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Executive Summary

To this date, the majority of textile and apparel companies worldwide have strict secrecy around their suppliers and production facilities, and consumers have few rights in terms of access to and knowledge of how goods are produced. As a response, “Framtiden i Våre Hender” initiated a petition for an ethics law in 2015, which are now up for debate within the Norwegian Government. The goal of this law is to give consumers and organisations the right to request information regarding the working conditions under which goods are manufactured.

The purpose of this thesis was to further explore the proposed Norwegian ethics law, and its effect on consumer behaviour. As trust is an important element in influencing consumer behaviour, we investigated whether trust have an effect on consumers’ behavioural intentions. In addition, involvement with social consumption was investigated as a source strengthening this relationship. The industry tested in this thesis is the textile and apparel industry, social consumption encompasses consumers’ interests in ethical purchasing and corporate social responsibility, the behavioural intentions are defined in terms of a) seeking for additional information and b) avoiding repurchasing, and trust is measured by two dimensions; benevolence and credibility.

Through a within-subjects design, this thesis identified that consumers were more willing to seek additional information, with the availability of an ethics law, when the firm was perceived as less benevolent and credible. However, we revealed that less trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm had a low explanation rate towards consumers’ willingness to avoid repurchasing from the brand. Hence, we recommend marketing managers to increase transparency and factory list disclosure, which will help in building and maintaining their relationship with the consumers, in addition to reinforce its reputation as a trustworthy party.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

Accounting for nearly one-third of the world’s employment (James & Montgomery, 2017), the textile and apparel industry remain a critical part of the international economy. The industry represents a great part of manufacturing, production, trade, and employment in many developing countries, making the industry an important contributor to the process of development of these nations and their integration into the world economy (Keane, 2008). The textile and apparel industry offers a range of opportunities in terms of export of goods, providing income, and low-entry jobs in labour abundant countries due to the labour cost advantage (Keane, 2008). Moreover, the exploitation of low labour cost is vital as apparel retailers worldwide have been forced to operate on low cost and flexibility in design, quality, and speed, in order to maintain a profitable position in the increasingly challenging market environment (Bhardwaj & Fairhurst, 2010).

In Norway alone, the textile and apparel industry trades for nearly 40 billion annually (excluding value added tax) and accounts for more than 10 per cent of Norwegian retail regarding consumer products (Virke, 2017). Virke (2015) revealed that the import value of apparel in Norway reached 19.4 billion NOK in 2015, an increase of 12.6 per cent from the year before. Moreover, similar to apparel companies from all over the world, Norwegian textile and apparel firms benefit from the exploitation of the labour cost advantage in developing countries in order to meet the increasing consumer demand.

1.2 Social Responsibility

Existing literature has described that, over the years, consumers have begun to realize a responsibility of being concerned about their purchases (Joshi & Rahman, 2015). More and more tend to identify themselves as socially conscious consumers (Dickson, 2000; Gam, 2011; James & Montgomery, 2017; Laroche, Bergeron, & Barbaro-Forleo, 2001), which is defined by Webster (1975) as a consumer who attempts to use his or her purchasing power to bring about social change. Hoffmann and Hutter (2012) demonstrated that consumers around the world remain interested in improving the ethical behaviour of companies, which is
supported by Kang and Hustvedt (2014), who explain that consumers have the right and power to influence how organisations conduct their businesses.

Nowadays, fashion consumers expect and call for constant product change and that products are available on a frequent basis (i.e. fast fashion) (Bruce & Daly, 2006). Additionally, firms operating in the textile and apparel industry have to face consumer demands for the production of garments under non-exploitative conditions such as; safe and healthy working environment, fair labour wages, and ensuring labour right (Awaysheh & Klassen, 2010) (i.e. operate in a socially responsible way). For the purpose of this study, the term social responsibility will encompass the areas; safe working condition, fair wages, and human rights.

Moreover, textile and apparel corporations worldwide are currently experiencing greater demands and public pressure from their customers, media, and non-governmental organisations for greater responsibility and transparency regarding the names and addresses of their factories and suppliers (Kang & Hustvedt, 2014). Deegan (2002) demonstrate that there has indeed been an increase in disclosure and greater transparency regarding certain organisations’ social responsibility initiatives in recent years. However, literature suggests that there are instances where organisations have failed to present the “whole truth” and omitted vital information (Devin, 2016). When this asymmetry of information occurs, companies can mislead consumers by offering products as responsibly sourced, when it is in fact sourced from a non-responsible supplier (Guo, Lee, & Swinney, 2015). A result of this is that consumers all over the world remain sceptical and unconvinced about the truthfulness of the organisations’ claims (Hwang, Lee, & Diddi, 2015; Sneddon, Soutar, & Lee, 2014) and remain unknowledgeable and uninformed about the production process of the garments they purchase (Dickson, 2000; James & Montgomery, 2017).

1.3 The Emergence of an Ethics Law

To this date, the majority of textile and apparel companies worldwide have strict secrecy around suppliers and production facilities, by refusing to increase the transparency of their global labour practices and subsequently disclose factory list information (Doorey, 2005). While many textile and apparel companies operate with manufacturing facilities that comply with local law, numerous firms do not
ensure socially responsible actions that extend beyond the requirements of local legislation (Doorey, 2011). Recently, scholars have proposed numerous laws that would require organisations to disclose information related to how they act with regard to their own employees (Estlund, 2009; Williams, 1999). However, in regards to corporations in the textile and apparel industry, there is presently no law worldwide that require supply chain disclosure (Doorey, 2011).

Recognizing the transparency issues in the textile and apparel industry, and the fact that consumers have few right in terms of access to and knowledge of how goods are produced, in 2015, “Framtiden i Våre Hender” initiated a petition for an ethics law that gives consumers and organisations the right to request information regarding the working conditions under which goods are manufactured. With support from over 24,000 Norwegian consumers, the ethics law was introduced to certain political parties (Kristelig folkeparti, Senterpartiet, and Miljøpartiet), before acquiring support from the Norwegian government in June 2016 (Edland-Gryt, 2016). Currently, the Norwegian Government is further developing the law (Stortinget, 2016). Members of the Norwegian Parliament consider an ethics law to be an important step in the right direction as it encompasses potentially changes through transparency, and ensures consumers’ right to additional information regarding the production process and workers conditions (Stortinget, 2016). The proposed ethics law carries similarities to the existing Norwegian environmental law (“Miljøinformasjonsloven”), which has resulted in increased consumer knowledge and awareness, and played a major role in a number of environmental issues (e.g. “palmeoljekampanjen”).

While literature concerning an ethics law is limited, literature provides various arguments why transparency is important in terms of corporate social responsibility (Dubbink, Graafland, & Van Liedekerke, 2008). Doorey (2011) emphasize that transparency can provoke positive institutional changes, such as factory disclosure. This will lead to greater accountability by companies in regard to how products are being produced, which in time would possibly improve labour practices. For this reason, the impact of an ethics law is thought to influence business behaviour, leading to change in a positive way, by ordering companies to publicly report on the identity of the suppliers and under which

---

1 Norway’s largest environmental and solidarity organization with over 25,000 members.
conditions their products are manufactured. As the increased transparency may reflect poorly on the company's operations (e.g. ethically), an ethics law might in fact encourage companies to ultimately improve their initial operation for compliance with labour standards. This is supported by certain factory disclosure advocates, who argue that, if the identify of organisations’ suppliers became public, the organisations would pay closer attention to the supplier’s operations, including the factory workers’ working conditions (ETAG, 2003).

Further, we believe that an ethics law would contribute to positive organisational changes. Primarily, this would occur by facilitating actors such as; consumers, journalists, non-governmental organisations, and academics, in the discovery of labour abuses. These abuses then can be linked to specific brands, which in the end may result in diverse negative behavioural outcomes and responses towards these brands. Although an ethics law may possibly influence other responses, such as boycotting, negative consumer campaigns, or negative press and news articles (Doorey, 2011), in this thesis, we will focus on behavioural outcomes in form of certain behavioural intentions towards firms operating in the textile and apparel industry, when accounting for an ethics law.

**The Impact of an Ethics Law on Behavioural Intentions**

While the long-term consequence of an ethics law is to foster transparency and enhance corporate social responsibility behaviour of companies (Edland-Gryt, 2016), we believe that the influence of such a law is first and foremost to affect consumer behaviour. However, until now, this matter has remained just a theory because there has been an absence of a law that requires disclosure of the identity of a company’s supply chain factories (Doorey, 2011). First, we anticipate that the emergence of an ethics law, issued by the government, will affect consumers’ information seeking process. This is because the law ensures consumers’ right to request information about the conditions under which the goods (e.g. textile and apparel products) are manufactured, which again would make it easier for consumers to make ethical purchasing choices.

As previously mentioned by diverse scholars (Hustvedt & Dickson, 2009; Shaw, Hogg, Wilson, Shiu, & Hassan, 2006), consumers purchasing behaviour would be affected more frequently if consumers are made aware of how and where their
clothes are being manufactured. In their study, Carrigan and Attalla (2001) state that there is reason to believe that unethical behaviour would lead to customers switching or dropping the firm completely. On these ground, we expect that an ethics law is likely to affect consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing from a textile and apparel brand. Thus, consumers’ intention to seek additional information and their intention to avoid repurchasing, when in support of an ethics law, is central for this thesis.

The Impact of an Ethics Law on Trust

To this date, as companies are not required to disclose additional information to the public (e.g. supplier and factory lists), the truthfulness of textile and apparel companies’ social responsibility claims are being questioned by consumers worldwide (Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2010; Hill & Lee, 2012; Niinimäki, 2010). However, the presence of an ethics law would give consumers a voice and the right to request the “whole truth” regarding how, who, and where their clothes are being manufactured, in which they can make an informed purchase. Trust in organizations is considered critical for a long-term relationship (Morgan & Hunt, 1994) and a key driver for future intentions (Teichert & Rost, 2003). The trust consumers’ put in a firm is a focal point for this thesis. More specifically, in this thesis, we argue that trust reflect on individuals’ beliefs about a trustee's benevolent (i.e. to what extent a firm is believed to want to do good to others) and credible (i.e. to what extent the firm’s initial intentions is believed to be trustworthy and reliable) behaviour.

The Impact of an Ethics Law on Involvement

As consumers are shown to be socially concerned about their purchases, and wish to purchase products produced in a socially responsible way (Joshi & Rahman, 2015), we anticipate that consumers’ level of involvement with social consumption will indeed be of great importance in this study. That is, this thesis examines whether consumers involvement with social consumption will strengthen the relationship of consumers’ trust and their behavioural intentions, when under the influence an ethics law. Additionally, consumers’ level of involvement is considered a significant factor when explaining consumer behaviour (S. Knox, Walker, & Marshall, 1994). Supporting this, Teichert and Rost (2003) describes that involvement affects how consumers perform and consider their purchase actions. On these ground, and that certain behavioural
outcomes, when in support of an ethics law, is believed to be more important for socially conscious consumers’ (i.e. highly involved with social consumption), consumers’ level of involvement with social consumption is meaningful to further investigate.

1.4 The Focus of this Thesis and Research Question

In this thesis, the proposed Norwegian ethics law will be used as the context in underlying our investigation of consumers’ behavioural intention, in the empirical setting of Norway. Knowing that the proposed ethics law is a new and undeveloped phenomenon, we are in need of more knowledge and a deeper understanding of the behavioural outcomes of such law. When studying behavioural intentions, we will use the well-accepted theory of information seeking behaviour (Wilson, 1997) and customer churn (G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014). We anticipate an ethics law to have an effect on consumers’ intention to seek additional information and their intention to avoid repurchasing. While these topics have been extensively studied in the marketing literature, to the best of our knowledge, this study will be the first to address the concept of information seeking behaviour and customer churn, when law requirements from standardised authority is present. Moreover, while the concept of trust is recognized as a valuable element in influencing consumer behaviour (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Sirdeshmukh, Singh, & Sabol, 2002), the topic of information seeking behaviour and customer churn has largely neglected to include and investigate the aspect of the multidimensional trust concept. In addition, numerous studies have included the concept of involvement when investigating consumer behaviour (Celsi & Olson, 1988; S. Knox et al., 1994; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). However, to our knowledge, literature concerning consumers’ behavioural intention and involvement, with the presence of an ethics law, remains rather limited. For the purpose of this study, consumers behavioural intentions toward firms operating in the textile and apparel industry was taken into consideration, mainly on the grounds that research regarding information seeking- and customer churn behaviour in this industry has been neglected. The above presentation leads to our research question:

*What is the impact of consumers’ trust in firms on consumers’ behavioural intention, in the context of an ethics law, and to what extent does consumers’ level of involvement affect this relationship?*
1.5 Contribution

The thesis contribution to the field is both theoretical and managerial. The theoretical part is based on our framework, which fills a gap in the current body of consumer behaviour literature, in light of the textile and apparel industry. First and foremost, by examining the effect between consumers’ trust in firms and consumers’ behavioural intention, and how this relationship is affected by consumers’ involvement with social consumption. Secondly, it is essential to investigate the emergence of an ethics law as we feel that it is an academic duty to provide empirical findings to this area and investigate if certain behavioural outcomes; intention to seek additional information and intention to avoid repurchasing, are affected by this undeveloped phenomenon. Lastly, by connecting the Norwegian ethics law to consumers’ behavioural intentions, a vital concept to marketing, one can generate increased attention to academics and implementation of the concept for future research.

The managerial contribution is based on our examination of how consumers’ trust in firms can affect their behavioural intentions, in terms of seeking for additional information and avoiding repurchasing, under the influence of an ethics law issued by the government. Possible consequences of the proposed ethics law are; increased transparency and factory list disclosure, which may prevent firms from being perceived as untrustworthy when it comes to their social responsibility claims. Hence, the secrecy around suppliers, factories, and working conditions would be reduced and consumers would be informed about the production process of the specific company. However, as the “whole truth” regarding the company’s social responsibility operations will become clear for those consumers’ who request additional information, one can believe that companies would receive negative attitudes from its customers. By understanding the effect of an ethics law on behavioural intentions, managers can focus on building and maintaining their company-customer relationship, by meeting their increasing social responsibility demands (e.g. operate in a more social responsible way).

1.6 Structure

The thesis is organized into four sections. The following section contains a literature review elaborating upon consumers’ behavioural intentions, consumers’
trust in firms, and involvement with social consumption. This is investigated in order to analyse whether previous research can give us an indicator of how consumers’ trust in firms affect their behavioural intentions, and if consumers’ level of involvement with social consumption plays a role. This will lead up to our hypotheses and the conceptual model. The third section outlines the methods used to address the research question, before the results of the statistical analyses from the dataset of the study is presented and discussed. To close the study, the findings are discussed in light of theoretical contribution and managerial implications, along with limitations and directions for future research.

