the respondents were asked.

This research may benefit marketing practitioners in accurately aligning the target market with the consumer needs. The gap identified forms the basis of understanding the decision-making styles influencing the South African consumer. The study will be of value to potential researchers seeking to apply the Consumer Styles Inventory model to consumer purchases in other countries outside of South Africa. Furthermore, marketing practitioners will benefit from new facts emergent from this study in helping to segment consumer profiles to suit their consumer targeting strategies. Findings from this research will add value through helping companies and marketing practitioners to develop an understanding of the significance of their strategic choices. Delimitations of the study

The scope within this study will include the consumers that have recently purchased from a list of varying eco-friendly products (furniture, car, clothing, etc.) Furthermore, this work is limited to the Gauteng province in South Africa. The research will not discuss other psychological factors that influence the final decision of which brand to purchase; such as the input which are the marketing efforts such as advertising and output process which is the post-purchase point.
1.5 Definition of terms

- Consumer decision-making style: A mental orientation characterizing a consumer’s approach to making consumer choices (Sproles and Kendall, 1987). A consumer’s style has cognitive and affective characteristics, for example, quality consciousness and fashion consciousness (Sproles and Kendall, 1987).
- Perfectionistic and high quality conscious: A consumer who searches for the highest quality in products (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Brand conscious and price equals quality: A consumer who buys more expensive, well-known brands; this consumer is more likely to believe that a higher price means better quality (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Novelty and fashion conscious: A consumer who is likely to experience excitement and pleasure from seeking out new things (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Recreational and shopping conscious: A consumer who enjoys shopping and may shop for sheer fun (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Price conscious and “value for money”: A consumer who is careful about product prices and value for money. This consumer is more likely to look for sale prices and makes comparisons among the offerings in the market (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Impulsive and careless: A consumer who is impulsive, careless about how much they spend, and unconcerned about getting a “good buy” (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Confused by over-choice: A consumer who feels there is a preponderance of brands and stores from which to choose. They have difficulty making choices due to a feeling of “over choice” (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
- Habitual brand loyal: a consumer who is more likely to have favourite brands and stores; they have developed habits in the way they choose these brands and stores (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2013).
1.6 Assumptions

- The sample of consumers used for the purpose of this research is representative of the rest of the population.
- The respondents have experience in purchasing any eco-friendly products.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section consists of a literature review on the areas that this study sought to investigate. A scholarly review on buying eco-friendly products are discussed, Consumer Style Inventory are presented and literature based on each decision-making style follows.

2.2 Emergence of the eco-friendly consumer

The history of environmentally-friendly consumers traces back to the 1970s (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). Research found that consumers with income levels that are medium to high are more likely to take part in activities that are ecological as they have higher levels of education; these consumers demonstrated a higher sensitivity to social ills (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). This view is confirmed by other researchers (Min and Galle, 2015; Gilg, Barr, and Ford, 2005) who reiterate that the modern consumer seeks to participate in activities that are pro helping the environment.

Other studies revealed an opposing view which suggests that a consumer that is environmentally conscious has minimum education and earns an income that is less than the average American (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). These results reveal that the use of income and education are not valid in predicting the environmental consciousness or buying behaviour of consumers (Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). Research by Berkowitz and Lutterman (1968) and Anderson and Cunningham (1972) identified that the environmentally conscious consumer is young. However, in the 1980s, the results in numerous studies showed that the “green consumer” is older than average as identified in previous research (Roberts, 1996). Even though the results of the effect of the consumer’s demographical features on their environmentally conscious behaviour are inconsistent (Roberts, 1996), the consumer demographics have a significant influence.

Nevertheless, there are researchers that support that demographics are not as significant as knowledge, values or attitude in understanding the consumer’s ecologically friendly
behaviour (Chan, 1999). An increase in environmental awareness and the rise in environmentally friendly products results in a need for investigating the environmentally conscious consumer and that was part of the justification for this study.

2.3 Going Green: Eco-friendly products

The interest all over the world for going green through the use of eco-friendly products is growing as consumers want to protect the environment (Brosdahl and Carpenter, 2010; Cherian and Jacob, 2012). The consumer that is referred to as “green” is the consumer that purchases the eco-friendly products (Chen and Chai 2010). The consumer’s worry about the environment and man’s well-being increases the demand that consumers have for eco-friendly products, which results in the modifications and improvements of performance of many environmental products and companies (Sachdev, 2011). The terms “green products”, “environmentally friendly” or “eco-friendly” products are used interchangeably to define products that will not pollute the environment (Sachdev, 2011). An “eco-friendly product” or “green product” can be defined as an ecological product, or environmental friendly product. Datta (2011) has defined an eco-friendly product as a product that has a minimal effect on the environment.

Consumers all over the world have an increased awareness concerning protecting the environment as consumers are more concerned about the environment (Tanner and Kast, 2003). Studies by ecologists show that society is more concerned about their attitude and behaviour towards the environment and is working to change their behaviour (Sachdev, 2011). As consumer behaviour patterns change, it reveals that an increasing number of the consumers, both individual and industrial, seek eco-friendly products; the majority of these consumers prefer the use of eco-friendly products as they are less harmful to the environment (Sachdev, 2011).

2.3.1 The green revolution

Green buying behaviour is likely to have been caused by the pro-environmental concern among consumers as green buying mimics the behaviour of consumers that are eco-
friendly (Cherian and Jacob, 2012). The past decades have been witness to the fast economic growth through the increase in consumer consumption worldwide which has resulted in environmental deterioration through the over-consumption and utilisation of natural resources (Ramlogan, 1997). According to Ramlogan (1997), the consequences of environmental degradation are global warming, depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer, pollution of sea and rivers, noise and light pollution, acid rain and desertification. A report by Grunert (1993) suggested that approximately 40% of environmental degradation has been caused by the consumption activities of private households. It has become a public concern in developed countries as the environment continues to worsen as there has been research in developed countries such as Australia, (Lockie, Lyons, Lawrence and Mummery, 2002) the UK (Gilg, Barr and Ford, 2005), Switzerland (Tanner and Kast, 2003) and the US (Brosdahl and Carpenter, 2010). Moreover, developing countries have become more aware of the green movement for protection of the environment as research by Datta (2011) on the environmental concern of Indian consumers demonstrates. The results of the study indicated that educated Indian consumers tend to be aware of eco-friendly products and are also knowledgeable about environment related issues (Datta, 2011).

Amongst other strategic objectives, firms seek to create consumer satisfaction and build long-term profitable consumer relationships in order to sustain their business in the competitive environment in which they operate (Chen and Chai, 2010). Following an increase in social and political forces, companies started to embrace marketing strategies tailored for the green products and explored these environmental matters as a source of competitive advantage (Chen and Chai, 2010). Numerous companies started to develop environmentally friendly packaging and invested numerous efforts to keep well-informed with the environmental movement in order to be increasingly socially responsive in addressing pollution and waste disposal (Chen and Chai 2010).

The growing concern displayed by consumers for the environment and any environment related issues has driven firms across the globe to offer consumers a wider range of eco-friendly products across varying product categories such as: fashion, cars or gadgets.
Firms offering products that are designed and manufactured with an environmental marketing mix will have a strategic competitive advantage (Datta, 2011).

Consumers that are environmentally conscious when making a purchase consider environmental or ecological issues (Sachdev, 2011). When firms have a better understanding of consumer preferences, it will result in a more relevant market approach to remain sustainable in a competitive market (Datta, 2011). The changes evident in the state of natural resources and their long-term negative impact has resulted in an awareness about human accountability and responsibility toward the environment (Lawrence and Mummery, 2002). The realisation has led to the growth of eco-friendly consumption patterns among consumers (Lawrence and Mummery, 2002). Mainieri, Barnett, Valdero, Unipan, and Oskamp (1997) define green buying as purchasing and consuming products that are not harmful towards environment.

2.3.2 Green marketing

Green marketing is a rising phenomenon for marketing eco-friendly products (Kassaye, 2001) and this might imply that firms use green marketing to appeal to the consumers that are concerned about the environment.

A study by Belz & Peattie (2008) stated that green marketing and environmental marketing in the late 1980’s focused on green consumers who would be willing to pay premium prices for more eco-friendly products. This study further suggested that many consumers will purchase products that are not harmful to the environment over less environmentally friendly products, even if these products are at a higher price. Within green marketing, advertisers will tend to focus on the environmental benefits of products to ensure sales, examples are products such as biodegradable diapers, energy-efficient light bulbs, and environmentally safe detergents (Datta, 2011). Consumers are encouraged by green marketing approaches to utilise eco-friendly products and also the manufacturers are driven to produce more environmentally beneficial products as Datta (2011) suggests.

Ottman, (1998) asserted that environmental or green marketing, a strategic marketing approach, is a recent focus in business endeavours. The increase in focus on issues
concerning the environment shows that a strategic concern for firms as being pro-environmental has emerged (Polonsky & Kilbourne, 2005). One of the major challenges that firms face is the variances of consumer preferences for eco-friendly products.

Marketers face the challenge of accurately identifying consumers that are passionate and concerned about the environment and will be willing to pay a higher price for the eco-friendly products (Belz & Peattie, 2008). So, the researcher’s view is that improved profiling to accurately segment these consumers is vital in order to understand what motivates them to pay higher prices for eco-friendly products. And as a result, marketing strategies will be better formulated in order to meet the needs of consumers.

2.3.3 Green Consumer

Consumers who are aware of and interested in environmental issues are called green consumers (Soonthonsmai, 2007). The green consumers purchase eco-friendly products when they know that the product will not be harmful to the environment (Ottman, 1992). Three variables appear to be influential in classifying the green consumer; these are environmental and social values, socio-demographic variables and psychological factors (Gilg Barr and Ford, 2005).

Research by Laroche, Bergeron and Barbaro-Forleo (2001) which looked at the consumers that are willing to pay more for eco-friendly products identified that there are several factors that may influence consumers' willingness to pay more for environmentally friendly products, these factors were knowledge, demographics, and behaviour. Knowledge is recognized in consumer research as a characteristic that influences all phases in the decision process (Laroche et al. 2001). A study by Chan (1999) showed that knowledge about environmental issues is a notable predictor of environmentally friendly behaviour. The pioneers that studied the profile of socially responsible consumers; the “green consumer”, were Berkowitz and Lutterman (1968), as well as Anderson and Cunningham (1972). Their results found that a socially responsible consumer is a highly socially conscious person, a female, pre-middle aged, with a high level of education (finished high school) and above average socioeconomic status (Laroche, Bergeron and
Barbaro-Forleo, 2001). However, Balderjahn (1988) found that the relationship that exists between environmentally conscious attitudes and the use of eco-friendly products was more intensive among men than among women. Although findings from a study that investigated the impact of consumers’ demographic characteristics on their environmentally conscious behaviour contradict, (Roberts, 1996), the demographical features do have a significant impact. With regards to behaviours, Suchard and Polonski (1991) suggested that environmentally conscious consumers attempt to save the environment in varying ways such as recycling, checking that a package is made of recycled material or purchasing only eco-friendly products.

2.4 Consumer Styles Inventory

Consumers are now involved in a more modern marketplace, with additional benefits being offered to them due to the rise in globalisation (Lyonski and Durvasula, 2010). The problem that the researcher sought to address was helping marketers understand the most influential decision-making styles in order to create appropriate marketing strategies that will effectively appeal to consumer’s decision characteristics. These are the forces that the research sought to address in order to help marketing firms to profile their target markets for consumer eco-friendly products. These objectives are supported by other researchers who posit that practitioners and companies need to know how these styles affect consumers in order to achieve appropriate product segmentation, targeting and positioning (Makkizadeh, 2012).

Marketers need to use consumer decision-making styles as an indicator of whether a marketing strategy that was implemented was effective and informative or whether it was poorly planned and misaligned to the market (Bandara, 2014). Therefore marketers need to understand consumer decision-making styles in order for them to formulate strategies (Bandara, 2014). There are various local and international consumer products competing for consumer spending for their product (Makkizadeh, 2012). Local firms must investigate the strategic alternatives to influence consumer preferences for the purchase of local product brands as global brands enter local markets with resources, sophisticated technology and information that allows them to have more successful brands than the local
brands (Bandara, 2014). Local brands compete with international brands which increases the competition in the market (Makkizadeh, 2012).