2.0 Literature Review

The aim of this literature review is to critically synthesise earlier, published research literature relevant to our main topics, in order to create familiarity with current thinking and research. Central topics for the literature review are consumer’s behavioural intentions, i.e. information seeking process and customer churn, different dimensions of trust, i.e. benevolence and credibility, and consumers’ involvement with social consumption. As a consequence, the thesis will be positioned with related research and thereby show its contribution.

Consumers’ Behavioural Intentions

Theories in social and health psychology have assumed that behavioural intention is a key predictor of behavioural change, as intentions are self-instructions causing individuals to perform particular behaviours or obtain given outcomes (Ajzen, 1985; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Webb & Sheeran, 2006). Several studies of consumer behaviour have measured behavioural intentions instead of actual behaviours (Ajzen, 1985, 2001; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Armitage & Conner, 2001; Johnson, Herrmann, & Huber, 2006; Webb & Sheeran, 2006). Prior research also supports a strong correlation between behavioural intentions and actual behaviours (Abraham, Sheeran, & Johnston, 1998; Ajzen, 1991; Austin & Vancouver, 1996; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Gollwitzer & Moskowitz, 1996; Maddux, 1999; Norman & Conner, 1996; Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw, 1988). This thesis defines behavioural intentions in terms of consumers’ intention to engage in two specific behaviours a) intention to seek additional information and b) intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand (i.e. customer churn).
2.1 Consumers’ Information-seeking Behaviour and its Importance

Literature on information-seeking behaviour within the field of information science has been extensively documented into several thousand reports and journal papers (Dervin & Nilan, 1986; Ellis, 1989, 1993; Kuhlthau, 1991; Wilson, 1981, 1997). In addition, several disciplines have surveyed how people seek and make use of information, and the channels used to gain access to information (Wilson, 1997). In recent years, however, there has been a shift towards a “person-centred” approach, rather than a “system-centred” approach, as most academic articles until the early mid-1970s focused on the system use rather than the user behaviour (Wilson, 2000). The problem with such a perspective is the overly excessive focus on how an individual is using and navigating a given system, instead of seeking to determine the context of an individual’s information needs and his or hers use of the information (Wilson, 2000). Thus, the new approach takes the user’s problem into consideration, and integrates the results into the user’s own life, as well as the evaluation of the usefulness of the information (Kuhlthau, 1991).

Due to the rising technology of the Internet, social media, and various media channels, information for consumers has become more accessible and easily obtained (Sparrow, Liu, & Wegner, 2011). But information about firms’ social responsibility initiatives is, however, often overwhelming and difficult to analyse in order to make a judgement about the quality of the information (Ge, Gao, Li, & Zhang, 2013). It all comes down to the accessibility of information, which is in fact quite limited, as the information on firms’ social responsibility performance is not always accessible to the public.

Needless to say, it appears that the study of human information behaviour, and particular information-seeking behaviour, has become a well-documented area of research (Ge et al., 2013). Although previous research provides important insights into the field of information science, other modes of information seeking may have different characteristics. Examination and comparison across disciplines is thus needed, particularly in the apparel and clothing industry, in order to understand how individuals seek and make use of information in this field, and the factors that may inhibit the process (Kuhlthau, 1991).
Definition and Nature of Information-seeking Behaviour

In this thesis, the concepts developed in Wilson’s model (1997) for information behaviour, is used when describing the terms associated with information seeking, searching, and use\(^3\). Wilson’s (1997) revised model of information-seeking behaviour has managed to consolidate a number of similar models into a nested one, thus providing a generalizable model across contexts (Courtright, 2007; Ellis, 1989; Hamid et al., 2016; Kuhlthau, 1991; Pettigrew, Fidel, & Bruce, 2001). Hence, we strongly believe that Wilson’s model of information-seeking behaviour and the concept proposed is the most relevant one, as it intends to incorporate a number of research fields, and thus make it possible to integrate other studies by using the model as a basis for further research (Wilson, 2000). Consequently, the following review of Wilson’s work, in addition to other authors, shows that inclusion of other sectors, such as the textile and apparel industry, is highly needed in order to expand the generalizability of the information-seeking behaviour of consumers.

In the information behaviour literature, researchers have presented various definitions of information behaviour. However, a much-used definition of information behaviour is: “the totality of human behaviour in relation to sources and channels of information, including both active and passive information seeking, and information use” (Wilson, 2000, p. 49). This is consistent with Pettigrew et al. (2001, p. 44) definition of the term, who define it as the study of “how people need, seek, give and use information in different contexts, including the workplace and everyday living”. This thesis is concerned with information-seeking behaviour in general, and the subsequent paragraphs will thus focus on the definition of information behaviour proposed by Pettigrew et al. (2001), in regard to how individuals seek and make use of information, by connecting it with a different context (i.e. the textile and apparel industry).

As mentioned, the information-seeking behaviour literature have been comprehensively documented and extended by researchers over the years (Ellis, 1989, 1993; Khoo, 2014; Kim, Sin, & Tsai, 2014; Wilson, 1981, 1997). Wilson’s

\(^3\) The model from 1981 is based upon two main propositions: first, that information need is not a primary need, but a secondary need that arises out of needs of a more basic kind; and second that in the effort to discover information to satisfy a need, the enquirer is likely to meet with barriers of different kinds.
model of 1996 draws upon research from fields including decision-making, psychology, innovation, health communication and consumer research (Wilson, 1999). Similar to the framework from 1981, the person in context remains the focus of the information needs, the barriers are described as ‘intervening variables’ and the behaviour of information seeking is identified (Wilson, 1999). The model proposes that at the root of information-seeking behaviour is the concept of information need, which occurs in the mind of the person in need (Wilson, 1997). Consequently, in order to satisfy that need the user locate formal or informal information sources, resulting in either success or failure to find relevant information (Wilson, 1999). Kuhlthau (1991) describes this as a complex interplay, where people move from an initial state of information need to the goal state of resolution, by making a series of choices.

In a similar manner, Ellis’s (1989) elaboration of the different behaviours involved in information seeking consist of a single set of stages or features, where a user beginning to search for information must initiate the starting of the information seeking process and the ending must complete the process. With this, we argue that the stages or features of information seeking behaviour are describing the same activities, as used by Wilson, meaning that it is possible to nest the model within Wilson’s model (2006; 1981, 1997). Further, Kuhlthau (1991) have managed to attach the associated feelings, thoughts and actions, and the appropriate information tasks to the stages of the information-seeking process, thus complementing Ellis’s work (Wilson, 1999). A consequence of users moving through the stages in an information-seeking process are changing judgment of relevance, feelings, thoughts, motivation and mood, as it reflects users’ personal knowledge of the topic and their understanding of the problem (Kuhlthau, 1991).

The framework and concepts of information-seeking behaviour developed by Wilson is strengthened by the fact that other researchers have used similar conceptualizations when describing the different stages in the information-seeking process. However, previous literature and theoretical frameworks have not taken the whole concept of information-seeking behaviour into account in the way Wilson has done (Dervin & Nilan, 1986; Ellis, 1989, 1993; Kuhlthau, 1991). Although the above-mentioned models represent well-documented streams of research, they do not account for the wide variety of information behaviours.
individuals describe and experience in their everyday lives (McKenzie, 2002). Previous models on information seeking have been research-based, and derived from scholars or professionals, which makes them useful in the context of academic or workplace environments. Further study in contexts such as the textile and apparel industry is thus highly needed, in order to establish whether the information-seeking process is transferable across contexts (McKenzie, 2002).

In Wilson’s (1997) revised model of information-seeking behaviour the concepts related to the information-seeking process is accounted for, and will now be further described in this thesis, in order to illustrate how these factors influences the information-seeking process. According to Wilson, the basic needs of a user can be defined as physiological, cognitive, or affective (Wilson, 1999). The context of these needs might evolve from the person him- or herself, the person’s work or social life or the political, economic, or technological environment (Wilson 1999, 252). Wilson (1997) proposes that the concept of information need can be categorized into three categories; need for new information, need to clarify the information held, and need to confirm information held.

Wilson clearly states that there are a number of potential hindrances that exist between the acknowledgement of a need and the activation of the search process. For instance, an individual’s personality, together with other factors, could inhibit the information-seeking process (Wilson, 1997). The barriers or intervening variables that impede or assist the information search will arise out of the same set of contexts as noted above, defined by Wilson as personal barriers, and social or role-related barriers (Wilson, 1997). These constraints could be prior experience, knowledge, and interest, information available, requirements of the problem, and time devoted for resolution (Kuhlthau, 1991). Within the personal barriers, variables such as emotions, education, and demographics characteristics may inhibit or assist information seeking.

Bettman and Park (1980) states that people that are highly knowledgeable in regard to a topic feel less need to search for more information. This is confirmed by MacInnis, Moorman, and Jaworski (1991) who propose that information acquisition become easier the more knowledgeable the individual is, thus contributing to an easier encoding of the information. In regard to the textile and
apparel sector, this shows that consumers’ knowledge may influence the information-seeking behaviour (Hill & Lee, 2012; Niinimäki, 2010), to the extent that consumers with sufficient knowledge about ethical conditions are more willing to support and reward ethical business practices (Dickson, 2000; Khan, Rodrigues, & Balasubramanian, 2016; Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011). However, consumer knowledge of the textile and apparel supply chain remains minimal, with the majority of customers having little knowledge of the origin of the products they buy (James & Montgomery, 2017). Supporting this, Dickson (2000) describes that consumers have insufficient knowledge of the problems related to manufacturing, and as a result, concern for workers, support for socially responsible businesses, and intention to purchase from companies with such initiatives may be lacking. Thus, we find that an important part of conscious consumerism is being able to educate themselves about the hidden cost of production, businesses social responsibility practices, and how their purchases can help to shape more social responsible business practices.

Essential for the information-seeking process is that some source of information is accessible for the user, meaning that the acquisition of information may be inhibited by the lack of an easily accessible source, in addition to impose a higher cost (Wilson, 1997). Purchasing fair trade products implies a more complicated information-seeking process, as consumers have to devote a large amount of time and effort into searching external information (Uusitalo & Oksanen, 2004). In order to make ethical decisions, consumers are dependent upon accessible and accurate information, which are conveyed in a manner that is easily reachable and do not cause any inconvenience for the consumers. In addition, many consumers call for information that facilitates an informed choice, in order to avoid contributing to unacceptable working conditions, such as low wages, and an unsafe working environment. However, in a study of James and Montgomery (2017), the authors found that consumers viewed access to information about production processes and companies’ level of social responsibility as a problem, as there is both a lack of available information in the area and lack of incentives for ethical purchasing.

It has also been acknowledged that there is a lack of trust concerning socially responsible claims in the textile and apparel sector (Hill & Lee, 2012; Niinimäki,
Thus, if the information is unreliable in regard to the quality and accuracy, an individual is likely to perceive the source as lacking in credibility (Wilson, 1997). Low levels of trust in the information source, lack of available and accessible information, and not enough high-quality information often characterize ethical issues, thus influencing consumers information-seeking behaviour (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Maignan & Ferrell, 2004; Nilsson, Tunçer, & Thidell, 2004; Roberts, 1996; Wessells, Johnston, & Donath, 1999).

In order to make information more accessible for consumers, political regulations are a necessity. To this date, there are presently no laws worldwide that require disclosure of the identity of the factories within the global supply chain (Doorey, 2011), which is the intent of the proposed Norwegian ethics law. As consumers have been found to have a positive attitude about increased governmental regulations (Doorey, 2011), implementing regulations in conjunction with voluntary actions by the apparel and textile industry should thus receive consumer support. However, there is a lack of data available in this area and future research is therefore necessary in order to address this issue. More specifically, further research is needed to determine whether and how an ethics law with governmental regulation is likely to affect consumer behaviour.

2.2 Customer Churn and its Importance

The concept of churn has been extensively documented and researched over the years (Bolton, 1998; Burez & Van den Poel, 2009; Karnstedt, Rowe, Chan, Alani, & Hayes, 2011; Keaveney, 1995; G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014; Rust & Zahorik, 1993; Santonen, 2007; Zhang, Zhu, Xu, & Wan, 2012). As repeat purchase intentions differentiate from single transactions, an important issue in the research of behavioural intentions is to identify which constructs are the most predictive of future behaviour of consumers, in order to assess their possibility to stay with or leave the company (Garbarino & Johnson, 1999). However, most research articles to this date have emphasized consumers’ intention to engage in specific behaviours that are perceived to be beneficial to a firm, in contrast to intentions that are harmful to a firm (Keaveney, 1995).

The loss of a customer does not only indicate loss of future earnings and incurring the cost of finding new customers, it also means giving up high margins, as the
cost of acquiring a customer is much higher than the cost of retaining an existing customer (Keaveney, 1995). Thus, in order to survive, companies are dependent on maintaining long-run relationships with their customers. Consequently, managers need to forecast future purchasing and identify whether their customers are at risk of leaving (G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014).

In the context of clothing, a priori knowledge about which customers are at risk for leaving is valuable information for companies, in order to take preventive measures and to be able to focus on identifying customers most likely to churn (Miguéis, Camanho, & e Cunha, 2013). Thus, it is important for companies to understand how customers’ assessment of unethical behaviour influences their subsequent behaviour (Bolton, 1998). Noticeable, consumers access to information and their growing intention to select the best option, constitute a problem as consumers are becoming more intolerant of inconsistent firms (Antón, Camarero, & Carrero, 2007).

The retail sector is becoming increasingly competitive due to globalization, which makes it difficult to attract new customers (Miguéis et al., 2013). Particularly in the retail sector, customers do not have to inform the firm about their intention of leaving, and therefore, retaining current customers is of great importance (Miguéis et al., 2013). Further, consumers have over the years begun to realize their responsibility to be concerned about their purchases (Joshi & Rahman, 2015), while at the same time recognizing the power of their objections to make a positive difference for the textile and apparel workers (James & Montgomery, 2017). More and more consumers tend to identify themselves as conscious consumers and are currently seeking to purchase products and services produced responsibly with social considerations in mind (Dickson, 2000; Gam, 2011; Laroche et al., 2001).

The day-to-day consumption habits of consumers are often driven by convenience, personal preferences, and value for money, in addition to resistance to change (Verbeke & Vackier, 2004). When it comes to ethical consumption, on the other hand, the issues are far more complex and controversial, leaving scholar with conflicting views on the value of social responsibility approaches to marketing activities (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Murphy, Laczniai, & Wood,
2007; Smith & Quelch, 1993). Moreover, whether the ethical or unethical marketing activities of firms have an effect on the purchasing behaviour of consumers is an area of debate, as there is reason to believe that unethical behaviour would lead to customers switching or dropping the firm completely (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001). However, it is neither as simple nor as straightforward, whereby Dragon International (1991) found that punishment of unethical actions (i.e. boycotting) were unlikely if the product was one consumers relied on (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001). Further, it was reported that if consumers had received more information about the ethically and socially responsible activities of firms, they would have been more discriminating in their purchases (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001).

Definition and Nature of Customer Churn

In the customer churn literature, there exist a number of different conceptualizations, and researchers have defined concepts related to the loss of a customer, in similar and different ways over the years (Bolton, 1998; Keaveney, 1995; G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014). Thus, there are several synonyms used to describe customer churn, such as customer attrition, dissolution, and defection - all describing the process in which a customer chooses to end the relationship. Customer defection can be determined as a series of interrelated problems or events, happening over time, which in turn slowly leads to defection. Moreover, defection can be total or partial, where total defection refers to consumers switching to another service provider, while partial defection can be described as a loss of any portion of a customer’s business (Santonen, 2007). In this thesis, we will operate with the widely accepted concept of customer churn, when describing antecedents related to the term, while “intention to avoid repurchasing the brand” will be used synonymously, as the overall term, and in the hypothesis section. In addition, churn will be discussed and analysed as a total defect of the customer.

Thus, for the current study we have chosen to use the definition of G. Knox and Van Oest (2014), stating that customer churn refers to the likelihood that the customer permanently stops buying from the company. This is confirmed by the definition of churn by Lemmens and Croux (2006, p. 276): churn is a marketing-related term that characterizes whether a current customer decides to take his or her business elsewhere. Equal for all customers, is that they start in an active state
and remain until they become inactive, i.e. when churn takes place (G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014). Understanding which factors that drive customer churn is essential, as it can have a profoundly negative impact on firms (Rust & Zahorik, 1993).

Many researchers have investigated the antecedents and factors pertaining to why customers choose to end an on-going relationship with a company (Bolton, 1998; Keaveney, 1995; G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014). However, previous research on customer’s relationship with a service provider has focused solely on satisfaction as the predictor of why customers choose to leave (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Bolton, 1998; Cronin Jr & Taylor, 1992). Although being related to customer churn, satisfaction has proved to be a weak predictor of why customers end an on-going relationship (Bolton, 1998; Caparco, Broniarczyk, & Srivastava, 2003; LaBarbera & Mazursky, 1983). Moreover, previous studies on customer churn have mainly focused on describing a few factors pertaining to the concept, instead of investigating and empirically testing a comprehensive model consisting of diverse constructs and the relationships among them (Ahn, Han, & Lee, 2006). Thus, there is value in broadening the understanding of which factors contribute in influencing customers’ likelihood to churn.

Antón et al. (2007) propose to categorize the antecedents of churn into two types: (1) factors with a direct effect, that directly precipitate the end of a customer relationship, and (2) factors with a moderating effect, which reinforce the direct effects on the customer relationship (e.g. exit barriers, switching costs or emotional links). Factors with a direct effect may be sudden and dramatic, and is caused by conflicts or episodes between customers and firms, which provoke consumers towards ending the relationship. Negative critical incidents can lead to a destabilization of long-term relationships between a customer and a company, meaning that customers start to reconsider the relationship (Van Doorn & Verhoef, 2008). Negative critical incidents are explained as extraordinary events during an interaction that is being perceived or recalled as negative by the customer. This can be connected to Gustafsson, Johnson, and Roos (2005) description of critical incidents, which are referred to as reactional triggers. When something unexpected occurs, either before purchase, during purchase or during consumption, it leads to a more thorough evaluation of present performance,
which may lead customers to switch to a new brand (Gustafsson et al., 2005). A report from McKinsey & Company revealed that Wal-Mart consumers had stopped shopping at the retailer because of negative press the firm had received, as a consequence of their mistreatment of immigrant janitors (Liu, Wang, & Wu, 2010). Thus, it is important to establish whether potential information disclosure taken by companies have a negative impact (e.g. churn) or positive impact (e.g. seeking for additional information) on consumer behaviour.

Previous research suggests that negative information regarding an object is more salient than positive information (Muthukrishnan & Chattopadhyay, 2007). This is consistent with the work of several other practitioners, which suggest that negative pieces of information are more memorable and enduring than positive ones (Cusumano & Richey, 1970; Richins, 1983; Tversky & Kahneman, 1991). In fact, earlier research has established that negative information has a stronger influence purchase intention, than does positive information (Griffin, Babin, & Attaway, 1991). The negativity effect is negative information being weighed greater than positive information in the formation of evaluations, due to it being perceived as more useful than positive information (Liu et al., 2010). When motivated by a concern for accuracy, the weight given to negative information is increased, which in turn causes these consumers to form significant attitude and behavioural changes toward a retailer if it is the object of negative publicity (Ahluwalia, 2002). However, Ahluwalia (2002) found that this is dependent upon the consumers’ processing goal and whether consumers are highly involved in a decision.

Porat and Haas (1969) as well as Streufert (1973) noted that in most cases, the availability of relevant information normally improves the accuracy of decisions. Thus, if the information is “good”, it will typically lead to “good” decision-making (O'Reilly, 1982). Previous research by Engel, Blackwell, and Kollat (1978) suggest that a consumer will not change purchase behaviour until a certain level of information about another alternative has been obtained. Thus, in order to consider another alternative as a viable alternative to defect to, consumers are dependent upon having sufficient knowledge about that other alternative.
There has been an overly excessive focus on quality and satisfaction when demonstrating consumers’ behavioural intention, which do not account for all of the reasons as to why consumers churn or stay with firms. Consequently, finding out which factors influences consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing from a brand is thus of great importance. In addition, the vast majority of previous research has focused on customers’ purchasing behaviour in making predictions (Gupta et al., 2006), while non-transactional elements like involvement and consumers’ trust in firms have been less incorporated by researchers (G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014). Trust and involvement are important non-transactional events, as they represent critical factors in explaining the relationship between companies and their customers (Teichert & Rost, 2003). Further, trust is recognised and viewed as an essential factor for a long-term relationship and a key driver of future intentions (Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; McKnight, Choudhury, & Kacmar, 2002; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Teichert & Rost, 2003). Trust presupposes a long-term relationship between consumer and retailer, and thus goes beyond the day-to-day purchasing. In accordance with research done by Morgan and Hunt (1994), we consider trust to be a precursor of involvement. Commitment and/or involvement involve potential sacrifices from the customers, meaning that trust should be established in order to generate commitment (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; Gustafsson et al., 2005; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). In addition, it is proposed that trust, involvement, and commitment are influential in future intentions of customers (Teichert & Rost, 2003).

However, previous studies on customer churn have mainly been conducted in industries such as bank and telecommunication (Bharti, 2017; Keaveney, 1995), information seeking have been conducted in academic or workplace environments (McKenzie, 2002), while apparel industries have been neglected. Thus, the analysis on behavioural intentions is extended by two core constructs of consumer behaviour: consumers’ trust in firms, and the moderating effect of involvement in terms of consumers’ social consumption, in the context of the Norwegian ethics law.
2.3 Trust in Firms and its Importance

The concept of trust, originally described by psychologists in the 1950’s, has been studied in numerous disciplinary fields, including sociology, management, economics, and marketing (Doney & Cannon, 1997). In the context of marketing, trust has been a focal point in many studies within the consumer behaviour literature and is recognized as an important element in influencing consumer behaviour (Hong & Cho, 2011; Keh & Xie, 2009; Martínez & del Bosque, 2013; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998; Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002). Emphasizing behavioural intentions, substantial advances have been made in the understanding of the trust concept, and its relation to organisations (Ganesan & Hess, 1997; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002; Urban, Sultan, & Qualls, 2000). Morgan and Hunt (1994) were pioneers in studying the trust theory and its centrality to relationship marketing. Their research characterizes trust as a direct predictor of behavioural intentions, while at the same time recognizing trust as a contributor to relationship marketing success. Similarly, Berry (1996) positions consumer trust as the single most powerful relationship-marketing tool available to organisations. Recognizing the importance of the consumer trust concept and its contribution to organisational success, it is essential for managers to understand the process of fostering trust and loyalty by building long-term relationships with their consumers.

In regard to the textile and apparel industry, previous research indicates that consumers prefer socially responsible brands and tend to trust retailers that have a reputation for socially responsible conduct more than they trust other retailers (Castaldo, Perrini, Misani, & Tencati, 2009). In fact, Gupta et al. (2006) discovered that 80% of consumers have higher trust in firms that conduct corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities, meaning firms that assume responsibility towards others in the society, and not only their customers and shareholders. Further, the idea that CSR influence consumer loyalty and trust, is one of the main reasons why organisations’ commit to social responsibility. Therefore, to show their commitment toward this concept, a growing amount of textile and apparel companies have implemented a number of social responsible practices, such as: labour laws to protect the workers right, safe working
conditions, and fair wages for employees (Awaysheh & Klassen, 2010; Chi, 2011).

However, in the past decades, cynicism, scepticism, and dissatisfaction have currently become trademarks of how many consumers deal with the textile and apparel industry (Hwang et al., 2015; Iwanow, McEachern, & Jeffrey, 2005; Sneddon et al., 2014). On this basis, we anticipate that one key reason why these traits become evident is due to the expectancy held by individuals that the companies they are doing business with are honest, reliable, and trustworthy, are in fact not met. As presented in the background, consumers are currently experiencing a violation of trust in textile and apparel firms as recent literature demonstrate that social responsibility claims of apparel companies appear to be untrustworthy (Bhaduri & Ha-Brookshire, 2011; Devin, 2016; Kang & Hustvedt, 2014; Lam & Postle, 2006). In fact, H. Park and Kim (2016) claim that the social responsibility approach taken by apparel brands may be more focused on being perceived as operating in a socially responsible way by its consumers, than truly focusing on fulfilling their commitment. Research show that the truthfulness and the amount of responsibility from companies, is receiving increased attention and is currently being questioned by consumers worldwide (Du et al., 2010; Kozlowski, Searcy, & Bardecki, 2015; Wildt, 2017).

Moreover, scepticism toward the level of social responsibility of companies has been identified as a major problem when organisations are communicating their social responsibility actions (Du et al., 2010). Du et al. (2010) suggest that scepticism mainly occurs because consumers evaluate a company’s CSR efforts as a promotional tool rather than for increasing transparency. A consequence of this is that consumers may perceive a company’s CSR efforts as inauthentic and dishonest, and can result in consumers’ developing mistrust in textile and apparel firms. For instance, if trust is not present, there will be an absence of loyal customers and the company might lose potential profit. Trust has been found to be positively affected by corporate evaluation (Tian, Wang, & Yang, 2011) and product evaluation (Brown & Dacin, 1997). More importantly, consumer trust is recognized as a facilitator of purchase intention (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Lin, Chen, Chiu, & Lee, 2011), while previous literature has similarly concluded that an absence of trust may cause negative behavioural outcomes such as; lack of
commitment (Cho, 2006) and avoid purchasing (Johnstone & Tan, 2015). As noted by Hiscock (2001) and described above, consumer trust in firms is critical when building and maintaining relationships. The ultimate goal of marketing is to generate an intense bond with the consumers. However, consumer trust is shown to be challenging to earn as it can take years to build, but can at the same time be lost very quickly. As exemplified by Urban et al. (2000), failing to meet consumers’ expectations is indeed considered the quickest way to destroy trust.

Despite the many studies on trust and its centrality to consumer behaviour, no study has investigated consumers’ trust in firms and their behavioural intentions, neither in the textile and apparel context, nor when in support of an ethics law. To the best of our knowledge, no previous empirical studies in the textile and apparel sector have examined consumers’ trust in firms and included an alternative to such law. In particular, little is known about the effect of an ethics law and its relationship with consumers’ trust in firms and their behavioural intentions. In order to get a broader understanding of consumers’ perceived trust in firms, the following section will further review the definition of trust and its dimensions.

**Definition and Nature of Trust**

The literature of trust suggests that trust consist of a relationship between two parties, but as a concept, trust has often been characterized as both complex and multidimensional. The complexity of the trust construct became evident after frequent attempts to fully explain the meaning and dimensions of the concept (Mayer et al., 1995). While early research conceptualized trust as one persons’ expectation about the behaviour of a partner (Barber, 1983; Rotter, 1967), later scholars focused on the importance of acceptance and vulnerability (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Ganesan, 1994; Kumar, Scheer, & Steenkamp, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). Throughout this thesis, the conceptualization of acceptance and vulnerability will be employed and reflected in consumers trusting beliefs (i.e. cognitive aspect) in firms.

The cognitive aspect has a tendency to be conceptually clustered into three dimensions: integrity (e.g. principles, honest, positive values), benevolence (e.g. concern, positive motives, caring, openness), and ability (e.g. skills, competence, implementation) (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Mayer et al., 1995; Sirdeshmukh et al.,
2002). As a set, these three characteristics appear to be the recurring themes in establishing trust (Mayer et al., 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). Although integrity, benevolence, and ability are related and often measured jointly (Doney & Cannon, 1997), these dimensions of trust have also been acknowledged as distinct and treated separately (Kumar et al., 1995). In contrast to Mayer et al. (1995) characterization of trust (e.g., integrity, benevolence, and ability), previous literature has examined the trust construct by focusing on the dimensions of benevolence and credibility (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Dwyer, Schurr, & Oh, 1987; Ganesan, 1994; Kumar et al., 1995). This view has been well accepted in the marketing literature, where benevolence is related to an organisation’s goodwill behaviour, whereas credibility reflects on its competence and reliability.

Throughout this thesis, the trust dimensions, benevolence and credibility, will be employed when investigating if consumers’ trust in firms will consequently influence their behavioural intentions, mainly by using Ganesan (1994) arguments. This means that the trust consumers’ put in a firm is based on (1) their trust in the benevolence of the firm (i.e. their belief in the positive intentions of the firm) and (2) their trust in the credibility of the firm (i.e. their belief that the firms have the ability to perform and fulfil their promises). In this thesis, we argue that trust reflects individuals’ beliefs about a trustee's benevolent and credible behaviour, thus making it a suitable measurement of consumers’ perceived trust in firms operating in the textile and apparel industry.