The consumer-oriented firms are now more aware of their reputational risk and similarly more responsive to changing awareness and social values of consumers through globalization (Juscius & Sneideriene: 2013). Sproles and Kendall (1986) identified eight characteristics as being among the most basic mental characteristics of consumer decision-making. These were formulated as the basis for developing a Consumer Styles Inventory (Sproles and Kendall, 1986).

In the context of consumer characteristics approach, Sproles (1985) developed an instrument to profile the decision-making styles of consumers. This instrument consisted of 50 items, relating to consumers’ cognitive and affective orientation towards shopping activities. Data collection was carried out from 111 undergraduate women in two classes at the University of Arizona. Using Factor Analysis technique Sproles (1985) found six consumer decision-making styles traits namely, perfectionism, value conscious, brand consciousness, novelty and fashion consciousness, shopping avoider, time saver and confused support seeking decision maker. Sproles and Kendall (1986) further refined this inventory and developed a more parsimonious scale called Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) in 1986. The Consumer Style Inventory comprised 40 items on consumer decision-making styles characteristics. Sproles and Kendall (1986) administered the instrument to 482 students in 29 home economics classes in five high schools in the Tucson, Arizona area. This instrument measured eight mental characteristics of consumer decision-making and they were: perfectionism, brand consciousness, novelty and fashion consciousness, recreational, price value consciousness, impulsiveness, confused by over choice and brand loyal and habitual.

The Consumer Style Inventory is an important phenomenon for researching different contexts for analysing consumer decision-making styles (Bandara, 2014). The Inventory by Sproles and Kendall (1986) measured the following eight characteristics and described them as follows:
(1) Perfectionistic, high quality conscious consumer: a characteristic measuring the degree to which a consumer searches carefully and systematically for the best quality in products.

(2) Brand conscious, price equals quality consumer: a characteristic measuring a consumer's orientation to buying the more expensive, well-known brands.

(3) Novelty and fashion conscious consumer, a characteristic identifying consumers who appear to like new and innovative products and gain excitement from seeking out new things.

(4) Recreational and shopping conscious consumer, a characteristic measuring the extent to which a consumer finds shopping a pleasant activity and shops just for the fun of it.

(5) Price conscious "value for money" consumer, a characteristic identifying those with particularly high consciousness of sale prices and lower prices in general.

(6) Impulsive, careless consumer, one identifying those who tend to buy on the spur of the moment and appear unconcerned how much they spend or getting "best buys".

(7) Confused by over-choice consumer, those consumers perceiving too many brands and stores from which to choose, experiencing information overload in the market.

(8) Habitual brand loyal consumer: a characteristic indicating consumers who have favourite brands and stores, who have formed habits in choosing these repetitively.

With the different styles being generated by differing components, each style is expected to have different influences on a consumer. Each style will have a unique influence and therefore each decision style has unique outcomes and each of these will be identified in order to know the influence of these characteristics on the impulsive and careless buying decision-making style.

Following the introduction of the eight decision-making styles, numerous researchers used the Consumer Style Inventory to analyse the influence of the styles in varying shopping situations: Durvasula 1995; Wang, Siu and Hui 2002; Butkevien and Stravinskientelion
Consumer Style Inventory has been accepted as a dependable measurement for the analysis of shopping behaviour for consumers in the developed and developing world (Bandara, 2014). Therefore, decision-making styles can be found by identifying the general orientation of consumers towards shopping and buying (Bandara, 2014). Studying underlying decision styles of shoppers, under the field of consumer behaviour literature has a long history since the 1950’s (Bandara, 2014). Most of these studies revealed that all consumers approach shopping with certain decision-making traits that combine to form consumer decision-making styles (Bandara, 2014).

Firms must understand which style is more dominant to the consumers so as to ensure that the product will appeal to the consumers’ decision-making styles. In-store decisions occur because stimuli encountered during the trip (e.g., point-of-purchase advertising, the physical product) lead consumers to believe or recall that they have a need for the product category (Inman, Winer and Ferraro, 2009). The various choices that consumers have access to will make it more important for firms to understand their market, as choices can be applied to things as diverse as toothpaste or a restaurant (Inman, Winer and Ferraro, 2009). Consumers now possess more power because of the variety of options available to them (Inman, Winer and Ferraro, 2009).

Marketers must continually formulate strategies for products or services in order to ensure that their offerings are competitive. Decision-making styles should therefore be understood by marketers in order to formulate appropriate marketing strategies for their respective products. The consumer is one who makes a choice, buys or refuses to buy; and as one who displays or is unwilling to display (Inman, Winer and Ferraro, 2009). The justification of this study is as a result of the number of consumer eco-friendly products that are available to consumers. Consumers are exposed to varying products from local brands and global brands. This exposure results in an increase in competition between firms as new products enter the market. Firms that offer these consumer products want to ensure that their products remain competitive and there is a demand for the products.

Following is a detailed review of the decision-making styles.
2.5 Perfectionist high quality conscious decision-making style

Sproles and Kendall (1986) posited that high quality conscious consumers are consumers that search cautiously and methodically for the highest or very best quality in products.

2.5.1 Advertising as a cue to quality

When a different product has an expensive advertising campaign, consumers perceive this to be a high quality product (Kirmani and Wright, 1989). Olson (1977), found that in judging product quality, consumers use intrinsic cues—information about quality-related product features—as well as extrinsic cues, such as price or brand name.

In their study, Kirmani and Wright (1989) found that once consumers perceive advertising expense to be high, it leads to consumers to assuming that the quality of the product will be high. Furthermore, the results of their study showed that people who have information on a campaign's features can deduce cost associations and thus the consumer has more expectations of quality from the product. Their study also showed that when consumers receive a lot of information as to why advertising costs were high, the high quality of the product is dampened (Kirmani and Wright, 1989).

The advertisements that are used for eco-friendly products should therefore communicate to the consumers the quality of the product in order for the consumer to perceive this as a sign of quality which will differentiate the product from others.

2.5.2 Perception of quality

One aspect of which is important to a consumer is the product's quality. “The cues that are important to forming impressions of quality include (a) price; (b) product composition characteristics such as taste, aroma, colour, style, and size; (c) packaging; (d) brand, manufacturer (i.e., corporate), and store image; (e) advertising; (f) word-of-mouth reports; and (g) past purchase experience” (Jacoby, Olson and Haddock 1971: 570).
In their study to try to research the magnitude of signal usage of a brand name, price, physical appearance and retailer reputation to judge the quality of a product for consumer electronics across several cultures, Dawar & Parker, (1994) state that when selecting among various competing brands, the consumers become unsure of product performance and, more generally, quality. Their research indicates that marketing strategies should not be uniform across the countries as brand, price, physical appearance and retailer reputation are not perceived the same in different cultures or countries; one may be more important than the other.

There are varying culture-specific behaviours which are used by consumers such as the use of different information sources which can either be a newspaper or an internet search. Some behaviour is likely to be the same across cultures and others may not, there are different influential factors such as resident business environments, legislation, and other cultural restrictions. However in their results, Dawar & Parker (1994) found that price is used as a signal of quality to the same extent across cultures; should this not be the case, perceived-quality pricing certainly should be adapted to local cultures.

The literature on the perfectionist and high quality decision making style shows that the consumer with this characteristic displays an effort in searching for products of a high quality. Furthermore, it indicates that consumers use extrinsic cues such as price to deduce quality of a product. The consumer expects the product to be of a high quality if the price is high. Price has also been found to be used as a signal of quality across varying cultures.

2.6 Brand conscious and price equals quality decision-making style

A brand conscious, price equals quality decision-making style, is defined as one that measures a consumer's orientation when buying the more expensive, well-known brands (Sproles and Kendall, 1985). According to Lamb, Hair, McDaniels, Boshoff, Terblanche, Elliot and Klopper (2002) and Walley, Custance, Taylor, Lindgreen and Hingley (2007), a consumer's attitude to a brand is quite influential in the purchasing decision-making process. Consumers have become more price sensitive due to the growth of competition
within the markets (Choi and Ahluwalia, 2013). Brand managers have to create stronger brands in order to ensure that sales are not affected due to consumer price sensitivity. In the research conducted by Sproles and Kendall (1986) of American consumers’ purchase decision styles, the consumers who chose more expensive national brands that have advertisement and high publicity were labelled “brand conscious.”

2.6.1 Brand consciousness

Consumers have an interest in the names of brands when they are buying a product. The brand name adds dimensions to a product in order to position the product in a different way from other products that are intended to satisfy the same want or need (Keller, 1998). Brand consciousness was defined by Sproles and Kendall (1986) as the identified need or desire which a consumer experiences to buy brands that are well-known; brands that are expensive or the brands that are advertised the most. When a brand is well-known it is likely to make a social statement about the consumer’s status, brands such as Guess jeans, Armani handbags or Apple phones (Ghazali, 2011). Consumers who have higher brand consciousness choose well-known brands (Shim and Gehrt 1996; Sproles and Kendall 1986). Shim and Gehrt (1996) further defined brand consciousness as a direction of shopping, which describes a type of consumer tending to buy well-known brand products. Brand consciousness plays a vital role in society as this provides perceptions of others based on the brands that they own. This notion alludes to the belief that higher prices are related to higher quality (Ghazali, 2011).

The higher price that a consumer will pay over other brands in the same category that will satisfy the same need, displays the strength of the brand (Grassl, 1999). With regards to the younger consumers, when they buy a pair of jeans, it is not simply buying a golf shirt, but buying Lois Vuitton, Gucci or Armani. Wechsler (1997) pointed out that “barrage of brand names offers the irresistible promise of instant cool,” particularly for teens. Thus, consumers with high brand consciousness consider brands to be a symbol of their image, identity and status, and will reflect their personality (Lee, 2008).
In a study by Moses (2000), results showed that 62 per cent of the teenagers in Indonesia would not use or wear a product that is not seen as the 'right' brand to wear. Ghazali (2011) found that this figure represented the highest percentage when compared to 44 nations who would not use or wear a brand that is not seen as the right brand. Ghazali (2011) conducted a study with a focus on college students that investigated the impact that socialization agents would have on a consumer’s brand consciousness. Young teenagers develop consumption skills through learned behaviour when they observe their parents, this concept is called consumer socialization. Consumer socialization is defined as the process by which children acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and experiences necessary to function as consumers (Shiffman and Kanuk; 2010). Through observing their parents while growing up, teens become more familiar with the use of a particular brand. Since socialization is a process that takes place over a life-time, consumers are constantly exposed to different things from various sources such as television, magazines or online platforms at varying stages in their life; this means that each life cycle will be dominated by a different cluster of variables (Moschis & Moore, 1983).

The results of Ghazali, (2011) highlighted that college students differ significantly on brand consciousness as the male students showed a lower result in relation to brand consciousness; while the female students displayed a significantly higher majority on being highly brand conscious. The differences lie in the fact that males and females share different shopping experiences, as parents influence aspects of the socialization process differently towards boys and girls (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2010). Ghazali, (2011) found that in addition to exposure to radio, magazine and online platforms, other factors that contribute to a teenager’s assessment of their personal brand consciousness are the perceived brand consciousness of parents and peers.

2.6.2 Brand relationships

Orth and Kahle (2008) found that consumers try to find brand benefits instead of product attributes within any product category available to them. Consumers are found to display this type of action due to social psychological reasons (Orth and Kahle, 2008). The brand benefits are an important factor in a product (Keller, 2003). Marketing practitioners need
to have knowledge and information of methods to develop and provide brands which can appeal to different consumption conditions or are appropriate for a specific social situation where the added advantages of the product are more important than design of the product (Orth and Kahle, 2008).

The study of consumers has concentrated on the relationship that exists between consumers and the attributes of the products (colour, price and taste) in order to predict consumer choice; and there was considerably less focus on the brand name. Recent studies have shown that the brand name can communicate the product advantages (Keller, 2003). The work by Orth and Kahle (2008) that discusses the advantages that consumers seek from a brand, show that brands are classified into four dimensions; these being a functional benefit in which a consumer purchases expensive chocolate brand as the consumer believes that it is of a high quality.

Another dimension is price or value for money in which a consumer purchases a brand that they believe has a quality which is suitable to the price. A third dimension is the emotional benefit which the consumer associates with the brand and lastly the social benefit displays the consumers that purchase a products due to the social benefit of that brand. Consumers that are brand conscious worry about the quality of store brands and self-image damage caused by the low price (Lee, 2008). The conclusion made by the researcher is that consumers are concerned about their image and the brands that they are seen with.