Socially responsible actions are generally based on a firm's desire to act on behalf of the customer and the society, rather than only for the firm's best interest (Dubbink et al., 2008). Thus, we argue that consumers cannot perceive a socially responsible business, which has a desire to make a positive impact for the society, as having lack of benevolence. Hence, based on this and the fact that benevolence has proven to be a crucial precondition for trust to exist (Poon, 2013; Vlachos, Koritos, Krepapa, Tasoulis, & Theodorakis, 2016; Vlachos, Krepapa, Panagopoulos, & Tsamakos, 2013) and if not the most influential form of trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995), benevolence will be one of the two dimensions of trust employed in this thesis. Credibility will be the second dimension used throughout this thesis. Since making an actual positive impact on society is only accomplished if the socially responsible actions that were initially promised are
followed through. For a company, this implies that it will be perceived as being credible if the firm demonstrates that it can actually deliver what was promised to the consumers. Additionally, firms operating in the textile and apparel industry are frequently shown to only present half-truth information to the public, which again can ultimately undermine the credibility of an organisation (Devin, 2016; Kang & Hustvedt, 2014; Lam & Postle, 2006). Moreover, companies within the apparel and textile industry may not act in the manner originally presented as they only want to be perceived as a socially responsible organisation, but does not incorporate socially responsibility within their core strategy. On the other hand, some socially responsible actions originally intended may be prevented due to challenging demands, such as the global economic system, and so forth. Thus, firms can still be understood as trustworthy if their consumers perceive their intentional actions as benevolent. Benevolence can indeed exist even when the actual credibility of firms is imperfect. Even if the distinctive dimensions of trust may vary independently, they may jointly contribute to overall consumer trust (Ganesan, 1994). In this thesis, the role of benevolence and credibility in regard to consumers’ behavioural intentions will be further reviewed individually, mainly by the use of Ganesan’s (1994) arguments.

The Role of Benevolence

In his work on trust, Ganesan (1994) conceptualized benevolence as a dimension of trust that encompasses the positive intentions, motives, characteristics, and responsiveness communicated by the firm, rather than its specific behaviour. Benevolence is by J. Park, Lee, and Kim (2014, p. 297) defined as: “Consumers' belief that a company is genuinely concerned with the preservation and enhancement of the welfare of society.” The positive motive aspect is also emphasized by Mayer et al. (1995), who explain that companies who demonstrate a genuine concern or have a desire to do good to others will be trusted to a greater extent than firms that solely have an egocentric profit motive. In accordance with Ganesan’s (1994) theory of benevolence, in this thesis, benevolence is defined as to what extent a firm is believed to want to do good to others.

Benevolence towards the society can be demonstrated by organisations that are showing a genuine concern about the welfare of the society (J. Park et al., 2014). In the textile and apparel industry, we have observed a gradual shift towards
increased importance of being perceived as a benevolent socially responsible business, and being perceived as good corporate citizens (McPhee, 2014; Siltaoja, 2006). More and more textile and apparel companies are currently seeking diverse approaches to engage with benevolent socially responsible activities, and have incorporated social responsibility into their business strategies (Fulton & Lee, 2013). Although actions in such areas may be minor, companies still demonstrate responsibility for others beyond the business itself, mainly to ensure that consumers’ will have more trust in the benevolence of the firm (N'Goala, 2007; Siltaoja, 2006).

There are various ways that affect consumers’ trust in the benevolence of the firm. Benevolent actions are mainly a company’s way of demonstrating concern for the society and primary stakeholders and their need (Siltaoja, 2006). In regard to the textile and apparel industry, these actions are often incorporated through a firm’s organisational values and commitment, in order to address social responsibility issues. In particular, certain textile and apparel firms that priorities benevolence actions typically aim to drive positive impacts throughout their value chain by empowering people, protect their employees right, and supporting communities in form of charitable actions. Firms who incorporate such values into their business strategy are more often perceived as a benevolent firm by its consumers, than firms that refrain from prioritizing socially responsible actions.

**Benevolence’s Effect on Consumer’s Behavioural Intentions**

In order to address the proposed research question, this thesis examines whether consumers’ trust in the benevolence of the firm will have an effect on consumers’ intention to seek additional information and their intention to avoid repurchasing, when under the influence of an ethics law. Knowing that the proposed ethics law is a new and undeveloped phenomenon, it is not surprising that no previous research has investigated the effect of such a law on the aspects of benevolence and behavioural intentions of consumers’ trust. However, in a broad sense, one can argue that our thesis is similar to the broad-spectrum of literature concerning consumer trust and behavioural intentions (Hong & Cho, 2011; Martínez & del Bosque, 2013; Morgan & Hunt, 1994), which are aspects we believe will be affected by an ethics law.
The study of Vlachos et al. (2013) gives us a favourable indication that communicated benevolent activities is shown to directly increase consumer trust, and indirectly increase consumer loyalty. This reasoning is further supported by the arguments of McKnight et al. (2002), who demonstrate that benevolence, one of three trusting beliefs, positively influences particular behavioural intentions (e.g. following the vendor’s advice, sharing personal information, and purchasing from the vendor’s website). Based on these studies, evidence confirms that perceived benevolence does in fact have an effect on consumer behavioural intention.

However, with regard to the textile and apparel industry, consumers are sceptical of the truthfulness of firms’ social responsibility initiatives (Du et al., 2010). This may be due to firms being more focused on being perceived as wanting to do good to others (i.e. benevolent motives), rather than actually fulfilling this commitment (J. Park et al., 2014). In similar manners, Du et al. (2010) discovered that consumers often consider a firm’s communicated CSR initiatives as a promotional tool (i.e. egocentric profit motive), and not an attempt at transparency. Moreover, Bhaduri and Ha-Brookshire (2011) claimed that the presence of malevolence (i.e. wishing harm to others) proved to have a significant effect on consumers’ perceived trust in firms (e.g. less trust in firms). Thus, as the presence of benevolence is highly important when the firm’s goal is to earn their consumers trust (Poon, 2013; Vlachos et al., 2013) we argue that less trust in the benevolence of the firm can indeed carry similarities to the presence of malevolence activity.

Bettman and Park (1980) states that people that are highly knowledgeable in regard to a topic feel less need to search for more information. Thus, since consumer knowledge of the textile and apparel supply chain remain minimal with the majority of customers having little knowledge of the origin of the products they buy (James & Montgomery, 2017), we argue that these consumers are more inclined to use the ethics law to seek additional information. As emphasized earlier, the weight given to negative information is greater than the weight given to positive information, which in turn causes consumers to form significant behavioural changes toward a retailer (Ahluwalia, 2002). Thus, it is of great importance to examine if less trust in the benevolence of the firm (i.e. negative information) and more trust in the benevolence of the firm (i.e. positive information) has different effects on behavioural intentions. Further, consumers’
access to information constitutes a problem, as they become more intolerant of inconsistent firms (Antón et al., 2007). Carrigan and Attalla (2001) propose that there is reason to believe that unethical behaviour of firms may lead customers to drop the brand (i.e. avoiding repurchasing) completely. Both information seeking and customer churn are, due to an ethics law, possible behavioural outcomes. Also, since benevolence is demonstrated to positively affect certain behavioural intentions (Ganesan & Hess, 1997; Wu, Huang, & Hsu, 2014), it is reasonable to assume that the benevolent aspect of trust in firms might affect consumers information seeking-and avoiding repurchasing behaviour in similar manners.

To our knowledge, there have not been any studies investigating the effect of consumers trust in the benevolence of the firm when examining consumer’s information seeking behaviour or their intention to avoid repurchasing, in the context of an ethics law. Thus, we hypothesise that:

**H1a:** Consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm

**H1b:** Consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm

**The Role of Credibility**

Credibility refers to a firm’s commitment that is reliable, with the belief that the firm will fulfil its promises completely (Ganesan, 1994). In contrast to benevolence, credibility is linked to organisational behaviour, where a firm is perceived as credible when the information provided is accurate and consistent with the specific behaviour demonstrated. Consistent with the credibility literature, in this thesis, credibility will be considered with regards to what extent the firm’s initial intentions is believed to be trustworthy and reliable.

The degree of credibility is often based on firms’ structural assurances, such as guarantees, regulations, promises, certificates, or other procedures provided to ensure that their initial social responsibility intention is followed through (Du et al., 2010). Textile and apparel industry companies are increasingly committing to addressing the issues of poor labour conditions and human rights by taking greater responsibility in terms of ensuring an improvement of social responsibility
challenges (Yu, 2008). This is mostly ensured by introducing corporate codes of 
conducts, joining multi-stakeholder initiatives for social responsibility, such as 
fair wear, ethical trading initiatives, united nation environmental programme, and 
fair labour associations, which mainly involve governments, civil society 
organisations, and the private sectors (Fulton & Lee, 2013; Mena & Palazzo, 
2012). Thus, we anticipate that firms who commit to such initiatives receive a 
certain degree of credibility among the consumers, whereas firms that do not 
commit have far less. In the same manner as ensuring benevolence, credibility 
builds on the importance of meeting their consumer’s expectations that firms are 
operating in a socially responsible way, as highlighted in the background.

Credibility’s Effect on Consumer’s Behavioural Intentions
Concerning the proposed research question, the current study explores whether 
consumers’ trust in the credibility of the firm will have an effect on consumers’ 
intention to seek additional information and their intention to avoid repurchasing, 
when under the influence of an ethics law. To our knowledge, no prior research 
has considered the effect of an ethics law when exploring consumers’ trust, more 
specifically, the credibility aspect and behavioural intentions. This is as 
anticipated, as the new law is an undeveloped phenomenon. Thus, the relevance of 
such law is of strong interest when investigating consumers’ trust in the credibility 
of firms and consumers behavioural intentions, in the textile and apparel industry.

As highlighted by Ganesan (1994), credibility is often used when investigating 
individuals’ trust in organisations. Similarly, Doney and Cannon (1997) 
investigated the field of consumer trust, and discovered that credibility is 
considered a strong predictor of consumers trust in firms. With respect to the 
textile and apparel industry, low levels of credibility often characterize ethical 
issues, and are influencing certain behavioural intentions of consumers (Carrigan 
& Attalla, 2001). In fact, Kelly and Schine (1992) provide evidence that a firm's 
long-term relationship with their consumers could be jeopardized when the firm 
proved to be a dishonest and unreliable actor.

In their study on consumer behaviour, Ito, Larsen, Smith, and Cacioppo (1998) 
discovered that negative (i.e. untrustworthy and unreliable) information has a 
greater effect on certain consumer buying behaviour, than positive (i.e. 
trustworthy and reliable) information. This is mostly due to the fact that
consumers tend to place more weight on negative information than positive (Ito et al., 1998). Based on this, we find it essential to investigate if less trust in the credibility of the firm (i.e. negative information) has a greater impact on behavioural intentions, than more trust in the credibility of the firm (i.e. positive information). Moreover, Antón et al. (2007) explain that consumers become more intolerant of firms as access to information constitute a problem. Thus, since consumer knowledge of the textile and apparel supply chain remains minimal (James & Montgomery, 2017), we argue that these consumers are more inclined to use the ethics law to seek additional information. Further, in their study of consumer behaviour, Carrigan and Attalla (2001) propose that there is reason to believe that a firm’s unethical behaviour may lead to consumers dropping the brand completely. As previous research has demonstrated that credibility does indeed impact consumers behavioural intention in form of purchasing (Doney & Cannon, 1997), there is reason to believe that consumers trust in the credibility of the firm might have a corresponding impact on consumers’ information seeking behaviour and their intention to avoid repurchasing.

To our knowledge, there is a lack of research regarding the effect of consumers trust in the credibility of the firm on consumer’s information seeking behaviour and their intention to avoid repurchasing, in the context of an ethics law. Thus, we hypothesise that:

**H2a:** Consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm

**H2b:** Consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm

### 2.4 Consumer Involvement and its Importance

The concept of involvement has been demonstrated by many researchers as an influential factor when explaining consumer behaviour, and is often related to a person’s needs, values, and beliefs (Celsi & Olson, 1988; G. Knox & Van Oest, 2014; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; D. Park, Lee, & Han, 2007; Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981; Schiffman, O’Cass, Paladin, & Carlson, 2013; Solomon, 2014; Zaichkowsky, 1985). Involvement influences the extensiveness of information search and the formation of beliefs, intentions, and attitudes. Additionally,
involvement influences behavioural outcomes, including variety-seeking behaviour and brand-commitment or loyalty (Verbeke & Vackier, 2004). Further, involvement includes aspects of motivation, arousal and interest, which have an impact on how consumers perform and reconsider their purchase actions (Teichert & Rost, 2003). The construct is regarded as a precedent of commitment and could thus predict long-term relationships. Research in consumer behaviour has mainly focused on involvement as a moderator of the amount and type of information processing (Petty et al., 1983). Thus, as this thesis is focusing on consumers’ trust in firms (i.e. benevolence and credibility) and their intention to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing, we believe that consumers’ level of involvement with social consumption can affect the relationship between trust and behavioural intentions. In this thesis, the term social consumption will encompass consumers’ interests in ethical purchasing and corporate social responsibility, respectively.

**Definition and Nature of Involvement**

With a variety of interpretations and definitions of the concept, involvement has received considerable attention after the introduction of the term by Krugman in 1965 (Celsi & Olson, 1988; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; Liu et al., 2010; Zaichkowsky, 1985). A reason for the diverse definitions of involvement is due to the different applications of the term. A person can be involved with different objects (e.g. advertisements, products, or purchase decisions), which will lead to different behavioural responses (Zaichkowsky, 1985). For this thesis, we will be using the definition by Zaichkowsky (1985, p. 342), stating that involvement is “a person’s perceived relevance of the object based on inherent needs, values, and interests”. Thus, we argue that the following definition of the term is applicable to this specific study, as involvement leads to different responses.

**The Moderating Effect of Involvement**

To address the research questions, this thesis examines whether consumers involvement with social consumption will strengthen the relationship of consumers’ trust and their behavioural intentions (i.e. intention to seek additional information and their intention to avoid repurchasing), when under the influence of an ethics law. In their study of consumer behaviour, Celsi and Olson (1988) discovered that consumers who experience a higher level of involvement in an information processing situation, will be more motivated to comprehend that
information and thus allocate more cognitive resources to the process, than consumers who experience a lower level of involvement. This can indicate that as the level of involvement increases, consumers allocate a greater amount of effort to comprehend environmental stimuli and to elaborate upon the information and form inferences from it (Celsi & Olson, 1988), which may lead to changes in behaviour (e.g. seek more information or avoid repurchasing).