Choi and Ahluwalia (2013) found that price and quality of a brand are important to consumers; therefore, marketers should strategically put in place promotions that do not tarnish the brand quality in the consumer’s mind. Though consumers may be exposed to various brand promotions, when a consumer is committed to one particular brand, they are less likely to switch to use a different brand (Choi and Ahluwalia, 2013). When the consumer is committed to a brand, they will try to resist the promotional offers that are made by the competing brands. The consumers that are committed to a brand will be more involved in a promotional offer, however, consumers that are not committed to a brand are less likely to show interest in any promotional offer (Choi and Ahluwalia; 2013).
The results from Choi and Ahluwalia (2013) highlight how consumers react differently to brand promotions when they are committed to a brand and when they are less committed to the brand. Furthermore, these results show that consumers interpret the promotions or discounts differently and additionally when consumers are committed to a brand, they are less likely to buy a competing brand when it is at discounted prices (Choi and Ahluwalia; 2013). Their findings further suggested that when a consumer that has low brand commitment is offered a competing brand at a promotional price, that consumer is likely to purchase the brand that is at a discounted price. Even when the consumer may not purchase the brand that is on discount; the brand commitment to their own brand will decrease (Choi and Ahluwalia, 2013). This implies that consumers that have a low brand commitment are more likely to be tempted to switch to another brand that is offered at a discount price.

The consumers that have a low commitment to the brand and resist discount, may switch the brands in upcoming promotions (Choi and Ahluwalia, 2013). Promotional or discounted prices are not always the only factor that will encourage a consumer to buy a competing brand. Reducing the price is sometimes used as a motivation for consumers to switch to a competitor brand; however, consumers may interpret this price cut negatively and stick to their current brand (Choi and Ahluwalia; 2013). A minor price cut to a product may be more effective as the new brand will be perceived as having the same level of quality as the current brand when the pricing is not vastly different and the consumers that have lower brand commitment may be more likely to use the new brands when there is a discount on a competing brand, however this is not always a guarantee as the Choi and Ahluwalia, (2013) study shows.

2.6.3 Luxury brands

Another study in China by Zhan and He (2012), shows the consumer perceptions of luxury brands. The economy in China is rapidly growing and the population is enormous, which has therefore made China an attractive market for luxury brands. The Zhan and He (2012) study shows that the Chinese middle-class consumers perceive luxury brands as highly respected by their reference groups and thus primarily aim to purchase luxury goods to fit
in with social expectations. Furthermore, when a brand is very popular, it is not a good option for the Chinese consumer, as they want to be unique and be able to express that (Zhan and He, 2012). Chinese consumers differentiate a luxury brand from other brands in the market by applying symbolic meanings associated with the brand (Zhan and He, 2012). The consumers also take into consideration the quality of the product. Therefore, for the middle-class consumer, luxury goods become affordable and valuable products that will satisfy the functional and social needs (Zhan and He, 2012).

The literature that studied the brand conscious decision making style found that consumers that are brand conscious are more likely to purchase brands that are popular. Some consumers are willing to purchase a product at a higher price just because they are committed to that brand, the consumer identifies with the brand and considers it to be a part of their image. Furthermore, literature found that consumers search for brand benefits due to social pressures.

2.7 Habitual brand loyal decision-making style

Brands are important as they form the link or connection between the producers of the product and the end users; the consumers become loyal toward the brand which highlights the importance of a brand. Lau and Lee (1999) posit that the element of trust forms an important base in the formation of being loyal to a particular brand.

A habitual brand loyal decision-making characteristic indicates consumers who have favourite brands and stores, and who have formed habits in choosing these repetitively (Sproles and Kendall, 1985). The American Marketing Association (2008) defines a brand as a name, term, symbol or design, or a combination of them intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of other sellers. A common application of brand loyalty is using brand loyalty programs in which consumers are offered additional benefits for purchasing a particular product (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2010). Chaudhur and Holbrook (2001) identified two types of loyalty namely behavioural or purchase loyalty which entails frequent purchase of a brand and also
attitudinal loyalty where there is commitment to a brand because there is value that the consumer has identified in the use of the brand.

In today’s competitive market, brand loyalty is important because the success of the brand depends on its frequent consumers (Chaudhur and Holbrook, 2001). However it exceeds repeated behaviour which is the extent to which the consumer is committed to the brand and the same brand also plays an important role (Chaudhur and Holbrook, 2001). Brand loyalty is defined by Oliver (1999) as an action in which consumers that are committed to a brand will continue to purchase the same brand repetitively; even though the consumer is exposed to competitors advertising efforts to encourage switching to a competing brand.

Brand loyalty is an important concept due to its underlying effect on the brand’s equity, (Aaker, 1991). A brand loyal consumer will share the positive experiences about the brand to others about their brand and will resist the competitors’ strategies (Yaras, 2015). Marketing practitioners should as a result be able to identify the factors that influence the brand loyal consumers.

Brand loyalty is also defined by Aaker (1991) as the extent to which a consumer is emotionally committed to a brand. A study by Reichfield (1996) identified the advantages of consumers that have a high loyalty towards a particular brand. Furthermore, the research identified the advantage of being able to maintain a high price, an ability to negotiate with distributors, a reduction in the costs of selling and a decrease in new competitors encouraging switching (Reichfield, 1996).

Building and maintaining brand loyalty is essential in establishing a sustainable competitive advantage (Aaker, 1991). Marketing practitioners are paying more attention to the extent to which consumers are committed to a brand (Aaker, 1991). Brand loyalty has advantages as it results in repeat purchases and consumers will recommend the brand to friends and family (Yoo and Donthu, 2001).
2.7.1 Brand loyalty Model

A definition of brand loyalty as discussed by Baldinger and Rubinson (1996) is that it contains two aspects; namely, affective loyalty and action loyalty. In their definition these authors suggest that the consumers are described to desire a particular brand however behaviour to purchase is not yet established. Additionally, when a consumer actually displays their loyalty through purchasing the product it displays loyalty that is linked to action.

Another definition of brand loyalty was established by Oliver (1999) in which it is clustered into four sections namely cognitive loyalty, affective loyalty, conation loyalty and action loyalty. There are additional indicators that were added by Day (1996), these are action and affection towards the consumer’s loyalty of the brand. He further separated brand loyalty into true brand loyalty and spurious loyalty. An action in which a consumer makes a repeated purchase of a particular brand which is the only one available in store, is defined as spurious brand loyalty (Day, 1996). Alternatively, the consumers that display true brand loyalty must show a commitment to the brand as well as repeat purchases of the brand. Figure 1 below illustrates the different classifications of loyalty as formulated by Dick and Basu (1994).

![Figure 1: Model of Loyalty](image)

The model of loyalty displayed in Figure 1 above displays the relationship which exists between a consumer’s related attitude and the possibility for repeat purchases (Lin, 2010). With the growth of competition globally, it has become more challenging to attract new consumers and retain existing consumers (Lin, 2010). For firms to remain competitive, it is important for them to invest in brand loyalty to ensure competitiveness in the market. Kotler and Keller (2005) found that within an organization, 80% of the profits may be
created by only 20% of the consumers from the total consumer base of the organization. Thus, the investment that is made by brands to create long-lasting relationships with consumers can prove to be profitable and highly valuable for the organization.

2.7.2 Customer Loyalty

A study conducted by Assael (1988) found that when loyal consumers repeatedly purchase a brand as they are loyal to a brand; it will result in the brand growing and gaining a higher market share. When consumers become more loyal to a brand, they begin to enjoy using it and also start to identify with the image of the brand. When customer loyalty increases, it will have a positive impact on the brand as consumers will purchase the brand repeatedly even though it is highly priced when compared to competitors. Therefore, the loyalty that consumers display has an effect on the overall brand performance. The repeated purchases indicates the trust that the consumer has with the brand.

The literature on the habitual brand loyal decision making style has found that this consumer has favourite brands which they purchase over and over again and brands become successful when they have frequent consumers that are loyal to the brand. Furthermore, literature has found that a brand that maintains brand loyalty is able to create a sustainable advantage in the market.

2.8 Price conscious “value for money” decision-making style

A price conscious "value for money" decision-making style is a decision-making style that describes the consumers that are highly conscious of prices that are on sale and lower prices (Sproles and Kendall, 1985). Jacoby (1976) found that consumers use price as one of the criteria to perceive quality of a particular product. Furthermore, a study by Makkizadeh, (2013) posited that consumers tend to use price as an indication of quality when there is no other product information available.

Price conscious consumers are aware of sales that may be occurring at a particular shop. When there are low prices for particular products, these consumers are aware of the changes to a lower price. Consumers with a low to average income will most likely
purchase a lower priced product when they have to choose between products that have the same benefits (Petkovski and Mirchevska, 2013).

2.8.1 Price as a cue

Price is undeniably one of the significant factors for consumers when making a purchase. According to Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer (1993), price plays a vital influence to the consumer as the price represents the financial expenditure which must be exchanged for a particular product; this holds for all types of purchase situations. When price is perceived this way, it means that price represents the amount of money that a consumer must sacrifice when purchasing a product. Higher prices may therefore negatively affect purchase probabilities (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993).

2.8.2 Negative role of price

Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, (1993) theorise value consciousness as reflecting a concern by the consumer for financial expenditure in relation to the level of quality that the consumer will receive.

Another negative price cue discussed by Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer (1993) describes the term "price consciousness" which discusses the degree to which consumers focus on spending less money through paying lower prices for products. The form in which a price is presented may also be a negative role for price.

Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993 found that consumers respond more to a reduced price when it is presented as a coupon than when a price reduction is presented without a coupon. This is due to a higher sensitivity to price in its negative role when consumers are offered the price in coupon form (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993).

Another negative role of price for consumers is sale proneness. This rationale proposes that when price sensitivity increases within a negative role; consumers associate this to a price that is in sale format (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993). The sale form
is when a product is presented as being sold on discount as there is a decrease on its regular price. When a product is being advertised as being on sale next to another product (comparing the prices), the perceptions of the value of the product becomes higher above a price that is not on sale (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993). The consumers that perceive price in a negative role are identified as displaying sale proneness (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993). Lastly, consumers reflect the desire for some consumers to be a “price maven”. This consumer desires to be a source to other consumers by providing them information of low price.

2.8.3 Positive role of price

The representation of the price-quality schema outlines that there are consumers that perceive the price cue in a positive role (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993). Therefore, to some consumers, this implies that there is a positive link between the price cue and the quality which the product has. Price is the most used indicator of product quality (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993).

The term prestige sensitivity refers to the positive perception that consumers have towards the price cue founded on the feelings the consumer has, in this situation, the consumer makes a purchase of an expensive product to signal to other people that the consumer is a “big spender” (Lichtensteinn, Ridgway and Netemeyer, 1993).

Literature that studied the price conscious “value for money” decision making style found that price is an important factor that consumers consider when making a purchase. Furthermore, literature found that price is also used as an indication of quality and it plays a negative or positive role to consumers.

2.9 Confused by over-choice decision-making style

Sproles and Kendall (1985) define the confused by over-choice characteristic as describing consumers that are exposed to a large number of brands to select from; these consumers would therefore experience an overload of information. Consumer authority assumes that consumers have sufficient information about products and have the ability
to comprehend the information and will thus be in a position to make a purchase (Walsh and Mitchell, 2008). However, when a consumer is confused, they are unable to make a purchase based on the knowledge and information that the consumer has. When a consumer experiences confusion due to the limitless options of products available; they are unable to decide which product to purchase (Sproles and Kendall, 1986). Consumer confusion occurs when there is exposure to an abundance of information and there are limitless options on offer for consumption (Alexander and Tjiptono, 2010).

The market has become more competitive and requires consumers to process information from varying sources. Different product factors such as communicating products benefits, similarities in packaging and the charges for searching for information will confuse the consumer. A confused consumer will not make informed, well thought purchase decisions and may be unlikely to buy the products with high quality and value (Walsh and Mitchell, 2008).

Some authors Poiesz and Verhallen (1989), have found that when a consumer experiences confusion, it is not a conscious act. They further propose that conscious confusion can occur infrequently. A study by Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, and Mitchell (2002) spoke about the nature of conscious or unconscious confusion; they contend that a vital factor is awareness as it relates to the abilities the consumer possesses. The consumer can also be able to reduce the confusion as they increase their knowledge of a product.

When consumers are confused, they are often feeling anxious, frustrated, lack of understanding and indecision (Walsh and Mitchell, 2008). Once the consumer experiences confusion, there are often general negative results.

2.9.1 Types of confusion

Similarity confusion proneness is defined by Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, and Mitchell (2007) as the consumer’s “propensity to think that different products in a product category are visually and functionally similar”. The similarity confusion proneness can result from related stimuli that have been previously learned. As consumers depend on the physical attributes of a product in order to be able to find and differentiate brands; when the physical
attributes of the product are similar to another brand, consumers may purchase a fake brand as they think it is the original brand because the look of the products are similar. Therefore, when a consumer is faced with similar-looking stimuli, a consumer that is prone to the notion of similarity confusion can possibly alter their product selection as the products are perceived to be similar. Supermarket shelves have products that look increasingly alike with regards to their physical attributes of the products (colour, size and feel) (Wang and Shukla, 2013). Furthermore, these consumers are unable to share with others about their experiences of frustration and misguided shopping purchases because this may cause them embarrassment (Walsh and Mitchell, 2008).

Another type of confusion is called overload confusion proneness. Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, and Mitchell (2007) describe this type of confusion as what consumers experience when they are exposed to high levels of product information and struggle to make a purchase. Thus, the consumer's confusion may increase when they are overloaded with information.

Walsh Hennig-Thurau, and Mitchell (2007) describe ambiguity confusion proneness, as "consumers' tolerance for processing unclear, misleading, or ambiguous products, product-related information or advertisements". Consumers may be faced with information pertaining to the product which is hard to interpret as some information may be misrepresented when the consumer attempts to process the information. There are consumers that seek help when they are confused by the stimuli and seek the approval of others prior to making the purchase (Greenleaf and Lehmann, 1995). When ambiguity confusion prone consumers are faced with uncertainty, the trust developed towards the brand will be diminished as they do not receive consistent information about the product (Walsh and Mitchell, 2008).

2.9.2 Online consumer confusion

As products and services have multiplied, it has offered consumers a variety of options available to choose from. The advent of online platforms as a source to research varying products has reinforced the extension of variety and product lines. Online retailers offer consumers a wide variety of products to cover all consumer needs. Online shopping also
leads to a large augmentation of information access (Matzlera and Waigunyb, 2005). O’Connor, (2001) found that travel is one of the most popular products sold online. There are researchers that argue that the online shopping helps consumers to analyse large quantities of product information, it also enables comparison shopping and lastly leads to better decision-making (Evans and Wurster, 1999).

2.9.3 Consumer Involvement

Consumers are exposed to various types of products that are either high involvement products or low involvement products; these may both confuse the consumer as they attempt to make a purchase (Alexander and Tjiptono, 2010). Consumer involvement is focused on the extent to which the personal relevance of that particular product or purchase holds for that consumer (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2010). When the risk of a potential purchase is classified as high, it is linked to a high involvement purchase and thus provokes extensive problem solving and information processing for example, a car may represent a high involvement purchase because of its perceived financial risk (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2010). When a purchase has low perceived risk, it is classified as a low involvement purchase and holds low vital relevance to the consumer, these are purchases of toothpaste as an example (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2010).
Table 1: Consumer Confusion's Relationship to Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Similarity</th>
<th>Stimulus Overload</th>
<th>Stimulus Un-clarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Involvement products</td>
<td>• In regards with appearance, consumers are more likely to recognize differences</td>
<td>• Highly involved consumer tends to search as much information as possible to convince themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumers are less likely to experience confusion.</td>
<td>• Consumers will identify ambiguous and contradictory information, unless there is too little time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Involvement products</td>
<td>• Consumers may be unable to detect differences between products because they have little product experience.</td>
<td>• Less involved consumers typically do not attempt to process a great amount of information that can overload and confuse themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Even when consumers only have limited time to identify a product, if consumers recognize ambiguous or contradictory information, it can generate confusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1 above shows that within a high-involvement context, consumers will invest more of an effort in order to seek information and different products whilst bearing in mind the perceived financial risk faced as a result of the purchase. A research by Alexander and Tjiptono (2010) on college students found that consumer confusion is not only present within a high involvement product purchase but also in a low involvement purchase. Therefore consumers may experience confusion particularly in conjunction with the resemblance of the products whether they are perceived to be high risk or perceived to be a low risk purchase.

2.9.4 Confusion reduction

A study by Mitchell and Papavassiliou (1999) suggested strategies that consumers use to reduce confusion. One of the strategies that consumers use is to delay the purchase of the product if they feel highly confused. Another method used by consumers is to establish the objectives of the shopping; when clearer goals are established the consumer will
experience less confusion. After the consumer clarifies their purpose for making a purchase, the goals will be clearer. A third strategy shows that when consumers include other people such as family or friends when purchasing a product, they feel less confusion and are more likely to purchase. The final strategy that can be used to reduce confusion is to research the product and collect information so that the consumer can make an informed choice.

In the South African consumer products brand context, not only is there a large variety of South African goods, there are also numerous international goods' brands in the market. Consumers may be confused by too much product choice in the South African market due to the advertisement effort and strong branding on the part of sellers. Consumers would therefore be exposed to various number of brands and therefore have an over-choice of brands to choose from.

Literature that studied the impulsive careless decision making style found that consumers that have access to a lot of products become overloaded with information and become confused by the choices available to them. Due to the competitiveness in the market, more products are available to consumers and this leads to confusion. With the availability of online purchasing, the consumer is exposed to even more products and this results in even more confusion.

2.10 Recreational shopping conscious decision-making style

A recreational and shopping conscious decision-making style is a characteristic measuring the extent to which a consumer finds shopping a pleasant activity and shops just for the fun of it (Sproles and Kendall, 1985). There are consumers that enjoy the activity of shopping and find it to be an enjoyable experience (Makkizadeh, 2013). The activity of shopping is also used as a platform to socialise with other people and create connections with fellow buyers (Maynes, 1976).

Among the earlier shopping studies, Stone (1954) offered the first classification of shoppers identifying them as economic, personalising, ethical and apathetic shoppers based on varying orientations toward shopping in general. Stone (1954) defines an
economic shopper as one that pays attention to price and quality. A personalising shopper searches for personal relationships in the store (Stone, 1954). An ethical shopper is one that favours local shops (Stone, 1954). Lastly an apathetic does not have an interest to shop but does it only because it is a need (Stone, 1954).

2.10.1 Shopping for pleasure

“Retail therapy” is a term, which consumers may have used when they have gone shopping and purchased a little treat to cheer oneself up (Atalay and Meloy, 2011). The term is used by consumers, whom, when are in a bad mood or are feeling sad, would go shopping in order to improve their mood.

The colloquial examples of Florists’ Transworld Delivery’s (FTD) “pick-me-up” bouquets of flowers (2011) or the classic McDonald’s (1971) saying, “You deserve a break today” (Atalay and Meloy, 2011). This shows that practitioners believe that consumers use retail therapy to improve their mood. The study by Atalay and Meloy, (2011) answers the question of whether the therapeutic buying sessions yield a short time of improving mood or the purchase will result in a long term positive mood change. The results of the research show that consumers indulge in retail therapy as a means to improve their mood and consumers make unplanned purchases when buying self-treats.

2.10.2 Online shopping orientation

With the advent of technology and an increased use of the internet, online shopping is also an additional shopping orientation to be discussed. Research conducted by Girard, Korgaonkar and Silverblatt (2003), showed that the convenience and recreational shopper were the dominant orientations that influence consumers for shopping online and that this influence varied by product type.

Shim, Quereshi and Siegel (2000) describe web-shopping as the process consumers experience to purchase products or services over the internet. The terms of online shopping, internet shopping, web-shop and online store are used interchangeably in literature (Ling, Chai and Piew, 2010). The internet allows the consumer to search
effectively as there is a large amount of product information available. South Africa has also seen a rise in online shopping on platforms such as takealot which is an online shopping platform that offers consumers products ranging from furniture, fashion and music to name a few (Takealot, 2015). Statistics show that 14% of South African online consumers shop online weekly or more frequently (Moorad, 2014).

Retailers that offer their products online must understand consumer online shopping behaviour so as to ensure they appeal to the consumers. With the rise of online shopping, consumers’ online shopping behaviour may be different in terms of their shopping orientation (Ling, Chai and Piew, 2010). Consumers use the internet to search for information of a product and make a purchase. Online shopping is not limited as there are varying products that can be purchased from groceries to cars.

A study by Ling, Chai and Piew (2010) found that consumers who prefer to shop from home, show higher intentions toward online shopping, however consumers who prefer mall shopping tend to have low online shopping intentions. With the increase in competition in the marketplace, organisation must ensure that they place sufficient product information on their websites so as to increase their online sales, this is to target the consumers with the “in-home shopping’ orientation.

2.10.3 Recreational shopping

The recreational shopper was first identified by Stephenson and Willett (1969). Recreational shoppers like the act shopping even though they do not make a purchase. Even the language of consumers is filled with sayings, such as "Born to shop," "Shop 'till you drop," "I shop, therefore I am," and "when the going gets tough, the tough go shopping" that are a reflection of the important position shopping plays in to consumers (Guiry and Lutz 2000, p5).

Literature that has studied the recreational and shopping conscious decision making style found that these consumers enjoy shopping and find it to be an enjoyable experience.
2.11 Novelty and fashion conscious decision-making style

A novelty and fashion conscious consumer is a decision-making characteristic identifying consumers who appear to like new and innovative products and gain excitement from seeking out new things (Sproles and Kendall, 1985). Consumers are always interested in the latest fashionable trends available and they are aware of what is fashionable as they do research through talking to others around them to know what the most fashionable items are.

Product novelty is described as a new or unique fashion product introduced into the market which gains the momentum and excitement from consumers who seek and try out the new fashion or trend (Schiffman & Kanuk 2008). Sproles and Kendall (1986) identified product novelty as an important trait in consumer decision-making. Dhurup (2014) suggested that product novelty could lead consumers to become more brand conscious.

2.11.1 Fashion Theories

At the turn of the century, sociologists highlighted fashion as a specific type of social process (Ruling, 2000). Table 2 below shows the different elements of theoretical contributions discussing fashion.
**Table 2: Elements of theoretical contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of fashion</th>
<th>Explanation of Dynamics</th>
<th>Related Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Veblen (1899)</td>
<td>Conspicuous consumption in order to exhibit wealth and social status</td>
<td>Struggle for status within the upper class, subsequent imitation through lower classes ('trickle down')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Simmel (1904)</td>
<td>Social distinction and integration as fundamental motives for individual action; social form (stable structure emerging from plurality of social facts)</td>
<td>Imitation of social elites who in turn create new fashions in order to keep up class distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Blumer (1969)</td>
<td>Particular social process, likely to occur under (1) high rates of change; (2) openness of a field to recurrent presentation of new models (3) lack of commonly accepted criteria for the evaluation of alternative models</td>
<td>Process of collective selection in which a fashion elite tries to match the common taste which has emerged through &quot;intense immersion&quot; among the fashion actors in a particular field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Bourdieu (1984)</td>
<td>Fashion functions as code allowing for social distinction/differentiation; ability to determine the fashionable reflects an actor’s cultural capital</td>
<td>Struggle between dominating and dominated actors; and new entrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from (Ruling, 2000:10)

Fashion surpasses various spheres and is in nearly all products or experiences. Sproles (1974) defined fashion as a consumer behavioural phenomenon surrounding both tangible and non-tangible contexts, within the realm of social influence and diffusion. Fashion consciousness refers to “a person’s degree of involvement with the styles or fashion of clothing characterised by an interest in clothing and fashion, and in one’s appearance” (Nam, Hamlin, Gam, and Kang 2007:103). The term fashion consciousness has been
acknowledged as a significant dimension of a consumer’s lifestyle that has an effect on purchase decision and consumption behaviour (Sproles and Kendall 1986).

2.11.2 Fashion perception by class

For many consumers, the notion of “keeping up with the Joneses” (ie. trying to be like ones neighbour) has been replaced by looking to more upscale reference groups that they would like to emulate (most often, people earning substantially more than they do (Shiffman and Kannuk, 2010). Members of specific social classes differ in terms of what they consider fashionable or in good taste (Shiffman and Kanuk, 2010). Social class is an important variable in determining where a consumer shops. Consumers are prone to shop at stores that appeal to their social class. Retailers should send the appropriate messages that will appeal to the class the product is targeted to through appropriate communication platforms.