Liu et al. (2010) propose that some individuals are more sensitive to corporate acts of social responsibility, especially firms who take the society’s well-being into account. Thus, for these consumers, a firm’s ethical behaviour may have an impact on their willingness to punish unethical behaviour, by avoiding repurchasing, or rewarding ethical behaviour, by seeking for additional information. Consumers who are more involved with a firm’s corporate social performance may be less willing to tolerate negative behaviour or information about the given company (Liu et al., 2010). In comparison, consumers who are less involved and sensitive towards corporate acts of social responsibility are expected to process the negative information in a biased manner, meaning that they may ignore a firm’s misbehaviour (Liu et al., 2010). For this reason, we believe that higher levels of involvement with social consumption will strengthen consumers’ intention to seek additional information and avoiding repurchasing, when consumers’ have less trust in the benevolence and credibility in the firm. Thus, we hypothesise that:

**H3:** When involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with (a) less trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than (a) consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) more trust with the credibility of the firm

**H4:** When involvement with social consumption, consumers with (a) less trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than (a) consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) more trust in the credibility of the firm


2.5 Theoretical Framework

In the following section, we propose a theoretical framework based on the discussions in the preceding sections, illustrated by the conceptual model below (see figure 1). The framework examines how consumers’ perceived trust in firms (i.e. benevolence and credibility) influences consumers’ intention to engage in two distinctive behavioural intentions; intention to seek additional information and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand. In the proposed model, the two dimensions of trust are conceptualized to have a direct effect (i.e. outcome) on the two behavioural intentions. Involvement is investigated as a source that can affect the relationship of consumers’ perceived trust in firms (i.e. benevolence and credibility) on consumers’ intention to seek additional information and consumer’s intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand. The Norwegian ethics law is the context surrounding the relationships described.

The conceptual model reflects the following relationships: First, (H1a) measures if consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm. Then, (H1b) measures if consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm. Further, (H2a) measures if consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm, while (H2b) measures if consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm. Lastly, we want to test whether involvement is a source that has an effect on the relationship of consumers’ perceived trust in firms (i.e. benevolence and credibility) on consumers’ behavioural intentions (i.e. to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing). More specifically, when consumers’ involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with (a) less trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than (a) consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) more trust in the credibility of the firm, measured through (H3). Likewise, when consumers’ involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with (a) less trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the
brand, than (a) consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) more trust in the credibility of the firm, through (H4).

**Figure 1:** Conceptual model showing the hypotheses

### 3.0 Methodology

The design of our thesis will now be accounted for, with a description of its population and sample, followed by an operationalization of the constructs, both the independent and dependent. In the end of the section, we present the manipulation check and the two pre-tests, before the data collection procedure is described.

#### 3.1 Research Design

Since the following study have formulated specific hypotheses and a clear statement of the problem, in addition to describing market characteristics and functions, a descriptive research design is appropriate (Malhotra, Kim, & Agarwal, 2010). The proposed effects i.e. how the dimensions of trust affect consumers’ behavioural intentions, in support of law requirements, requires
primary data in order to investigate the relationship between the variables in a new context. Descriptive research in the form of a web survey was undertaken to collect information from a given sample of population elements only once, also referred to as cross-sectional design (Malhotra et al., 2010).

For this study, a 1x2 within-subjects design with one factor (involvement) and two levels (positively formulated trust scenario and negatively formulated trust scenario) was chosen in order to answer our outlined research question. Further, this design was employed to be able to find a cause-effect relationship between the independent variables (consumers’ trust in the benevolence-and credibility of the firm) and the dependent variables (consumers’ behavioural intentions to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing). This design was used to prove that the chosen independent variables demonstrated a change in the selected dependent variables, thus causing causality (Malhotra et al., 2010) and not only prove that the variables are simply correlated (Hopkins, 2008).

Respondents of the web survey was exposed to two similar scenarios with different conditions (positively formulated trust and negatively formulated trust), as shown in table 1, and then asked to state the extent to which they agreed/disagreed with diverse statement regarding the level of trust they put in the firm of the scenarios. A within-subjects design was suitable to test our selected hypotheses, as it allowed the same scenarios to be presented to each and every individual from the survey. Erick and Fischhoff (1998) uncovered that individuals feel more compelled to differentiate their answers when presented to two scenarios at once and allowing them to contrast each scenario. Thus, scenarios in the within-subject design were appropriate to employ as the scenarios was intentionally manipulated in order to receive contradictory answers (i.e. more trust in the benevolence/credibility of the firm for the positively formulated trust scenario and less trust in the benevolence/credibility of the firm for the negatively formulated scenario).

In our web survey, we asked the respondents to imagine a Norwegian brand operating within the textile and apparel industry, which was referred to as the brand in the scenarios and throughout the survey. The two different scenarios were all within the same context (i.e. the Norwegian market), and included value
statements describing a firm's social responsibility efforts, gathered from existing apparel and textile brands in Norway. We chose to not include actual companies in the description of the value statements, as Klein and Dawar’s (2004) review of earlier research revealed that using real companies reduced the effects of the intended manipulations, which may have cluttered the results. Moreover, it reduced the risk of respondents using existing associations, when answering the survey.

In the positively formulated trust scenario, the value statements informed respondents that the brand had an immense focus on creating better living standard for the textile workers, by expecting their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that commit to their values and sign their ethical guidelines (see appendix A). This signals high benevolent activity. Further, in the negatively formulated trust scenario, the value statements stated that the brand had an insignificant focus on creating better living standard for the textile workers, by allowing their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories who refrain from committing to their values and sign their ethical guidelines (see appendix B). In other words, this signals low benevolent actions. Thus, both scenarios had the same value statements, except from the words describing benevolence and credibility.

However, as the respondents were exposed to multiple scenarios, we varied the order of the scenarios presented (i.e. randomization) to minimize the risk of biased answers, which is considered a psychological consequence associated with within-subjects design scenarios (Charness, Gneezy, & Kuhn, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positively formulated trust scenario</td>
<td>More trust in the benevolence/credibility of the firm in scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively formulated trust scenario</td>
<td>Less trust in the benevolence/credibility of the firm in scenario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: The condition of the positively formulated trust scenario and the negatively formulated trust scenario of the web survey*
Population and Sample

Qualtrics\(^4\) was used to gather data, which enabled us to recruit respondents over the Internet and publish it on Facebook. As the following thesis aims to study effects of the proposed Norwegian ethics law based on Norwegian scenarios and self-chosen companies, we chose to use a sample of Norwegian-speaking only, in order to avoid cultural differences and a biased result (Hofstede, 2001). Convenience sampling was used by recruiting family, friends, and members of social organizations on Facebook, due to it being the least expensive and time-consuming out of the sampling techniques (Malhotra et al., 2010). It is important to note that convenience sampling is not representative of the target population, and self-selection bias is present meaning that the respondents can initiate their own selection. Thus, a large sample was needed in order to make valid conclusions and reduce sampling errors (Malhotra et al., 2010). Moreover, a larger sample enables us to get a larger distribution of gender, age, and different subcultures of the society. By posting public statuses and personal messages on Facebook, we were able to get a relatively large sample size in short period of time, as the respondents were easily accessible and mostly willing to participate.

3.2 Operationalization of the Variables

As the sample consisted of Norwegian-speaking only, the questionnaire was translated to, and distributed in Norwegian, in order to make it easier for the respondents to understand specific words and terms (see appendix E for Norwegian version; and appendix F for the English version).

To ensure content validity for all of the constructs, we adapted items from previously tested and validated scales, which will be accounted for in the subsequent sections. However, as verbal changes were highly needed in order to fit the constructs to the right context in a meaningful way, the statements were translated from English to Norwegian, and then back to English. This was done in order to ensure reliable translations. Except from the opening questions and demographics, the questions were measured on a seven-point Likert-scale, where the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a scale from 1=strongly disagree, and 7=strongly agree. For this thesis, we chose the current scale, due to it being appropriate when measuring attitudes (Malhotra et al., 2010).

\(^4\) A Web-based online survey service
Trust in Firms

For the independent variables, benevolence and credibility, the questions were based on the operationalization and scale by Mayer and Davis (1999). Benevolence was measured through four statements: (1) “I trust that the brand is concerned about the society’s welfare”, (2) “I trust that the society’s needs seems to be important to the brand”, (3) “I trust that the brand would not knowingly hurt the society”, (4) “I trust that the brand will go out of its way to help the society.” For the credibility construct, scales were derived from Wu and Shaffer (1987), and were measured through two statements: (1) “I think that the brand appears to be trustworthy”, (2) “I think that the brand appears to be reliable”.

Involvement

For the moderator, involvement, we derived scales from S. Knox et al. (1994) and then adapted the statements in order to measure the constructs in a meaningful way: (1) “I am generally interested in corporate social responsibility (CSR)”, and (2) “I am generally interested in ethical purchasing”.

Behavioural Intentions

In measuring the respondent’s’ engagement in terms of intention to seek additional information and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand, two questions were used: (1) “How likely is it that you would seek additional information about the brand’s clothing production and ethical initiatives?” and (2) “How likely is it that you would avoid purchasing from the brand in the future?” are based on the operationalization of Ajzen (2002), and adapted to fit our two behavioural intentions, intention to seek additional information and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand, respectively.

Validity and Reliability

As our questionnaire is based on well-tested scales, we were able to measure each construct and assume high content validity (S. Knox et al., 1994; Mayer & Davis, 1999; Wu & Shaffer, 1987). Further, an important aspect of our study is construct validity, as we used multiple items to test the different constructs. This includes nomological, unidimensionality, convergent validity, and discriminant validity (J. Hair, Black, & Babin, 2010). The first one, nomological validity, is ensured through an examination of the different constructs and items. The factor loadings
are assessed for determining the underlying dimensions of the variables in the dataset. Moreover, the evaluation of convergent validity, is evaluated by examining the factor loadings and the average variance extracted, whereas discriminant validity is accounted for by systematically assessing the indicators to avoid overlaps. This has further been evaluated through factor analyses and the square root of the average variance extracted. Additionally, in order to assure reliability of our study, Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability analyses is used to confirm internal consistency reliability (J. Hair et al., 2010).

3.3 Data Collection

Before the distribution of the survey and data collection took part, a manipulation check and two pilot studies of the questionnaire was conducted. All of these were developed by using Qualtrics, and then distributed on Facebook to a random set of friends.

Manipulation Check of the Scenarios

First, the manipulation check was conducted to make sure the scenarios were perceived as intended, and whether the respondents perceived the firm’s value statements as realistic. The manipulation check was distributed on Facebook, to a convenience sample of 12 respondents, and took about 1-2 minutes to complete. We chose to select users between the age of 20 and 60, to be able to ensure the same background as the ones used in the actual survey (Malhotra et al., 2010).

In the manipulation check we used scenarios and a within-subjects design, as it enabled the respondents to compare the two scenarios - one representing the positively formulated trust scenario, and the other representing the negatively formulated trust scenario. We developed two questions to assess if the scenarios captured the definition of the constructs, benevolence and credibility (see appendix C), since multiple variables were included to test each construct. The question used to measure the respondents’ perceived benevolence were based on Mayer and Davis (1999): “To what extent do you think the brand shows compassion and care about others?”, while the respondents’ perceived credibility was based on Wu and Shaffer (1987): “To what extent do you think the brand is a trustworthy and reliable company?”. In addition, we included one question for the purpose of measuring whether the respondents found the scenarios to be realistic or not: “To what extent do you think the situation described in the scenario is
realistic?”. Lastly, the respondents were encouraged to report if there was anything in the survey that was difficult to understand. These questions were later removed when distributing the final questionnaire.

We conducted a paired samples t-test\(^5\), in order to see if the mean fit values of the scenarios were significantly different from each other. For the positively formulated trust scenario (scenario 1), the results from the manipulation check revealed that the respondents had more trust in the benevolence of the firm (mean 6.25), as well as the credibility of the firm (mean 6.17). In contrast, for the negatively formulated trust scenario (scenario 2), the respondents had less trust in the benevolence of the firm (mean 1.58), along with the credibility of the firm (mean 1.33). Also, it is worth noting that the respondents found both scenarios to be fairly realistic, where scenario 1 received a mean value of 5.25 and scenario 2 a mean value of 5.50 (see table 2). To evaluate the difference between the benevolence of the firm and the credibility of the firm, a seven-point Likert-scale was used to measure the questions related to the scenarios. From the result of the paired samples t-test (see table 3), it appears that the respondents perceived the benevolence of the firm (\(t = 15.065\ p = 0.000\)) and the credibility of the firm (\(t = 20.055\ p = 0.000\)) to be significantly different from each other, and the scenarios was implemented in the forthcoming pre-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Sen1_real</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sen2_real</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Sen1_ben</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sen2_ben</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Sen1_cred</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sen2_cred</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Paired sample statistics*

\(^5\) Compares the means of two variables/measurements from two matched groups; within subject design
Pre-test

After the manipulation check on the scenarios was completed, we conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire with the two different scenarios (see appendix F), in order to identify and eliminate eventual problems (Malhotra et al., 2010). Similar to the manipulation check, the pre-test was distributed on Facebook, to 15 respondents, and took 3-4 minutes to complete. However, three uncompleted answers had to be removed prior to conducting a statistical analysis, more specifically, a paired samples t-test in SPSS, which was employed to gain insight into the diverse mean fit values.

From the results of the first pre-test, we identified more insignificant differences among the questions from each scenario, than significant differences (see table 4). Regarding the questions related to the perceived benevolence of the firm, question posben_2 and negben_2 (t = 0.566 p = 0.583) and question posben_3 and negben_3 (t = 0.240 p = 0.815), did not significantly differ from each other. Correspondingly, the second question related to the perceived credibility of the firm, poscred_2 and negcred_2 (t = -0.205 p = 0.842), which illustrates that the difference was not significant. Similarly, the questions related to the respondent’s involvement with social consumption revealed insignificant results of posinv_1 and neginv_2 (t = -0.971 p = 0.352) and posinv_2 and neginv_2 (t = -0.616 p = 0.551), however, this is as expected as most respondents identified themselves as highly involved with social consumption throughout the survey (i.e. in both scenarios). For the dependent variable, the question regarding the respondents’ intention to seek additional information, posint_seek and negint_seek (t = -0.284 p = 0.782), displayed similar results of insignificant differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Sen1_real - Sen2_real</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.897</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Sen1_ben - Sen2_ben</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>15.065</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 Sen1_cred - Sen2_cred</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>20.055</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Paired sample test
Paired Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Condition Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>posben_1 - negben_1</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>posben_2 - negben_2</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>posben_3 - negben_3</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>posben_4 - negben_4</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>poscred_1 - negcred_1</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>poscred_2 - negcred_2</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>posinv_1 - neginv_1</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.971</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>posinv_2 - neginv_2</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>-0.616</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>posint_seek - negint_seek</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 10</td>
<td>posint_avoid - negint_avoid</td>
<td>-2.417</td>
<td>-5.800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Paired sample test

The results of the paired sample t-test indicated that the respondents did not manage to sufficiently differentiate certain questions related to the benevolence and credibility of the firm, nor the question regarding their intention to seek additional information. Thus, in order to examine the logic for these unusual results, we used a procedure called debriefing, where three respondents from the pre-test were told about the purpose of the pre-test and encouraged to state any problems they encountered during completion (Malhotra et al., 2010).