Literature that has studied the novelty and fashion conscious decision making style found that these consumers like new and innovative products. Furthermore, consumers that are fashion conscious want their product choices to match their lifestyle.

2.12 Impulsive and careless decision-making style

The impulsive, careless consumer decision-making style characteristic is one identifying those who tend to buy on the spur of the moment and appear unconcerned how much they spend or getting “best buys (Sproles and Kendall, 1985).

2.12.1 Spontaneous purchases

Impulsive behaviour has a history of being related to an individual being immature, primitive, foolish, lack of intelligence, or social nonconformity and criminality (Rook and Fisher, 1995). In the consumption field, impulsive behaviour is linked with "being bad," and with negative results for personal finance, post-purchase pleasure, social responses, and overall self-esteem (Rook and Fisher, 1995). However there are consumption
situations in which impulsive purchases may be viewed as neutral or even resulting in positive behaviour. An example is a spontaneous purchase such as gift for an upset wife, a decision to pay the bill after a restaurant dinner, or purchasing a buy-one get-one free in-store special; these are impulsive buying examples that may characterize generous and kind practical activities.

Highly impulsive buyers are likely to encounter spontaneous buying stimuli. These consumers' shopping lists are more "open" and highly possible that there will be additional quick, unexpected buying ideas.

However, it is noted by Rook and Fisher, (1995) that varying factors such as a consumer's finances, time constraint, social visibility, and possibly even the buying impulse itself may trigger the necessity to evaluate a potential impulsive purchase quickly.

2.12.2 Culture and impulse purchasing

The study by Lee and Kacen (2007), researches the in-cultural influences on consumer satisfaction with impulse and planned purchase decisions. Consumer exposure to technology such as online shopping has expanded consumer impulsive purchasing. Different platforms such as the internet, television or cellphones have allowed consumers access to information about products and increased the convenience to purchase products and services. An impulsive purchase is more spontaneous than wary and more unworried than contemplative.

Lee and Kacen (2007) found in their study that there are vital underlying differences between consumers in two Western individualist cultures (USA and Australia) and two Eastern collectivist cultures (Singapore and Malaysia). Schiffman and Kanuk (2010) define individualism as rejection of dependency; that is, it is better to rely on one-self than others, they further define collectivism as implying that being in a group is a basic human endeavour, so that self-concept involves group membership. The results from the Lee and Kacen (2007) study found that consumers from the collectivist countries were more satisfied with their impulse purchase when they were with an important “other” individual versus when they were alone at the time of purchase. However the consumers from
individualist countries showed no difference in satisfaction between these two purchase situations. The Lee and Kace (2007) study illustrates that culture impacts consumer buying behaviour.

2.12.3 In-store influences

Pack and Childers’ (2006) research examines how the element of ‘touch’ in-store may affect impulsive behaviour. Pack and Childers (2006) posit that the encouragement to touch at the point-of-purchase is expected to influence the consumer’s impulsive purchase. Other research by Ramanathan and Menon (2002) provides further insight into the effect that touch may have on impulsive purchasing. The researchers of this notion state that impulsive consumers are more likely to pick up or touch a hedonic target (such as a cookie) as opposed to non-impulsive consumers. The impulsive purchase characteristic is categorised by an absence of a relevant purchase intention, when the shopping experience begins (Pack and Childers, 2006). Their results showed that consumers with a higher “need for touch” would make more impulsive purchases.

2.12.4 Online impulsive buying

With an increased acceptance of the internet among consumers and the fast growth of multi-channel retailing, it is found that consumers more frequently exposed to marketing stimuli will promote impulse buying (Dawson and Kim, 2003). The internet may be seen as an alternative impulse channel which serves as a convenient shopping channel which will allow consumers to shop at any time, this offers twenty four hour shopping, and convenience of making purchases while being at home (Phau and Lo, 2004). The increased convenience of online shopping is more advantageous as it is done at any time compared to traditional in-store shopping; such convenience also encourages impulsive buying. Since the internet is globalised, it can be accessed from any country therefore impulsive buying is not confined to a specific country.

Apparel purchases constitute one of the fastest-growing segments of e-commerce (Cowart and Goldsmith, 2007). It is found that eight in ten adults indicated that when they gather
information on products or services, they use the internet as a source of information before buying. Considering the convenience of shopping online and the increase of the electronic age, it is sensible that impulsive consumers would be drawn to online shopping (Cowart and Goldsmith, 2007).

2.12.5 Eco-friendly products: impulsive, careless consumer

Literature has shown that this decision-making style describes a consumer that purchases products on the spur of the moment and carelessly. Practitioners note that use of various platforms by consumers such as online shopping, television shopping channels and cellphones as a source of information and making online purchases. The literature further points out that in-store influences such as touching a product in-store influences impulsive purchases. Practitioners must encourage consumers to touch or sample their products so as to influence the impulsive purchase of an eco-friendly product.
2.13 Conceptual Model

Figure 2: A conceptual model of the decision making styles that influence consumers buying eco-friendly product brands

2.13.1 Eco-friendly products: Perfectionist high quality decision making style

The perfectionist high quality conscious consumer searches for high quality products in order to make the best purchases (Sproles and Kendall, 1986). The consumer takes time to ensure that they find the best products and will not merely impulsively or carelessly
purchase a product. As the literature has shown, a consumer may rely on the advertisements that the products has displayed in order for the consumer to deem the product to be of a high quality or not (Kirmani and Wright, 1989). Furthermore, the cues that are important to forming impressions of quality include “(a) price; (b) product composition characteristics such as taste, aroma, colour, style, and size; (c) packaging; (d) brand, manufacturer (i.e., corporate), and store image; (e) advertising; (f) word-of-mouth reports; and (g) past purchase experience” (Jacoby, Olson and Haddock, 1971). Practitioners must provide consumers with sufficient information for each cue relating to their eco-friendly products so as to inform the consumer of product performance and, more generally, quality (Jacoby, Olson and Haddock, 1971). The literature for a perfectionist and high quality conscious consumer illustrates the effort that a consumer puts into buying products that are of a high quality. The characteristics of the high quality conscious consumer show that the consumer will not carelessly or impulsively purchase products as high quality is an important factor to this consumer. This study will research the extent to which the perfectionist high quality decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

### 2.13.2 Hypothesis 1

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;

\[ H_1 \Rightarrow \text{A perfectionistic and high quality conscious decision-making style inversely influences impulsive and careless buying.} \]

### 2.13.3 Eco-friendly products: Brand conscious: price equals quality decision making style

An influence of the brand conscious: price equals quality consumer decision-making style on a consumer suggests that the consumer is brand conscious and therefore searches for products that when highly priced, will be related to the quality of the product based on the price. As literature has illustrated, a brand differentiates products amongst competing
brands (Keller, 1998). Furthermore, literature indicates that brand benefits, price and quality of a brand are important to consumers, thus practitioners must communicate the brand benefits to the consumers (Grassl, 1999). Luxury brands as shown in literature have an influence on the consumer to perceive the product to be of a high quality as it is highly priced (Zhan and He, 2012); and thus consumers purchasing the eco-friendly products could utilise the price to give an indication of the product quality. This study will research the extent to which the brand conscious and price equals quality decision-making style influences buying towards an eco-friendly product.

2.13.4 Hypothesis 2

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;

\[ H_2 \Rightarrow \text{A brand conscious and price equals quality decision-making style inversely influences impulsive and careless buying}. \]

2.13.5 Eco-friendly products: habitual brand loyal decision making style

The literature discussed the importance of brands to consumers. A definition formulated by Aaker (1991) is that brand loyalty illustrates the extent to which a consumer experiences some attachment emotionally with regards to the brand; this is an indication of the importance of brand loyalty. Practitioners need to build relationships with consumers that purchase eco-friendly products in order to build brand loyalty towards the brand. When consumers are loyal to the brand, they will repeatedly purchase the brand’s products. Thus, repeating a purchase of the eco-friendly product will show true brand loyalty towards a brand. A loyal consumer is less likely to purchase impulsively or carelessly because they are loyal to a brand. The importance of building brand loyalty with the consumers purchasing eco-friendly products is that the consumers may become loyal to the brand. This study will research the extent to which the habitual brand loyal decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.
2.13.6 Hypothesis 3

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;

\[ H_3 \Rightarrow \text{A habitual brand loyal behaviour decision-making style inversely influences impulsive and careless buying} \]

2.13.7 Eco-friendly products: price conscious “value for money” decision making style

The literature discussed that this decision-making style is a consumer characteristic that identifies consumers that are aware of prices of products; these may be prices that are on sale or a low price of a product. Practitioners who are marketing eco-friendly products will have to note the effects and the role of price on the consumer as it may play either a positive role or a negative role as some consumers may either be willing to pay high prices or are only willing to pay lower prices for products. The characteristics of this consumer that is influenced by price, shows that they are influenced by the price of a product and thus may not impulsively or carelessly purchase a product without considering the price of the product. There are consumers that are "price conscious" which defines the degree that consumers will make an effort to pay low prices, marketers need to tailor their marketing initiatives to be able to attract these consumers to purchase their eco-friendly products that they are selling. The consumers that perceive price as playing a positive role want to signal to other people that they are big spenders. Practitioners should align their marketing initiatives to appeal to these consumers so they may be seen as big spenders when they buy the eco-friendly products that are highly priced. The study will research the extent to which the price conscious “value for money” decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

2.13.8 Hypothesis 4

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;
H₄ ⇒ A price conscious and "value for money" decision-making style inversely influences impulsive and careless buying

2.13.9 Eco-friendly products: confused by over-choice decision making style

The literature has highlighted how competitive markets are characterized by an excess of choices available to consumers: which lead to consumers feeling confused and experiencing difficulty when they make a purchase. Consumers that are buying an eco-friendly product experience a level of confusion due to the overload of products to choose from. When a consumer is confused, they are less likely to make rational purchase choice. Literature has discussed the types of confusion that are experienced by consumers (Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, and Mitchell, 2007). Practitioners must provide consumers with sufficient information about the product attributes in order to decrease confusion. When consumers are not provided with clear product information and benefits, the consumer is more likely to be confused about which eco-friendly product to purchase because they do not have all the information that they need about the product. Marketers must provide sufficient information online as well; the literature has highlighted how consumers may also be confused when making purchases online. Consumers do not have enough information that will assist them consumers to make an informed decision when purchasing either a high-involvement product or a low involvement product. Providing consumers with all the information that they require will reduce the confusion that the consumer experiences when buying an eco-friendly product. This study will research the extent to which the confused by over-choice decision-making style influences impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

2.13.10 Hypothesis 5

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;

H₅ ⇒ A confused by over-choice decision-making positively influences impulsive and careless buying
2.13.11 Eco-friendly products: recreational and shopping conscious decision making style

The different studies showed that the different types of shoppers can be identified as economic, personalising, ethical and apathetic shoppers. The consumers that are buying eco-friendly products may fall into any one of these shopper categories. Eco-friendly products may also be purchased by consumers online through online search and ordering the products to be delivered at their home. Due to the use of this platform to purchase eco-friendly products, marketers need to offer consumers enough online website information to be able to buy their products online. The literature also discussed the role of culture in the purchase of products; marketing practitioners need to take this into consideration when marketing new eco-friendly products to different cultures. The study will research the extent to which the recreational shopping style influences impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

2.13.12 Hypothesis 6

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;

H₆ ⇒ A recreational shopping decision-making style positively influences impulsive and careless buying

2.13.13 Eco-friendly products: Innovative and fashion conscious decision making style

A consumer influenced by the innovative and fashion conscious decision-making style is always interested in the latest fashionable trends available. Furthermore, literature indicates that when a new or unique fashion is introduced into the market, consumers become excited about it. There are studies that have been conducted that discuss the various fashion theories available. Fashion transcends various spheres and is in almost any kind of product or experience such as clothing, cars, decoration, sport and music. If a consumer is highly influenced by this decision-making style, they may be excited about
buying eco-friendly products that are new in the market such as new clothing styles. Practitioners should therefore provide consumers with innovative fashionable eco-friendly products. This study will research the extent to which the innovation and fashion conscious decision making style influences impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

2.13.14 Hypothesis 7

Drawing from the discussion above and empirical evidence investigated, the following hypotheses is proposed;

\[ H_7 \Rightarrow \text{An innovative and fashion conscious decision-making style positively influences impulsive and careless buying} \]

2.14 Conclusion of Literature Review

The findings in the literature review discussed the notion of green purchases and the green consumer based on studies conducted by various researchers. The key findings of the literature review suggest that the Consumer Style Inventory is an important yet under-researched area particularly in South African eco-friendly products sector. Just as the notion of choice goes almost unquestioned within consumer studies, in spite of the frustration it causes, so too it is taken for granted that choice has increased with the growth of product ranges (Inman, Winer, & Ferraro: 2009:1). Firms continuously offer consumers new products and results in consumers having more choices to make. It is imperative that marketing management learn about differences in consumer decision-making for use in strategies for the products for consumers (Leo, Bennett and Hartel: 2005).
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research procedure that used in this study. Research methods are the means by which researchers propose to do data collection, analyses and interpretation (Cresswell, 2009a). The study was survey-based taking the form of structured questions in a survey.

3.2 Research process

The steps undertaken in the research process were to firstly, identify the problem and the sub-problems. Thereafter a review of the literature on the Consumer Styles Inventory was undertaken across products and countries. This step was vital to understand tested and tried empirical evidence and knowledge that currently exists in the field of Consumer Styles Inventory. The literature came from academic journals in order to prove the validity of the theory that is available. Additional sources used included textbooks, academic internet websites and business reviews.

Propositions were formulated that would be tested with South African consumers. The most appropriate research method was identified to be a survey questionnaire that would be similar to the ones previously applied in other research, however, modified to suit the research topic and research objectives.

Data was collected through online surveys. The following step was to examine collected data. An interpretation and discussion of the results follows this step. SPSS was used for statistical analysis. Interpretation of the results was based on the outcomes of the data analysis and input from the literature review. There are recommendations that emerged from the results that are followed by a conclusion of the study.

The following diagram represents the research process:
3.3 Research methodology / paradigm

Research methods are the means by which researchers propose to do data collection, analysis and interpretation (Cresswell, 2009a). There are three different research frameworks that can be used when conducting a study and they are; qualitative design, quantitative design, and mixed methods (Cresswell, 2009a). The differences between quantitative and qualitative design are that quantitative design applies measurement while qualitative design cannot quantify the outcomes of the study (Bryman, 2012; Cresswell, 2009a; Bryman, 2004). This study took the quantitative form as it needed to empirically test the relationship between the variables or constructs under scrutiny. The quantitative method was better placed to achieve the expected research outcome.
3.3.1 Research Philosophy: Positivist Paradigm

Collins (2010) states that research philosophy refers to the development and nature of understanding. The concept of the paradigm is essential to the research process in all areas of learning (Mangan, Lalwani and Gardner, 2004). The positivist paradigm is a philosophy in agreement with the pragmatist view that knowledge comes from human experience (Collins, 2010). Collins (2010) stated that positivism is an atomistic, ontological view (nature of reality) of the world involving discrete, observable features and events that work together in a noticeable, determined and regular manner.

3.4 Research Design

The research design employed for the study is a quantitative study. Quantitative research is appropriate for the current study as it allows for testing of objective theories by examining the relationship among variables (Cresswell, 2009a). The same variables can in turn be measured on instruments so that the numbered data can be analysed using statistical procedures (Cresswell, 2009a).

3.5 Population and sample

3.5.1 Population

A population is the universe of units that will be used to select a sample (Bryman, 2012). The population consisted of consumers that purchase eco-friendly products in South Africa. Babbie and Mouton (2003) define a population as “a group of people, items, objects, or elements who meet the designated set of criteria for the study and about whom one wants to draw a conclusion or conclusions”.

3.5.2 Sample and sampling method

Samples were selected from the population in such a way that the sample matches as closely as possible the characteristics of the population (Salkind, 2010). The goal is to
have the sample as close to the population as possible (Salkind, 2010). Stratified random sampling was used. This type of sampling involves dividing the population into a number of groups or strata where members of a group share particular characteristics (Robson, 2011). The characteristics that the member in the sample will share are that they will be consumers that purchase and use eco-friendly products. The most important implication of ensuring similarity between the sample and population is that the research results based on the sample can be generalised to the population (Salkind, 2010). It is, therefore, vital that the sample will be representative of the population. When the sample accurately represents the population, the results of the study are said to have a high degree of generalizability (Salkind, 2010).

The use of real life samples increases the validity of the findings. The respondents are real consumers that consume the eco-friendly products. The sampling technique that was employed was to gain as much data as possible that is representative of the population. The sample size used will be large enough to support analysis.

3.5.3 Sampling Frame

A sampling frame represents a list of all units in the population from which the sample will be drawn (Bryman, 2012). A sample frame is defined as “a selection of subjects from an overall population group that has been clearly defined” (Santy & Kneale, 1998). It refers to the researched setting (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991) and the respondents used in a study (Yang, Wang, & Su, 2006).

The sampling frame was generated from a list of consumers that buy eco-friendly products. A sampling frame is the sum total of units that will be used to drawing the population from which the sample will be drawn (Bryman, 2012; Bryman, 2004; Cresswell, 2009a).

3.5.4 Sample size

The sample size refers to the number units drawn from the sample frame that will be utilised for the research. The sample for this study was made up of 317 respondents. The suggested sample size is sufficient for the software which was utilized for data analysis.
3.5.5 Sampling method

Stratified random sampling was used. This type of sampling involves dividing the population into a number of groups or strata where members of a group share particular characteristics (Robson, 2011). The respondents were consumers that have purchased or are intending to purchase an eco-friendly product.

3.6 The research instrument

The Consumer Style Inventory developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986) was used to measure the decision-making styles of the respondents with some modifications to fit the research topic and the South African context. This scale has been validated by different studies in different countries by previous researchers (Bandara, 2014). In the previous studies, it has reported sufficient value of Cronbach’s alpha as an indicator of the reliability of the scale (Bandara, 2014).

The survey consisted of items measuring all eight decision-making style characteristics formulated by Sproles and Kendall (1986). The questionnaire comprised of two sections; Section A and B. Section A required the respondents to fill in their background information. Sections B, measured each of the eight decision-making style characteristics. Each consumer decision-making style was measured by a five-point Likert scale (Appendix B). The items were measured based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

3.7 Procedure for data collection

Qualtrix was used to create the questionnaire that consumers received. Consumers received an initial email with the link to the questionnaire.

The survey questions were previously employed by Leo, Bennet and Harte (2005) in a similar study as it was seeking to identify the cross-cultural differences in consumer decision-making styles. The survey was used in the context of this research for South African consumers. The respondents received a letter with the email informing them of the
purpose of the research. The questions are all structured in a manner that seeks to address each of the CSI factors as formulated by Sproles and Kendall (1986).

3.8 Data analysis and interpretation

For analysis and interpretation, the researcher will utilise the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) software.

Descriptive statistics will be used to analyse demographical information obtained from questionnaires. Demographical categories included are “age”, “personal annual income”, “race”. These demographical categories will be cross-tabulated with the Consumer Style Inventory factors: brand consciousness, quality, value, fashion consciousness, impulsive buying, recreational shopping and confusion by choice of product and loyalty.

3.9 Limitations of the study

The potential weaknesses of the study may be the fact that the study will be limited to a sample of consumers in Gauteng, the results may not fully represent the population in the rest of South Africa.

3.10 Validity and reliability

The reliability and validity of the Consumer Style Inventory were established using a sample of US high school students, Sproles and Kendall (1986) recommended validating the instrument across other populations (Lyonski & Durvasula, 2010). The research will, therefore, be applied to South African consumers. In order to ensure that reliability, internal and external validity will be upheld in this study, below are details how these were applied in the context of this research paper.

3.10.1 External validity

External validity is the degree to which conclusions in a particular study would hold for other persons in other places and at other times, according to Wainer and Braun (1998).
In order to maximise validity, a sample of consumers that use eco-friendly products formed part of this research. An issue that can be a potential threat to the external validity of the outcome is the fact that the sample was drawn from Gauteng. This may reduce generalizability to the rest of the population in the rest of the country and, therefore, external validity of the study.

### 3.10.2 Internal validity

Internal validity addresses the question of whether a study and its conclusions holds water or is sound – particularly where there is a causal relationship between two or more variables (Bryman, 2012).

All the data received from the respondents was analysed and interpreted accurately to ensure that the results will be accurate for the study. The researcher tried to maximise validity through carefully selecting the respondents that will be required for the sample and ensuring that they meet the criteria of purchased, purchasing or intending to purchase eco-friendly products.

### 3.10.3 Reliability

Kirk and Miller (1986) refer to reliability as firstly, the degree to which a measurement gives the same response repeatedly; secondly, the stability of a measurement over time; and thirdly, the similarity of measurements within a given time period (Kirk and Miller 1986:41).

Reliability of the measurement items was assessed using factor analysis in particular factor loadings, Cronbach’s alpha and Composite Reliability index developed by Hatcher (1994).
CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

This chapter tables the empirical results of the research conducted and concluded. It is important to validate and confirm the empirical outcomes of the study's hypothesis in order to meet the objectives as outlined in Chapter 1.

4.1 Respondent profile

Table 3: Respondent profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that females accounted for 52.4% of the total sample and males accounted for 47.6% of the sample.

Table 4: Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that 26.8% of the respondents were married while 73.2% of the respondents were single.
Table 5: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 years or younger</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25 years</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that the 18-25 years category has the highest age group responses at 46.7% followed by the 26-35 years category at 25.2% as the second highest age group respondents.

Table 6: Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that most of the participants were employed represented by 73.82% indicated by 2. The “Other” occupations had the lowest representation indicated by 0.63% of the total sample.
Table 7: Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the participants had a diploma as their highest academic qualification shown by 38.49% indicated by 2. On the other hand, the least represented qualification was high school which had 0.63% indicated by 1.

4.2 Questionnaire respondent responses

4.2.1 Perfectionist and high quality decision-making style responses
The results above present participants responses to the importance of obtaining high-quality, eco-friendly products to them. The largest group that considered the quality of eco-friendly products to be important to them was represented by 52.37% and the smallest group that considered the quality of eco-friendly products to be important to them was represented by 0.63%.

The results above present the responses of participants as far as purchasing the best eco-friendly products is concerned. The largest group that stated that they purchase the best eco-friendly products was represented by 55.52% and the smallest group that stated that they purchase the best eco-friendly products was represented by 0.63%.
The results above present responses based on trying to purchase the best overall quality eco-friendly products. The largest group of participants that stated that they try to purchase the best overall quality eco-friendly products was represented by 57.41%. The smallest group of participants that stated that they try to purchase the best overall quality eco-friendly products was represented by 1.26%.

The results above present responses based on trying to make a special effort in purchasing the best overall quality eco-friendly products. The largest group of participants that stated that they try to make a special effort to purchase the best overall quality eco-friendly products was represented by 49.53%. The smallest group of participants that
stated that they try to make a special effort to purchase the best overall quality eco-friendly products was represented by 0.63%.

The results above illustrate responses of participants with regards to giving a lot of thought to the purchasing of eco-friendly products. The largest group of participants that stated that they give much thought or care to the purchase of eco-friendly products was represented by 53.63% and the smallest group of participants that stated that they give much thought, or care to the purchase of eco-friendly products was represented by 2.21%.

The results above present responses based on their expectations of eco-friendly products. The largest group of participants that stated that they expect high standards for eco-
friendly products were represented by 53% and the smallest group of participants that stated that they expect high standards for eco-friendly products were represented by 5.99% of the total sample.

The results above present responses to the extent that eco-friendly products have to satisfy the customer. 50.47% of the respondents stated that eco-friendly products have to be the best for them to be satisfied. This group was then followed by 43.85 and 5.68 respectively.

4.2.2 Habitual brand loyal decision-making style responses
The results above present responses of participants of their brand preference of eco-friendly products. The largest group of participants that stated that they buy the same eco-friendly products again and again was represented by 53.94% of the total sample and the smallest group of participants that stated that they buy the same eco-friendly products again and again was represented by 3.15%.

The results above illustrate participants’ respondents on brand loyalty as far as eco-friendliness is concerned. The largest group of participants who stated that they would stick to an eco-friendly brand was represented by 54.26% and the smallest of participants who said that they would stick to an eco-friendly brand was represented by 4.4% of the total sample.
The results above illustrate participants' respondents on store loyalty as far as eco-friendliness is concerned. The largest group of participants who stated that they would stick to the same store was represented by 47% and the smallest of participants who said that they would stick to the same store to purchase eco-friendly products was represented by 1.58% of the total sample.