Some of the respondents reported difficulties in terms of understanding what the questions referred to, and consequently we had to modify wordings used to describe benevolence and credibility in the two scenarios. In addition, a few of the respondents reported confusion in terms of the company they were asked to imagine in the beginning, as they found it difficult to picture the chosen company in the specific scenario. To decrease the confusion, we decided to relocate the statement containing this and have it read right before the firm values and questions. We also decided to reduce the length of the scenarios, containing the firm’s value statement (i.e. the trust in the benevolence and credibility of the firm), with the intention of reducing noise (Social Research Methods, 2016), and due to it being difficult for the respondents to comprehend the scenarios. However, as the scenarios contained important information, and were still fairly
long, we chose to also include them under the questions displayed for each scenario.

After revision of the first pre-test, we corrected the questionnaire for the problems identified during pretesting and in the interviews. Consequently, we conducted another pre-test, using a different sample of 12 respondents on Facebook. The results from the second pre-test (see table 5) indicated that we successfully managed to control the scenarios and guide the respondents in the intended direction. Noticeable, the differences among the various questions have diminished after the modification.

![Table 5: Paired sample test](image)

**Procedure**

At the beginning of the survey, the respondents were told that the answers were to be used in our master thesis, and thus completely anonymous. Further, we informed the respondents that the survey would take approximately 5 minutes to complete. The respondents were then asked to read a text from the Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget, 2016), with the intention of informing the respondents about the intended ethics law, which are now up for debate within the government (see appendix D).

Before being exposed to the scenarios, the respondents were asked to imagine a brand operating in Norway with textile and clothing, which was referred to as the
brand throughout the survey. Then, the respondents were exposed to the scenario with positively formulated trust, and the scenario with negatively formulated trust, or the other way around (i.e. randomization). After being exposed to the scenarios, the respondents had to answer questions, in order to control for the level of trust at the end. Then, respondents were asked questions about the following demographic variables: gender, age, annual income, education and place of residence. Malhotra (2010) suggest placing sensitive topics at the end, in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining information from the respondents. In addition, we chose to include an incentive due to the findings of Ryu, Couper, and Marans (2005). They review earlier research on the use of incentives (Goyder, 1987; Nederhof, 1983; Sudman & Bradburn, 1974; Willimack, Schuman, Pennell, & Lepkowsk, 1995) and found that incentives, both monetary and non-monetary in surveys yield higher response rate. However, it is important to note that an incentive could influence response distributions and correct sampling biases (Ryu et al., 2005). Even so, we chose to include it as a way to increase overall response rate by drawing respondents who would otherwise consider the degree of effort attached to the survey.

4.0 Results

This section will start with a description of the respondent’s characteristics, in order to get an overview of the data collection, followed by descriptive statistics of the data. Then, validity, and reliability is evaluated through factor analyses in SPSS⁶, before the focus shifts towards the structural equation modelling in SmartPLS⁷. Lastly, based on the results from the model testing in SPSS and SmartPLS, we tested for causal relationships in the proposed hypotheses, and whether they are supported or not.

4.1 Respondents Characteristics

The data collection of the web survey lasted for approximately two weeks and resulted in a total of 322 respondents, of which 202 were deemed useful. This left us with a dropout rate of 37.27 %, which can be explained by the fact that Internet surveys often have a poor response rate (Malhotra et al., 2010).

---

⁶ SPSS is a widely used program for statistical analysis by market researchers
⁷ SmartPLS is a software used for variance-based structural equation modeling using the partial least squares
Out of the 202 respondents, our sample was composed of slightly more women (58.9%) than men (41.1%), which is considered a fairly even distribution. With regards to age, the population of the survey were individuals ranging from the age of 18 to over 50 years of age. The largest age group were between 21 to 30 years of age with a percentage of 32.2. Taken into consideration that we belong to this age group, and distributed the survey through a convenience sampling, we see this as a logical explanation. Almost all of the 19 counties in Norway were represented (except Nordland and Troms), with 45.0 % being from the southern part of Norway (Aust-Agder), which is where one of the authors of this thesis is born and raised. The second largest part of the sample came from Oslo, respectively 26.7 %, while the other counties had a low distribution of respondents, indicating a geographical skewness.

The majority of the respondents had a bachelor or master degree, which can explain that 65.3 % have an income ranging between 350 001 to over 550 001 NOK. Additionally, this is the average income level in Norway according to Statistics Norway (SSB 2016). The data of education and income demonstrates a sample that has certain skewness towards respondents with an academic background. However, 23.7 % reported that they had an income ranging from under 150 000 NOK to 250 000 NOK, which may indicate a fairly large bulk of students in the sample.

The data obtained from the demographic variables and questionnaire described above, can mainly be explained by the use of a convenience sampling, as a large part of the respondents were our family and friends.

**4.2 Descriptive Statistics**

We performed a simple descriptive analysis on each scenario (i.e. the positively formulated trust scenario and the negatively formulated trust scenario) to be able to summarize the sample of respondents from our questionnaire.

**Mean values**

Regarding the positively formulated trust scenario (see table 6), the mean values indicate that the independent variables the dimensions of trust (i.e. benevolence and credibility) all have average mean values between 4.01 and 4.76. In other words, the respondents answered on the positive side of the seven-point Likert-
scale, by somewhat agreeing to the statements. This indicates that the sample of respondents perceived the brand as benevolent and credible. Inspection of the moderating variable, involvement, revealed a mean value of 5.41 and 5.29, which indicates that respondents view themselves as interested in ethical purchasing and corporate social responsibility. The two dependent variables, intention to seek additional information and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand, receives a mean value of 3.76 and 3.21, respectively. This might indicate that the respondents’ behavioural intentions were not altered based on the manipulated scenario, as they do not want to search for more information, nor avoid purchasing in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>1.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.308</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>-0.564</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-1.147</td>
<td>-0.842</td>
<td>-0.717</td>
<td>-1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.668</td>
<td>-0.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.664</td>
<td>-0.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-1.037</td>
<td>-0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Positively formulated trust scenario

Regarding the negatively formulated trust scenario (see table 7), demonstrating benevolence and credibility of the firm, the mean show values between 2.15 and 2.65. This indicates that the respondents for the most parts perceived the brand as being less benevolent and not credible, as they answered on the negative side of the scale (by disagreeing to the statement). Consequently, the mean values for both of the scenarios show that we were able to manipulate the scenarios as intended. Examination of the moderating variable, involvement, revealed a mean
value of 5.3 and 5.22, which indicates that respondents view themselves as relatively interested in ethical purchasing and corporate social responsibility. However, it is important to note that as the mean values for involvement in both the positively- and negatively formulated trust scenario provide similar values, this may indicate that there is poor spread in dataset. Further, the dependent variables from the negatively formulated trust scenario (i.e. intention to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing) received an average mean value of 4.59 and 4.21, indicating a somewhat agreement with wanting for search for more information, and avoid repurchasing from the brand in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>1.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.826</td>
<td>-0.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Seek Additional Information</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Avoid Repurchasing from the Brand</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.dev.</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Negatively formulated trust scenario

Noticeable, all of the items have standard deviations below the value of two (see table 6 and 7), which can be argued to be fairly low. This indicates that the data is somewhat close to the mean, and that we may continue with our subsequent analyses.

Skewness and Kurtosis

In order to check for normality, skewness and kurtosis is an appropriate measure, where values outside the range of -1 and +1 indicate a skewed distribution (J. Hair
et al., 2010). First, by looking at the positively formulated trust scenario, we can see that all the independent variables are within threshold, in addition to the dependent variables (see table 6). For the moderator, involvement, one item is satisfactory, except for Q1- posinv_1 (-1.037).

In the negatively formulated trust scenario, the items of the benevolence construct, Q1-negben_1 (1.348), Q2-negben_2 (1.351), and Q4-negben_4 (1.337), and one item of the credibility construct, Q2-negcred_2 (1.049) has a positively skewed distribution (see table 7). The rest of the items are within the threshold value (see table 6 and 7). The dependent constructs, intention to seek additional information and intention to avoid repurchasing, have a satisfactory skewed distribution within the range, in addition to the moderator, involvement. Thus, as values between -2 and +2 are considered an acceptable range for skewness (George & Mallery, 2003), we believe that our sample provides fairly normal distribution, and we can continue with our subsequent analyses.

When it comes to kurtosis, J. Hair et al. (2010) propose that the values should be above zero (i.e. positive values). 9 out of the 20 items are above zero, indicating a fairly normal distribution (see table 6 and 7). Thus, based on this, the skewness values, and with a sufficient sample size of 202, we do not consider our sample to be non-normal, and we can pursue with our subsequent analyses (J. Hair et al., 2010).

**Missing Values**

The data set contained from the questionnaire were run through SPSS, and cleaned for non-predicting variables. The uncompleted answers, which contained some missing values were removed from the data set. Moreover, the questions that included the dependent variables (question 6 and 9) were negatively loaded (i.e. reversed scores), and had to be coded as reversed scores (1=7, 2=6, 3=5, 4=4, 5=3, 6=2, 7=1) for the upcoming analyses.

**4.3 Validity and Reliability**

In this section, we test that the validity and reliability of the independent and dependent variables are accounted for, through an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in SPSS and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using SmartPLS. Despite the fact that the questionnaire formulated in this study is based on well-
tested scales from previous literature, there is always an uncertainty to which construct the questions correspond. To begin with, validity will be evaluated through unidimensionality, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, followed by a determination of the reliability of the method.

Validity

Unidimensionality of Items

There are various methods of assessing the unidimensionality and to ensure a satisfactory validity of the variables included. For this reason, the EFA was used for determining the underlying dimensions of variables in the dataset (Janssens, De Pelsmacker, & Van Kenhove, 2008). The statistical and practical significance of the factor loadings is one of the guidelines used for determining the significance level (Janssens et al., 2008). Thus, as the sample size of this study consists of 202 respondents, the factor loadings will in this case be considered significant if it is greater than or equal to 0.40 (Janssens et al., 2008). When measuring the degree of correlation of the variables involved, the Bartlett’s test of sphericity, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO), and the anti-image correlation matrix was examined (Janssens et al., 2008). The KMO statistic shows a value of 0.849, which indicate that the sample is adequate (see table 8). The Bartlett’s test revealed that the variables are satisfactory correlated (0.05>0.000) (see table 8). Further, the anti-image correlation (see table 9) shows an absence of MSA values under 0.50, and as the lowest value is 0.709, no variables should be excluded at this point. Based on the results of the anti-image correlation matrix, KMO, and the Barlett’s test, it can be considered both appropriate and meaningful to perform a factor analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>0,849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: KMO and Bartlett’s test
As this thesis is based on a within-subjects design with two scenarios (i.e. positively- and negatively formulated trust), the items measuring trust (i.e. benevolence and credibility) was considered to have a strong presence in the same construct, respectively. Thus, the EFA was conducted on each construct separately with their respective items, through a Principal Component Analysis. For a meaningful interpretation and to simplifying the interpretation process, the method varimax (orthogonal rotation) was performed, whereby the number of variables that have high loads on each of the factors is minimized.

In regard to the total variance explained, all constructs had a rather high explanation power and score above the minimum level of 0.40 (see table 10). For instance, the benevolence constructs had an explained variance of 81.55%, where the items posben_1-4 load high on the first component, whereas negben_1-4 load high on the other component. The credibility constructs explained variance was equal to 94.35%, where the items poscred_1 and poscred_2 load high on the first component, and nedcred_1 and negcred_2 load high on the second. Moreover, the involvement construct had an explained variance of 75.86%, and as only one component was extracted, the solution could not be rotated. However, the unrotated component matrix showed that both the posinv_1-2 and neginv_1-2 loaded relatively high on the specific component and thus, there were no need to further investigate these items. Finally, the behavioural intention constructs explained variance is equal to 79.16%. While posint_seek, posint_avoid load high on the first component, negint_seek load significantly higher on the other component, along with negint_avoid. Regardless of the EFA factors loadings (see Table 9: Anti-image matrix

| Correlation | posben_1 | posben_2 | posben_3 | posben_4 | negben_1 | negben_2 | negben_3 | negben_4 | poscred_1 | poscred_2 | poscred_3 | poscred_4 | negcred_1 | negcred_2 | negcred_3 | negcred_4 | posinv_1 | posinv_2 | posinv_3 | posinv_4 | neginv_1 | neginv_2 | neginv_3 | neginv_4 | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| posben_1    | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posben_2    |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posben_3    |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posben_4    |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negben_1    |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negben_2    |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negben_3    |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negben_4    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| poscred_1   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| poscred_2   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| poscred_3   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| poscred_4   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negcred_1   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negcred_2   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negcred_3   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negcred_4   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posinv_1    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posinv_2    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posinv_3    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posinv_4    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| neginv_1    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| neginv_2    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| neginv_3    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| neginv_4    |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1.000    |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posint_seek |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| posint_avoid |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negint_seek |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
| negint_avoid |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | posint_seek | posint_avoid | negint_seek | negint_avoid |
Table 11), these items will be further treated independently and will not be taken into account in the upcoming CFA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence Trust</td>
<td>no reduction</td>
<td>81.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility Trust</td>
<td>no reduction</td>
<td>94.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>no reduction</td>
<td>75.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>no reduction</td>
<td>79.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10: Total variance explained*

**Convergent Validity**

In order to confirm the that the intercorrelations among the variables tested in the EFA illustrates a clean factor structure in which convergent validity is evident, the CFA was conducted separately on each construct by using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) technique in SmartPLS (Janssens et al., 2008). In similar manners, this is due our study being based on a within-subject design with two scenarios (i.e. positively- and negatively trust formulated), where the items measuring trust (i.e. benevolence and credibility) was assumed to have a strong presence in the same construct. The convergent validity of measurement was considered by examining the factor loadings and the average variance extracted (AVE), which is frequently employed by many scholars (Wong, Fornell and Larker, 1981). To obtain adequate convergence, the factor loading should be greater than 0.5 (J. Hair et al., 2010), while literature suggest that an AVE of 0.5 (50%) or more is satisfactory (Janssens et al., 2008). First, for the positively formulated trust scenario, all four items of benevolence had factor loadings exceeding 0.70 and gave an AVE of 78.8%, which is above the recommended level. Next, the credibility items had factor loadings above 0.70, with a satisfactory AVE of 95.5%, which was the highest explained variance level among the constructs. Further, for the negatively formulated trust scenario, all four items of benevolence had factor loadings above 0.70, with a sufficient AVE score of 83.8%. Finally, the factor loadings were satisfactory on both of the credibility items, which was above the recommended level. Likewise, the construct had a satisfactory AVE score of 93.1%. Within this study, the conditions of a satisfactory level of convergent
validity were achieved throughout all CFA factor loadings (see table 12), despite slight variation among the different constructs.

**Summary of EFA and CFA**

The results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis corresponded to the results from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis, as both analyses revealed that the items had satisfactory loadings on the constructs they were believed to belong to. The summarized findings based on factor loadings from the EFA are illustrated in table 11, whereas the factor loading from the CFA is presented in table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Benevolence Trust</td>
<td>posben_1</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posben_2</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posben_3</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posben_4</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Benevolence Trust</td>
<td>negben_1</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negben_2</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negben_3</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negben_4</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Credibility Trust</td>
<td>poscred_1</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poscred_2</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Credibility Trust</td>
<td>negcred_1</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negcred_2</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>posint_seek,</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posint_avoid</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>negint_seek</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negint_avoid</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unrotated Component Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>posinv_1</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posinv_2</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neginv_1</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neginv_2</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11: EFA factor loadings*
Discriminant Validity

When testing for discriminant validity, more specifically, if there is significant difference from one in the correlation among the construct, Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggest that the “square root” of the average variance extracted (AVE) of each latent variable should be larger than the correlation among the latent variables. Comparing the constructs in Table 13, none of the correlations appeared to be greater than the √{AVE} estimates calculated, thus providing evidence that discriminant validity correlation was present among all variables. These findings confirmed that the CFA fits should be satisfactory.

Reliability

Internal Consistency Reliability

The final step was to determine the reliability of the construct items, which was conducted by using the Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability analyses. As illustrated in Table 13, for the positively formulated trust scenario, both the independent variables benevolence (0.91) and credibility (0.95) were above the critical value of 0.80 (Janssens et al., 2008). Similarly, the independent variables from the negatively formulated trust scenario, both benevolence (0.94) and credibility (0.93) were above the critical value of 0.80 (Janssens et al., 2008). Thus, the independent variables from both scenarios indicated satisfactory
reliability. Moreover, literature suggest that composite reliability coefficients varies from 0 to 1, but should not exceed the value of 0.70 in order to obtain satisfactory internal consistency reliability (J. F. Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011; Rossiter, 2002). Table 13 exhibits that, both the independent and dependent variables, hold a CR above the threshold value. This demonstrates that each and every construct achieved a high level of reliability and had been measured consistently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>posben</th>
<th>poscred</th>
<th>posint</th>
<th>negben</th>
<th>negcred</th>
<th>negint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posben</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poscred</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posint</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negben</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negcred</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negint</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and correlation

### 4.4 Structural Equation Model

The focus will now shift towards the structural equation model (SEM). SEM has become a well-accepted methodological model in marketing research as it grants authors to test overall theory and concepts (Rigdon, 1998). In addition to examine latent variables as the observed level, the method also tests the strength of the relationship between the observed variables and the latent variables. We argue that the variance-based partial least square-SEM model (PLS-SEM) is an appropriate method to employ in this study. This is due to the fact that the selected theoretical model includes more than one single dependent variable, thus a complex model, and as the study objective involve prediction in research context with limited theory (J. F. Hair et al., 2011).

### Model Characteristics

As this study includes a within-subjects design with two scenarios, where the positively formulated trust scenario and the negatively formulated trust scenario
are independent from each other, two separate structural models were assessed. Further, as no effect between the moderating effect “involvement” and the dependent variables is hypothesized, this construct was excluded from the structural model. For both structural models, a balanced model was employed (i.e. intermediate of the focused and unfocused models⁹), as the number of exogenous latent variables is parallel with the endogenous latent variables. Moreover, regarding the outer model, solely reflectively measured latent variables were composed. The number of indicators per construct ranged from 2 to 4 (e.g. 2 indicators for the credibility construct and 4 indicators for benevolence construct).

**Inner Model Quality**

When assessing the inner model’s quality, an explanation of each target endogenous variable variance is appropriate (J. F. Hair et al., 2011; Wong, 2013). The coefficient of determination (R²) for model 1 involving the positively formulated trust scenario (see appendix G) was 0.008 for the behavioural intention to seek endogenous latent variable. This means that the two latent variables, trust in the benevolence of the firm and trust in the credibility of the firm, explained a weak¹⁰ level of 0.8% of the variance in behavioural intention to seek. By the same token, the coefficient of determination for the endogenous latent variable behavioural intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand represented a weak level of 0.136 (13.6%).

With regard to model 2 concerning the negatively formulated trust scenario (see appendix H), trust in the benevolence of the firm and trust in the credibility of the firm simultaneously explained 22.1% of the variance of the behavioural intention to seek endogenous latent variable. Correspondingly, the exogenous latent variables together explained 14.7% of the variance of the behavioural intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand latent variable. In spite of poor model quality of both models, an alternative to increase the R² would include adding additional exogenous constructs. Thus, we decided to keep them as originated. That is, as the main purpose of this study was not to create a conceptual “textbook model”, but rather to examine the roles and the relationship between the constructs, it was

---

⁹ Focused models (i.e. the number of exogenous latent variables is at least twice as high as the number of endogenous latent variables). Unfocused model (i.e. the number of endogenous latent variables is at least twice as high as the number of exogenous latent variables)

¹⁰ R² of 0.75 is substantial, 0.50 is moderate, and 0.25 is weak
significantly more important to investigate the proposed connections, than to provide a new empirically model of superior quality.

**Hypothesis Testing**

When testing the proposed hypotheses, we decided to use the bootstrapping procedure\textsuperscript{11} in SmartPLS (Wong, 2013). The hypotheses were evaluated by inspecting the structural path significance and the t-values of both the inner and outer models, with path coefficient values <0.01 and a t-statistic critical value above 1.96, respectively.

Regarding model 1, which was based on the positively formulated trust scenario (see table 14), revealed that trust in the benevolence of firm and intention to seek additional information (0.052) had the highest standardized path coefficient, followed by trust in the credibility of the firm (0.043). However, the t-value analysis of the hypothesized path relationship between trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to seek additional information (0.657<1.96), in addition to the relationship between trust in the credibility of the firm and intention to seek additional information (0.571<1.96) indicated a result lower than the critical value. Thus, both paths were not statistically significant ($p>.05$), meaning that the presence of either trust in the benevolence-and credibility of the firm did not affect consumers’ intention to seek additional information.

Moreover, the path relationship of trust in the credibility of the firm and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand presented a negative standardized path coefficient (-0.036). With a t-value (0.526) that falls below the critical value, the hypothesized path relationship was not significant ($p>.05$). Nevertheless, trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand had the highest standardized path coefficient (0.396). The relationship was considered statistical significant ($p<.05$), with a t-value (4.310) that falls above the critical value. Thus, we conclude that the presence of more trust in the benevolence of the firm is predicting consumer’s intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand.

\textsuperscript{11} The Bootstrap result approximates the normality of data, by taking a large number of subsamples (e.g. 5000) from the original sample with replacement to give bootstrap standard errors, which in turn gives approximate T-values for significance testing of the structural path.
Table 14: T-values, coefficients, and p-value for the SEM Paths with regard to “the positively formulated trust scenario”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>coefficients</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the benevolence of firm → Intention to avoid repurchasing</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the benevolence of firm → Intention to seek additional information</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the credibility of the firm → Intention to avoid repurchasing</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the credibility of the firm → Intention to seek additional information</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding model 2, which is based on the negatively formulated trust scenario (see table 15), suggested that trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to seek additional information (0.274) had the strongest standardized path coefficient, followed by trust in the credibility of the firm (0.230). The t-value analysis of the hypothesized path relationship between trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to seek additional information (2.560>1.96) falls above the critical value, along with the t-value of trust in the credibility of the firm (2.036). Thus, the hypothesized path relationship between trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to seek, in addition to the relationship between trust in the credibility of the firm and intention to seek were statistically significant (p<.05), meaning that the presence of both benevolence- and credibility trust in firm did indeed predict consumers intention to seek additional information. These results make us conclude that less trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm have a greater effect on intention to seek additional information, than more trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm, hence we find support for both H1a and H2a.

Correspondingly, the hypothesized path relationship between trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand (0.243) displayed a statistical significant relationship with a t-value (2.560) that falls above the critical value. The hypothesized path relationship between trust in
the credibility of the firm and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand (0.167) presented a t-value (1.811) above the t-statistic critical value of 1.65 (10 %), but was exceeded by the critical value of 1.96 (5 %). Thus, the hypothesized path relationship of trust in the benevolence of the firm and intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand was statistically significant ($p<.05$), while trust in the credibility of the firm and behavioural intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand did not give support for the hypothesis ($p>.05$). Thus, we conclude that less trust in the benevolence of the firm is alone a predictor of consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand. However, as more trust in the benevolence of the firm also had an effect on intention to avoid repurchasing, we could only give partial support to H1b. The presence of trust in the credibility of the firm did not affect consumers intention avoid repurchasing from the brand. Hence, we did not find support for H2b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>coefficients</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the benevolence of firm</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Intention to avoid repurchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the benevolence of firm</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Intention to seek additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the credibility of the firm</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Intention to avoid repurchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the credibility of the firm</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Intention to seek additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15: T-values, coefficients, and p-value for the SEM Paths with regard to “the negatively formulated trust scenario”*

### 4.5 Moderating Effects

Linear regression was conducted in SPSS in order to test our moderator, and prove an effect between involvement (M), on the proposed relationship between a) benevolence (X), b) credibility (X), and intention to seek additional information (Y), and intention to avoid repurchasing (Y) (Janssens et al., 2008). Thus, four linear regressions were run in order to test hypotheses H3 and H4.
Baron and Kenny (1986) proposes a procedure for measuring a moderator, where the interactions variables (XM) explain Y. When the interaction is positive, the effect of X on Y increases as M increases, while the opposite take place when the interaction is negative. As our conceptual model included two dependent variables in each scenario, we conducted four multiple regression equations in order to explain the procedure (see table 16, 17, 18, and 19):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.198</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posben</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosCred</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.445</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posben</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosCred</td>
<td>-1.278</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosBenIn</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosCredIn</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Sen1: Søke etter mer informasjon om kleskjedens klesproduksjon og etiske initiativ?

Table 16: Coefficients for the positively formulated trust scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.797</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posben</td>
<td>-0.408</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosCred</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>4.932</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posben</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosCred</td>
<td>-0.476</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosBenIn</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosCredIn</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Sen1: Unngå å handle hos kleskjeden i fremtiden?

Table 17: Coefficients for the positively formulated trust scenario
| Model | | \multicolumn{4}{c|}{Unstandardized Coefficients} | \multicolumn{2}{c|}{Standardized Coefficients} |
|-------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|       | | B               | Std. Error       | Beta             | t                | Sig.             |
| 1     | (Constant) | 6.136            | 0.235            | -0.252           | -2.705           | 0.007            |
|       | NegBen     | -0.348           | 0.128            | -0.252           | -2.645           | 0.009            |
|       | NegCred    | -0.283           | 0.107            | -0.246           | -2.645           | 0.009            |
| 2     | (Constant) | 5.986            | 0.218            | -0.286           | -1.074           | 0.284            |
|       | NegBen     | -0.395           | 0.368            | -0.821           | -3.127           | 0.002            |
|       | NegCred    | -0.945           | 0.302            | -0.246           | -2.645           | 0.009            |
|       | NegBenIn   | -0.006           | 0.076            | -0.079           | -0.079           | 0.937            |
|       | NegCredIn  | 0.155            | 0.064            | 0.712            | 2.414            | 0.017            |

a. Dependent Variable: Sen2: Søke etter mer informasjon om kleskjedens klesproduksjon og etiske initiativ?

**Table 18: Coefficients for the negatively formulated trust scenario**

| Model | | \multicolumn{4}{c|}{Unstandardized Coefficients} | \multicolumn{2}{c|}{Standardized Coefficients} |
|-------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|       | | B               | Std. Error       | Beta             | t                | Sig.             |
| 1     | (Constant) | 5.343            | 0.219            | -0.234           | -2.410           | 0.017            |
|       | NegBen     | -0.289           | 0.120            | -0.174           | -1.794           | 0.074            |
|       | NegCred    | -0.179           | 0.100            | -0.106           | -0.365           | 0.715            |
| 2     | (Constant) | 5.249            | 0.213            | -0.106           | -0.365           | 0.715            |
|       | NegBen     | -0.131           | 0.359            | -0.106           | -0.365           | 0.715            |
|       | NegCred    | -0.738           | 0.295            | -0.718           | -2.500           | 0.013            |
|       | NegCredIn  | 0.129            | 0.063            | 0.665            | 2.062            | 0.041            |
|       | NegBenIn   | -0.045           | 0.074            | -0.200           | -0.603           | 0.547            |

a. Dependent Variable: Sen2: Unngå å handle hos kleskjeden i fremtiden?

**Table 19: Coefficients for the negatively formulated trust scenario**

**Linear Regression**

The moderating effect of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables are displayed in table 16,17,18 and 19.

For the first dependent variable, intention to seek additional information (see table 18), involvement had a negative (B = -0.024), non-significant (p = 0.937) effect on benevolence (NegBen*In). Further, involvement proved to have negative (B = -0.936), but statistically significant (p = 0.043) effect on benevolence (PosBen*In). First of all, this indicates that benevolence was more important for
low-involved consumers towards intention to seek additional information. Second, when involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm were less likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm. Thus, we had to reject H3a.

For credibility, involvement had a positive (B = 0.712), significant (p = 0.017) effect on credibility (NegCred*In), indicating that the effect of trust in the credibility of the firm on intention to seek additional information increased, when involvement was higher. Further, involvement had a positive (B = 1.596), significant effect (p = 0.000) on credibility (PosCred*In). These results did not enable us to conclude that consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm were more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm, when accounting for involvement. However, trust in firms in general was more important for highly involved consumers on their intention to seek additional information. Hence, we found some, but not significant, support to H3b.

For the second dependent variable, intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand (see table 19), involvement had a negative (B = -0.200), non-significant (p = 0.547) effect on benevolence (NegBen*In), implying that benevolence was more important for low involved consumers towards avoiding repurchasing from the brand. Further, involvement had a negative (B = -0.270), non-significant (p = 0.561) effect on benevolence (PosBen*In). In other words, these results did not enable us to conclude that when involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm were more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm. In addition, one may assume that trust in firms was generally more important for low-involved consumers on the intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand. Hence, we had to reject H4a.

Finally, involvement had a positive (B = 0.665), statistically significant (p = 0.041) effect on credibility (NegCred*In), indicating that when involvement with social consumption increased, consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm were more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand. In addition,
Involvement had a positive ($B = 0.662$), non-significant ($p = 0.124$) effect on credibility ($\text{PosCred}^\text{In}$). As a consequence, there was significant support to H4b.