4.2.3 Brand conscious and price equals quality decision-making style responses

The results above illustrate participants' preference for well-known brands. The largest group of the respondents that stated that they prefer well-known brands was represented by 47% of the sample and the smallest group of participants that stated that they prefer well-known brands was represented by 6.62%.
The results above illustrate participants' preference for the more expensive eco-friendly brands. The largest group of the respondents that stated that they prefer the more expensive brands represented 66.25% of the total sample and the smallest group of the respondents that stated that they prefer the more expensive eco-friendly brands represented 2.21% of the total sample.

The results above illustrate participants' preference for high-quality, eco-friendly brands. The largest group of the respondents that stated that they prefer the higher quality eco-friendly brands represented 61.51% of the total sample and the smallest group of the
respondents that stated that they prefer the higher quality eco-friendly brands represented 0.95% of the total sample.
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The results above illustrate participants' preference for the best-selling eco-friendly brands. The largest group of the respondents that stated that they preferred the best-selling eco-friendly brands represented 59.62% of the total sample and the smallest group of the respondents that stated that they preferred the best-selling eco-friendly brands represented 0.95% of the total sample.
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The results above illustrate participants’ responses to eco-friendly brands being very good choices. The largest group of the respondents that stated that the eco-friendly brands are...
usually very good choices represented 37.85% of the total sample and the smallest group that stated that the eco-friendly brands are usually very good choices represented 0.95% of the total sample.

The results above illustrate participants' responses to eco-friendly products having to look perfect or the best to satisfy them. The largest group of the respondents that stated that eco-friendly products have to look perfect or the best in order to satisfy them represented 66.25% and the smallest group of the respondents that stated that eco-friendly products have to look perfect or the best in order to satisfy them represented 2.25%.
4.2.4 Innovative and fashion conscious decision-making style responses

The results above illustrate participants’ responses to simply purchasing eco-friendly brands purely for trial purposes. The majority of participants who stated that they would simply purchase eco-friendly brands to see what they are like was represented by 61.20% of the sample and the smallest group of participants who stated that they would simply purchase eco-friendly brands to see what they are like was represented by 0.63% of the sample.

The results above illustrate participants’ responses to trying new eco-friendly products only once. The majority of participants who stated that they would try new eco-friendly products...
only once are represented by 68.88% and the smallest group of participants who stated that they would try new eco-friendly products only once was represented by 0.95%.

The results above illustrate participants' responses to trying new eco-friendly products personally before others try them. Most of the participants that stated that they would prefer to try eco-friendly products personally before others try them represented 54.26% of the total sample and smallest portion of the participants that stated that they would prefer to try eco-friendly products personally before others try them represented 1.58% of the total sample.
The results above illustrate participants’ responses to investigating new eco-friendly products before using them. The largest group of participants who stated that they would investigate new eco-friendly products before using them was represented by 50.16% of the total sample and the smallest group of participants who stated that they would investigate new eco-friendly products before using them was represented by 5.36%.

The results above illustrate participants' responses to the need for obtaining information on new eco-friendly products that they would wish to purchase. The largest group of participants that stated that they need would to obtain information on new eco-friendly products that they would wish to purchase represented 17.96% of the total sample and the smallest group of participants that stated that they would need to obtain information on new eco-friendly products that they would wish to purchase represented 0.63% of the total sample.
The results above illustrate participants’ responses to purchasing eco-friendly brands in order to get some variety. The largest group of participants that stated that they would purchase eco-friendly brands in order to get some variety represented 19.56% of the sample and the smallest group of participants that stated that they would purchase eco-friendly brands in order to get some variety represented 5.99% of the sample.

4.2.5 Recreational shopping decision-making style responses
The results above illustrate participants’ responses to shopping for eco-friendly products being pleasant. The largest portion of participants that stated that shopping for eco-friendly products is pleasant for them represented 45.74% of the sample and the smallest portion of participants that stated that shopping for eco-friendly products is pleasant for them represented 0.63% of the sample.

The results above illustrate participants’ responses to shopping for eco-friendly products being a good use of their time. The largest portion of participants that stated that shopping for eco-friendly products is a good use of their time represented 32.81% of the sample and the smallest portion of participants that stated that shopping for eco-friendly products is a good use of their time represented 0.63% of the sample.
The results above illustrate participants’ responses to shopping for eco-friendly products just for the fun of it. The largest portion of participants that stated that they would shop for eco-friendly products just for the fun of it represented 29.02% of the sample and the smallest portion of participants that stated that they would shop for eco-friendly products just for the fun of it represented 1.58% of the sample.

4.2.6 Price conscious and value for money decision-making style responses
The results above illustrate participants’ responses to buying eco-friendly products at sales prices. 30.28% stated that they would purchase eco-friendly products at sales prices representing the largest group and 2.21% stated that they would purchase eco-friendly products at sales price representing the smallest group.

The results above illustrate participants’ responses to eco-friendly products being their preferred choice. 49.84% stated that eco-friendly products are their preferred choice representing the largest group and 7.89% stated that they would purchase eco-friendly products are their preferred choice representing the smallest group.
The results above illustrate participants’ responses to whether they would carefully find the best value eco-friendly products. The largest group that stated that they would try to find the best value eco-friendly products represented 57.41% of the population and the smallest group that stated that they would try to find the best eco-friendly products represented 1.26% of the population.

4.2.7 Impulsive and careless buying decision-making style responses

The bar graph demonstrates that almost half of the participants are impulsive when it comes to purchasing eco-friendly products indicated by 49.53% and only 0.63 % are not impulsive when it comes to purchasing eco-friendly products.
The results above illustrate participants' responses to whether they would make careless eco-friendly product purchases. The largest group that stated that they are more likely to make careless eco-friendly product purchases accounted for 53.63% of the total sample and only 2.21% of the total sample accounted for those who do not make careless eco-friendly product purchases.

The results above show that more than half of the respondents (53%) would rush to buy the best eco-friendly products, and only 5.99% would not rush to buy eco-friendly products whereas the rest (41.01%) are indifferent.
The results above illustrate the distribution of sample responses to the item “I rush to purchase best buys for eco-friendly products.” Only 19 respondents felt neutral about this, representing 5.99% of the total sample, while 41.01% and 53% of the sample respectively agreed and strongly agreed that they rush to purchase the best buys for eco-friendly products.

4.2.8 Confused by over choice decision-making style responses

The distribution in the bar graph above illustrates sample responses to spending recklessly on eco-friendly products. 18 respondents felt neutral about spending recklessly on eco-
friendly products, constituting 5.68% of the total sample. However, 139 and 160 responses agreed and strongly agreed that they spent recklessly on eco-friendly products, representing 43.85% and 50.47% of the sample.

Almost half of the total sample of respondents agreed that there were many brands of products to choose from that they often felt confused, as shown in the distribution of the bar graph above. Out of 317 respondents in the sample, 171 strongly agreed while 136 agreed, representing 53.94% and 42.9% of the sample respectively. Neutral responses accounted for 3.15% of the sample, represented by ten (10) responders.
The distribution of the sample responses to the item “It’s hard to choose stores to shop from for eco-friendly products.” Respondents who strongly agreed with the statement represented more than half (54.26%) of the sample, respondents who agreed represented 41.32% of the sample and 4.42% felt neutral about whether it was hard to choose which stores to shop from for eco-friendly products.
4.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA): Model and Model Fit
### 4.4 Sample description

**Table 8: Sample profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>≤ 17 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-25 Years</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26-35 Years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>36-45 Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 46 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Other Occupations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Academic Qualifications</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Qualifications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Measurement instrument

4.5.1 Measure validation

Structural equation modelling was employed for the purpose of analysing data. The technique is highly considered for testing theory (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004) and suits the nature of the study. The study followed a two-step approach recommended by Anderson and Gerbing, (1998) and Hair et al., (1998). The first approach that is Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to evaluate the reliability and convergent and discriminate validity of construct measures (Nusair & Hua, 2010; Chinomona & Pretorius, 2011).

Overall adequate model fit is indicated by a Chi-square/degrees of freedom value <3, a Normed Fit Index (NFI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and a Composite Fit Index (CFI) value ≥0.90 as well as a Random Measure of Standard Error Approximation (RMSEA) value ≤ 0.08 in addition to Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Augmented Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) values ≥ 0.90 (Chen & Lin, 2010; Bone, Sharma & Shimp, 1989; Chinomona et al., 2011).

The overall model fit test indicated an acceptable fit of data to the measurement model: Chi-square/degrees of freedom= 383.352/146, CMIN/DF=2.04; NFI=0.90; TLI=0.90; IFI=0.92; CFI=0.92; RMSEA=0.06.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>less than 3</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>less than 0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: GFI=Goodness of Fit Index; NFI=Normed Fit Index; RFI=Roamed Fit Index; IFI=Incremental Fit Index; TLI=Tucker Lewis Index; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA=Random Measure of Standard Error Approximation

### 4.6 Reliability and validity assessment

Table 9 below indicates loadings of individual items on their respective constructs while scale construct correlations are depicted in Table 10.

**Table 9: Scale accuracy analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research constructs</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's test</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item-total</td>
<td>α value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist &amp; High Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ1</td>
<td>4.380</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Conscious &amp; Price Equals Quality</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused by Over-Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research constructs</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Cronbach’s test</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Factor loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Item- total</td>
<td>α value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC3</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying</td>
<td>ICB1</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICB2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICB3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICB4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Brand Loyal</td>
<td>HBL1</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HBL2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HBL3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Conscious &amp; Value for Money</td>
<td>PCM1</td>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCM2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCM3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Shopping</td>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative &amp; Fashion</td>
<td>IF1</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PHQ=Perfectionist & High Quality; BCQ=Brand Conscious & Price Equals Quality; COC=Confused by Over-Choice; ICB=Impulsive & Careless Buying; HBL=Habitual Brand Loyal; PCM=Price Conscious & Value for Money; RS=Recreational Shopping; IF=Innovative & Fashion

SD= Standard Deviation       CR= Composite Reliability   AVE= Average Variance Extracted

* Scores: 1 – Strongly Disagree; 3 – Moderately Agree; 5 – Strongly Agree
Measurement CFA Model fits

χ²/DF=2.626; NFI=0.865; TLI=0.896; IFI=0.912; CFI=0.911; RMSEA=0.069

A loading that is above 0.5 signifies convergent validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Item loadings exhibited in Table 2 are therefore indicating acceptable item reliabilities as they are all greater than 0.5. This implies that items’ variance represent more than 50 percent of their respective constructs. Employing a formula proposed by Fornell and Lacker, (1981) composite reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were also determined. CR values shown in Table 2 are all exceeding the recommended threshold 0.6 (Chinomona, 2011; Nunnally, 1967) thus confirming the existence of internal consistency and reliability of the respective measures. All AVE values were greater than the recommended value of 0.5 thus indicating good representation of latent constructs by respective items as advocated in literature (cf. Fraering & Minor, 2006; Fornell et al., 1981; Sarstedt, Ringle, Smith, Reams & Hair, 2014). These result provided confirmation of acceptable research scale reliability.

Table 10: Correlation between the constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research constructs</th>
<th>PHQ</th>
<th>BCQ</th>
<th>COC</th>
<th>ICB</th>
<th>HBL</th>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist &amp; High Quality (PHQ)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Conscious &amp; Price Equals Quality (BCQ)</td>
<td>0.607”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused by Over-Choice (COC)</td>
<td>0.570”</td>
<td>0.718”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research constructs</td>
<td>PHQ</td>
<td>BCQ</td>
<td>COC</td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>HBL</td>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>0.586**</td>
<td>0.621**</td>
<td>0.686**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitusal Brand Loyal (HBL)</td>
<td>0.567**</td>
<td>0.450**</td>
<td>0.608**</td>
<td>0.602**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Conscious &amp; Value for Money (PCM)</td>
<td>0.743**</td>
<td>0.498**</td>
<td>0.614**</td>
<td>0.636**</td>
<td>0.757**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Shopping (RS)</td>
<td>0.576**</td>
<td>0.674**</td>
<td>0.556**</td>
<td>0.633**</td>
<td>0.505**</td>
<td>0.595**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative &amp; Fashion (IF)</td>
<td>0.626**</td>
<td>0.617**</td>
<td>0.751**</td>
<td>0.632**</td>
<td>0.459**</td>
<td>0.512**</td>
<td>0.677**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PHQ=Perfectionist & High Quality; BCQ=Brand Conscious & Price Equals Quality; COC=Confused by Over-Choice; ICB=Impulsive & Careless Buying; HBL=Habitual Brand Loyal; PCM=Price Conscious & Value for Money; RS=Recreational Shopping; IF=Innovative & Fashion

* Scores: 1 – Strongly Disagree; 3 – Moderately Agree; 5 – Strongly Agree

Discriminant validity determined by examining if whether items are loading high on their own constructs than on any other construct (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2014). Inter-correlation values for all paired latent variables exhibited in Table 3 are less than the recommended threshold 1.0 (Chinomona, 2011). These results are therefore confirming the existence of discriminant validity.
4.7 Structural model

Figure 4 below is a representation of the path model. The circles or ovals represent the latent variables while the rectangles or squares represent the observed variables with measurement errors adjacent to them in circular or oval shape too. The unidirectional arrow signifies the influence of one construct on another.

Figure 4: Structural model
The model is acceptable in terms of overall goodness of fit since largely, results achieved the thresholds recommended by Chen et al., (2010), Bone et al., (1989) and Chinomona et al., (2011): Chi-square/degrees of freedom= 383.352/146, CMIN/DF=2.4; NFI=0.91; TLI=0.94; IFI=0.95; CFI=0.95; RMSEA=0.05. Table eleven below presents the current study’s results of path analysis. Literature asserts that a standardized path coefficient that is at least 0.2 or preferably greater than 0.3 is accepted (Chin, 1998).

Table 11: CFA Model Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>less than 3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>less than 0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: GFI=Goodness of Fit Index; NFI=Normed Fit Index; RFI=Roamed Fit Index; IFI=Incremental Fit Index; TLI=Tucker Lewis Index; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA=Random Measure of Standard Error Approximation.

The results exhibited in Table 12 below provide support for all four hypotheses.
Table 12: (PHQ) Hypothesis testing results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Hypothesis Relationship</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Rejected/Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist &amp; High Quality (PHQ) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>-0.433 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Conscious &amp; Price Equals Quality (BCQ) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>-0.328 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Brand Loyal (HBL) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>-0.521 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused by Over-Choice (COC) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.701 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Conscious &amp; Value for Money (PCM) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>-0.467 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Shopping (RS) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.684 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative &amp; Fashion (IF) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H7</td>
<td>0.598 (^a)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(\chi^2/DF=2.810; NFI=0.853; TLI=0.884; IFI=0.900; CFI=0.900; RMSEA=0.073\)
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter puts forward a discussion of the empirical results of the research conducted as presented in Chapter 4. The results in this chapter are interpreted and evaluated in accordance with the research propositions formulated in Chapter 2 in the literature review. The results discussion per hypothesis and the conclusion are discussed.

![Conceptual Model](image)

Figure 5: Conceptual Model
5.1 The relationship between perfectionist high quality decision making style and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is an inverse relationship between the Perfectionist, High Quality (PHQ) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this relationship exists. The coefficient of H1 was -0.433, and this suggests an inverse relationship between PHQ and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.

5.2 The relationship between brand conscious and price equals quality decision making style and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is an inverse relationship between the Brand Conscious & Price Equals Quality (BCQ) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this relationship is inverse. The coefficient of H2 was -0.328, and this suggests an inverse relationship between BCQ and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.

5.3 The relationship between habitual brand loyal decision making style and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is an inverse relationship between the Habitual Brand Loyal (HBL) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this inverse relationship exists. The coefficient of H3 was -0.521, and this suggests an inverse relationship between HBL and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.
5.4 The relationship between confused by over choice decision making style and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is a positive relationship between the Confused by Over-Choice (COC) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this relationship exists and is significant. The coefficient of H4 was 0.701, and this suggests a strong relationship between COC and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.

5.5 The relationship between price conscious and value for money decision making style and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is an inverse relationship between the Price Conscious & Value for Money (PCM) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this inverse relationship exists. The coefficient of H5 was -0.467, and this suggests a strong relationship between PCM and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.

5.6 The relationship between recreational shopping and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is a positive relationship between the Recreational Shopping (RS) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this relationship exists and is significant. The coefficient of H6 was 0.684, and this suggests a strong relationship between RS and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.
5.7 The relationship between innovative and fashion decision making style and impulsive and careless buying discussion

The study proposed that there is a positive relationship between the Innovative & Fashion (IF) decision-making style and impulsive and careless buying (ICB). Based on the results of this study, it has been confirmed that this relationship exists and is significant. The coefficient of H6 was 0.598, and this suggests a strong relationship between IF and ICB. The P value indicates a 0.01 level of confidence which, therefore, means that the hypothesis is supported and significant. The arguments as put forward under hypothesis development in Chapter 2 are accepted.
CHAPTER 6. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter tables the implications and recommendations of the research findings as outlined in Chapter 5. As initially indicated, the study sought to identify the Influence of consumer decision-making styles on impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

6.1 Conclusions of the study

The results of the research were in line with the hypothesis initially put forward in Chapter 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Hypothesis Relationship</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Rejected/Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist &amp; High Quality (PHQ) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>-0.433 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Conscious &amp; Price Equals Quality (BCQ) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>-0.328 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Brand Loyal (HBL) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>-0.521 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused by Over-Choice (COC) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.701 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Conscious &amp; Value for Money (PCV) Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>-0.467 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Shopping (RS) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.684 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative &amp; Fashion (IF) → Impulsive &amp; Careless Buying (ICB)</td>
<td>H7</td>
<td>0.598 a</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported and significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Results Structural Equation Model Analysis
Note: \( \chi^2 / DF = 2.810; \) NFI = 0.853; TLI = 0.884; IFI = 0.900; CFI = 0.900; RMSEA = 0.073

Individual coefficients of H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, and H7 were -0.433, -0.328, -0.521, 0.701, -0.467, 0.684 and 0.598 respectively. These results convey that confused by over choice (COC) has the strongest influence on impulsive careless buying (ICB). The inverse influences exist with price and high quality (PHQ), brand conscious and price equals quality (BCQ), habitual brand loyalty (HBL) and price conscious and value for money (PCM) decision-making styles. HBL has the weakest influence on ICB at -0.521.

6.2 Implications of the study

This study has provided a few vital implications that must be taken into consideration by both marketing practitioners and academics alike. The results convey that the confused by over-choice (COC) decision-making style has the highest positive influence on impulsive and careless (ICB) buying of eco-friendly products. This implies that consumers have various products to choose from, however, these products are not clearly differentiated and positioned to the consumer thus the consumer is highly confused by the choices available and as a result is more likely to make an impulsive and careless purchase of a product.

6.2.1 Managerial implications

The importance of practitioners to have more knowledge of the influencing decision-making styles to South African consumers is vital. The concept of the “green marketing” process is as a result of the rise of the green consumer, one that has pro-environmental concerns and thus buys products that are not harmful to the environment.

The results indicated that the strongest influence of impulsive careless buying are consumers that are confused by over-choice of products that are available in the market. This indicates that practitioners must reformulate their product positioning strategies and increase their brand awareness to consumers so that they may become more loyal to one brand and repeat the purchase of that brand.
Currently, the results indicate that brand loyalty has the weakest influence on consumers; this further illustrates the importance of increasing consumer brand loyalty and ensuring that consumers can differentiate the different products from other brands that are available on the market. Practitioners must, therefore, invest more in positioning their brand's products as the most impactful to the environmentally conscious consumer.

6.2.2 Academic implications

The study has provided literature with research results of key influences towards buying eco-friendly products. The "green" phenomenon is still relatively new in South Africa, and thus this research shows the extent to which consumers are influenced when making the "green" purchases. This study will contribute to the literature as it puts forward the argument that consumers are most influenced by confusion of over-choice when making purchases of eco-friendly products.

6.3 Recommendations

Based on the conclusions above, it is recommended that for eco-friendly brands to have a distinctive brand within the highly competitive market place, there needs to be more investment into building brands that will be clearly differentiated from other brands in the market. Consumers' level of confusion will thus be lower when the marketing practitioners have provided the consumer with relevant information about the respective product and the consumer can differentiate the chosen product.

When practitioners formulate strategies for products that are sold to consumers, they need to support this with intensive drives to educate the consumers about the products on offer. Clearly differentiating the brand so as to ensure that the consumers know that the products on offer will meet or exceed their expectations will benefit the organisations that produce these products. A weak influence of brand loyalty indicates weak branding, and thus this has to be improved.
6.4 Suggestions for further research

The following areas are suggested for further research to improve strength and applicability of the CSI model to the South African context as well as improve eco-friendly product sales.

- Research into the applicability of the Consumer Styles Inventory model to other different products in South Africa and the rest of Africa
- Research that will indicate whether there is a relationship between consumer income levels and green purchases
- Research that will investigate whether gender has an impact the level of consumers that purchase eco-friendly products
- Research on how consumers that are confused by over choice can be reached by marketing practitioners in order to create brand loyalty

It would be beneficial to the academia if this study was conducted with a focus on a different type of product example: clothing, electronics, etc. This study was conducted only within the Gauteng region (one of nine South African provinces); it would be advantageous if future studies would be conducted nationally or in the Southern Africa region.
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Dear Sir/Madam

Questionnaire

Thank you for paying attention to this academic questionnaire. The purpose of this research is to examine the influence of decision-making styles on impulsive and careless buying of eco-friendly products.

I am therefore, requesting your assistance to complete the questionnaire below. The research is purely for academic purposes and the information obtained will be kept confidential.

It will take you approximately 5 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Yours Sincerely

Zamani Tshabalala
APPENDIX B

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

The section is asking your background information. Please indicate your answer by ticking (X) on the appropriate box. The questions are strictly for research purpose only.

A1 Please indicate your gender

- Male
- Female

A2 Please indicate your marital status

- Married
- Single

A3 Please indicate your age category

- 17 years or less
- 18 – 25 years
- 26 – 35 years
- 36 - 45 years
- 46 years upwards

A4 Please indicate your highest academic level

- High School
- Diploma
- Degree
- Post graduate degree
- Other (specify)

A5 Please indicate your occupation

- Student
- Employed
- Self-employed
- Unemployed
- Other (specify)
SECTION B:

“Eco-friendly products” refers to goods that keep both environmental and human safety in mind such as organic food, eco-friendly shopping bags, green clothing, solar powered electronics, recyclable goods, etc.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by ticking the corresponding number in the 5 point scale below:

1. Perfectionist and high quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Getting very good quality eco-friendly products is very important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When it comes to purchasing, I get the very best choice of eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I try to buy the best overall quality of eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I make special effort to choose the very best quality of eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I give my eco-friendly products purchases a lot of thought or care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My standards and expectations for eco-friendly products I buy are very high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>An eco-friendly product has to be perfect or the best to satisfy me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Habitual brand loyal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have favourite eco-friendly brands I buy again and again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once I find an eco-friendly brand I like, I stick with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I go to the same stores each time I shop for eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. *Brand conscious and price equals quality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The well-known eco-friendly brands are best for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The more expensive eco-friendly brands are usually my choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The higher the price of an eco-friendly brand, the better its quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The most advertised eco-friendly brands are usually very good choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>An eco-friendly product has to look perfect or be the best, to satisfy me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. *Innovative and fashion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>When I see a new or different eco-friendly brand, I often buy it just to see what it is like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am the kind of person who would try any new eco-friendly product once.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would rather try out new eco-friendly products myself than wait for someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When I see a new eco-friendly brand that is somewhat different from usual, I investigate it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I hear of new eco-friendly products I want to purchase, I find out more about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I enjoy taking chances in buying unfamiliar eco-friendly brands of goods just to get some variety in my purchases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. *Recreational shopping*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shopping for eco-friendly products is a pleasant activity to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shopping for eco-friendly products is a good use of my time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I enjoy shopping for eco-friendly products just for the fun of it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Price conscious and value for money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I buy eco-friendly products at sale prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The lower priced eco-friendly products are usually my choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I look carefully to find the best value for eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Impulsive and careless buying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am impulsive when purchasing eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I make careless eco-friendly product purchases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I rush to purchase best buys for eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Confused by over-choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are so many brands of products to choose from that I often feel confused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It's hard to choose which stores to shop from for eco-friendly products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The more I learn about eco-friendly products, the harder it seems to choose the best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All the information I get on different eco-friendly products confuses me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>