### 4.6 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

To sum up, the results of the SEM analysis conducted in SmartPLS gave support to H1a, indicating that less trust in the benevolence of the firm indeed had a greater effect on intention to seek additional information, than more trust in the benevolence of the firm. Noticeable, more trust in the benevolence of the firm also affects consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand, although the effect was stronger for less trust in the benevolence of the firm. Thus, we could only give partly support to H1b. In addition, we found support for H2a, implying that less trust in the credibility of the firm had a stronger influence on intention to seek additional information, than more trust in the credibility of the firm. On the contrary, we found that less trust in the credibility of the firm did not have a greater effect on intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than more trust in the credibility of the firm, thus rejecting H2b.

The linear regression analysis shows that we could give partly support to both H3 and H4. In other words, we were not able to conclude that when involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with less trust in the benevolence and credibility of the firm were neither more likely to seek additional information, nor avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence and credibility of the firm. Thus, as these hypotheses were partly supported, we could only give directions for further research, whiles not draw any direct conclusions from them.

Based on the statistical tests conducted in SPSS and SmartPLS, we found support for two out of six hypotheses, while three of them were partly supported. The summarized results of the hypotheses testing can be found in table 20.
### Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1a:</strong> Consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1b:</strong> Consumers with less trust in the benevolence of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm</td>
<td>Partly supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2a:</strong> Consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2b:</strong> Consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the credibility of the firm</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3:</strong> When involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with (a) less trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than (a) consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) more trust with the credibility of the firm</td>
<td>Partly supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4:</strong> When involvement with social consumption, consumers with (a) less trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than (a) consumers with more trust in the benevolence of the firm and (b) more trust in the credibility of the firm</td>
<td>Partly supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20: Summary table of the hypotheses testing*

### 5.0 Discussion

For the last section of our thesis, conclusions about the implications of the results will be accounted for, followed by a discussion of its theoretical contribution to the literature and its implications for marketing managers. Finally, the limitations of the thesis are critically reviewed, before we give our final recommendations for future research.

The main purpose of this thesis was to investigate the impact of an ethics law, issued by the Norwegian government, on consumer behaviour in the textile and apparel industry. Our approach was to demonstrate how two dimensions of trust,
benevolence and credibility, will affect consumers’ behavioural intentions in terms of two specific behaviours a) intention to seek additional information and b) intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand (i.e. customer churn). Further, we wanted to examine whether being involved in social consumption could strengthen such a relationship. We uncovered a gap in research on the effect of the proposed relationship, in the context of an ethics law. No previous research has investigated the effect of consumers’ trust in firms, on information seeking behaviour and customer churn, in support of law requirements. Drawing upon the consumer behaviour literature, we applied a descriptive research design, and collected data through a web survey. A within-subjects design was suitable to test our selected hypotheses, and to prove a cause-effect relationship between the independent variables, benevolence- and credibility trust, and the dependent variables, intention to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing. Our research question was:

What is the impact of consumers’ trust in firms on consumers’ behavioural intention, in the context of an ethics law, and to what extent does consumers’ level of involvement affect this relationship?

The first part of the research question investigated if consumers with less trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm are more likely to seek additional information, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm, through (H1a and H2a). These hypotheses were supported, indicating that less trust in the firm indeed has a greater effect on intention to seek additional information, than more trust in the firm. Thus, if consumers perceive a Norwegian textile and apparel firm to not being concerned for others or untrustworthy, they will be more inclined to use the ethics law to seek additional information (e.g. request information regarding the working conditions under which products are manufactured).

Further, we wanted to find out whether consumers with less trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than consumers with more trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm, measured through (H1b and H2b). H1b, was only partly supported, while H2b was not supported, which indicates that less trust in the firm
do not have a stronger influence on intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand, than more trust in the firm. This can be explained by the findings of Carrigan and Attalla (2001). Their research discovered that boycotting or dropping of the firm was unlikely if the product was one they relied on (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001; Simon, 1995). Thus, as ethical consumption is a complex and challenging issue, supporting positive actions rather than punishing unethical actions, may be a more likely consumer response (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001). This might to a degree explain our finding that benevolence and credibility trust have little to no effect on consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing. However, as these hypotheses are not fully supported, we cannot draw any direct conclusions from this, only give directions for future research.

For the second part of the research question, we investigated if the effect of involvement with social consumption on consumers’ behavioural intentions is stronger when consumers have less trust in the firm through (H3 and H4). However, we were only able to find partial support for these hypotheses. In support of these findings, Vermeir and Verbeke (2006) explains that the consumption habits of consumers are often driven by convenience and personal preferences, and thus decisions made daily by the consumers are very often low involvement decisions (Kassarjian, 1981). This may explain why involvement with social consumption, when consumers have less trust in firms, have little or no effect on consumers’ intention to either seek more information, or avoid repurchasing. In other words, involvement with social consumption may not be explicitly consistent with behavioural responses (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006).

Even though the hypotheses regarding intention to avoid repurchasing received mixed results, in addition to the hypotheses measuring the moderation of involvement, the path between the dimensions of trust, benevolence and credibility, and seeking for additional information was confirmed.

5.1 Theoretical Contribution

Our thesis makes unique contribution to a yet unexplored phenomenon: the effect of law requirements (i.e. an ethics law) on consumers’ intention to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing. The relevance of such a law is of strong interest when investigating the influence of consumers’ trust in firms on their behavioural intentions, in the Norwegian textile and apparel industry.
Additionally, this research confirms findings from previous researchers, while at the same time adding to the trust-, consumer behaviour-, and involvement literature, by demonstrating how trust affects consumers’ behavioural intentions, and the influence of involvement on this relationship.

Thus, the findings in this thesis contributes to (1) advancing the understanding of the effects of trust on consumers’ behavioural intentions, particularly intention to seek additional information, as well as (2) creating awareness towards the effects of an ethics law on different factors, which may lead to greater accountability by firms, which again (3) enables firms to gain more trust from its customers. These contributions will now be accounted for more in-depth.

**Contribution to the Trust Literature**

The current study offers contribution to the trust- and consumer behaviour literature, by measuring the effects of two trust dimensions, benevolence and credibility, on consumers intention to seek additional information and avoid repurchasing. Although extensive research has been conducted on the concept of trust (Mayer et al., 1995; Morgan & Hunt, 1994), there have been less research on the dimensions of benevolence and credibility (Rousseau et al., 1998). More specifically, to our knowledge, there is currently no research that has focused on how an ethics law will affect benevolence- and credibility trust on our proposed behavioural intentions, neither intention to seek additional information, nor avoid repurchasing, in the textile and apparel industry.

First of all, we found that less trust in the benevolence- and credibility of the firm significantly affects consumers’ intention to seek additional information. This is similar to the findings of Wilson (1997), who found that if the information source is perceived to be unreliable or untrustworthy, an individual might regard the source as lacking in credibility. This could in turn influence consumers behaviour in terms of fostering information-seeking, whereby continuing search is carried out to update or expand one’s framework of knowledge, beliefs, or values. This indicates that the availability of an ethics law will translate into behavioural outcomes, such as consumers being more inclined to search for more information. Further, it implies that when consumers are made aware of information on a firm’s unethical behaviour, it leads to less trust in the firms, which again causes consumers to be more willing to make ethical purchase decisions by seeking for
more information. On the other hand, we found that less trust in the benevolence and credibility of the firm has little to no effect on consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand. This indicates that consumers may be uninterested in regard to avoiding repurchasing from specific brands on the basis of unethical actions, even with the presence of an ethics law. Thus, despite the fact that consumers are given the opportunity to receive more information about ethically and socially responsible activities of firms, as a result of an ethics law, it seems like social responsibility is not a dominant criterion in regard to consumers purchasing behaviour. This indicate that it is enough for consumers to simply possess information about a firm's unethical or ethical actions, and have the ability to make ethical buying practices, then acting according to that knowledge.

Thus, our results contribute to the trust and consumer behaviour literature through (1) by discovering that less trust in the benevolence and credibility of the firm affects consumers’ intention to seek additional information, in the context of an ethics law, thus covering a cap in literature between trust and the proposed behavioural intention (i.e. intention to seek additional information), and (2) confirming previous research by Wilson (1997).

**Contribution to the Involvement Literature**

Another area of this study is the moderating role of involvement, when measuring the effect of consumers trust in firms on their behavioural intentions. We found evidence that credibility trust in general, both less- and more trust in the credibility of the firm are more important for highly involved consumers on the intention to seek additional information. Further, evidence suggests that more trust in the benevolence of the firm has an effect on intention to seek additional information, where less trust in the benevolence of the firm has no effect, when accounting for involvement. These observations are somewhat confusing as our structural equation results indicate that trust in benevolence has the strongest effect on intention to seek additional information, followed by trust in the credibility of the firm. Thus, we are not able to conclude that trust in the benevolence of the firm in fact affects consumers’ intention to seek additional information, when accounting for involvement. Further, our findings demonstrate that when involvement with social consumption increases, consumers with less trust in the credibility of the firm are more likely to avoid repurchasing from the
brand. On the other hand, we found that trust in the benevolence of the firm, in
general, is not important for consumers involved with social consumption,
towards avoiding repurchasing from the brand. Although our results do not fully
support the findings in the literature, we still feel that the logical explanation
behind this is due to poor spread of the involvement construct. Additionally,
previous research supports our credibility findings as consumers’ behavioural
intentions are in fact affected by credibility trust (Doney & Cannon, 1997) and
consumers who are involved with a firm’s corporate social performance are less
willing to tolerate negative (i.e. untrustworthy and unreliable) information about a
firm (Liu et al., 2010).

This thesis contributes to the involvement literature by (1) demonstrating that
when involvement with social consumption increases, credibility trust, in general,
is more important towards intention to seek additional information and avoiding
repurchasing from the brand, and (2) revealing that when involvement is low,
benevolence trust is more important towards intention to seek additional
information and avoid repurchasing from the brand, and (3) confirming previous
research by Doney and Cannon (1997) and Liu et al. (2010).

5.2 Managerial Implications

We will now go through how our study relate to marketing managers attempting
to understand how an ethics law, issued by the Norwegian Government, will
affect consumers’ behavioural intentions. There are several reasons for why a
marketing manager should attempt to increase the transparency of their supply
chain and disclose information to the public. First of all, consumers demand for
more accessible information will continue to emerge and influence how firms
conduct business (Kang & Hustvedt, 2014). This outlines the importance of
governmental regulations (i.e. an ethics law), as transparency can provoke
institutional change and lead to greater accountability by firms (Doorey, 2011).
Further, as trust influences behavioural intentions (Morgan & Hunt, 1994), a
dishonest and untrustworthy firm may lead to consumers developing mistrust
towards the firm (Du et al., 2010).

Our findings show that consumers are more inclined to use an ethics law to seek
additional information, when the firm is perceived as less benevolent and credible.
In addition, consumers are somewhat inclined to use an ethics law to avoid
repurchasing from the brand, when the firms are perceived as less benevolent. The presence of a less credible firm, on the other hand, does not seem to affect consumers’ intention to avoid repurchasing from the brand.

**Intention to Seek Additional Information**

From our study, we found that consumers were more willing to seek additional information, with the availability of an ethics law, when the firm was perceived as less benevolent and credible. This means that consumers can make more informed purchase decisions, as the presence of the law will force companies to disclose information about their supply chain, which in turn may increase the benevolence- and credibility trust their customers have towards the firm. A company needs to be perceived as both benevolent and credible, in order to ensure that customers believe that the company is “wanting to do good to others”, and that they seem trustworthy in their actions. Increased transparency from firms’ due to an ethics law will create value for their customers, as they are giving access to and knowledge of how the goods are being produced. This can first of all influence consumers’ image of the company, which in turn can boost product sales. By doing so, managers can build and maintain their relationship with the consumers, in addition to reinforce its reputation as a trustworthy party. Further, it can in the long run lead to improved labour practices, as companies have to disclose the conditions under which their products are being made.

**Intention to Avoid Repurchasing from the Brand**

As less trust in the credibility of the firm, did not affect consumers’ willingness to avoid repurchasing from the brand, the intended ethics law will not be a determining factor in explaining why customers churn. On the other hand, we found that less trust in the benevolence of the firm may affect consumers’ willingness to avoid repurchasing from the brand.

So why is customer churn important for managers? First of all, the proposed ethics law will give consumers the right to request access to previously strictly held information (e.g. suppliers and production facilities). Further, as most of the textile and apparel firms worldwide take part of the exploitation of the low labour in developing countries, this may lead consumers perceiving them as untrustworthy. Thus, they will remain sceptical of companies’ social responsibility efforts, which again could result in an intention to avoid
repurchasing from the brand. Thus, managers should stimulate social consumption by increasing communication efforts and the provision of information in order to build and maintain the company-customer relationship. A somewhat low explanation rate from the two dimensions of trust (i.e. benevolence and credibility) indicates that customer churn may be impacted by other factors, such as convenience, personal preferences, and resistance to change (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). For this reason, managers should use their resources to increase the cost of switching in order to increase customer lifetime value and prevent customer churn, while building a long-term relationship with customers.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

For the final part of our thesis, we will discuss the limitations of this study and give recommendations for future research. The current study holds several limitations. First of all, there may be some issues in regard to generalizations (e.g. external validity). This is because a convenience sampling was used to recruit family and friends on Facebook, in addition to including Norwegian-speaking only. Thus, the sample may not be representative of the target population, and a replication of the study is therefore needed in order to generalize the results further. Additionally, as consumer behaviour, trust, and involvement are not “objective” phenomenons that can easily be measured and understood across cultures and countries (Lyon, Mšllering, & Saunders, 2015), an examination of these aspects in other countries is highly needed. Second, we used scenarios and self-chosen companies in the questionnaire. This means that the respondents were presented with company information and value statements, which they otherwise may not have been fully aware of. In real life, consumers are for most parts not aware of a firm’s socially responsibility efforts and the effect on behavioural intentions can thus be different. Future research could therefore test the effect of trust on consumers’ behavioural intentions in a field experiment with real companies, which would serve as a great supplementation to our study. In addition, the same scenarios were presented to each and every respondent (i.e. within-subjects design), which allowed them to compare each scenario. Thus, future research should use a between-subjects design, as it would enable researchers to test respondents in different conditions and then compare the results of the groups, which would hinder the carryover effects from the within-subjects design.
For the current study, we have focused on social responsibility efforts (i.e. safe working conditions, fair wages, and human rights), while future research could look at environmental efforts (i.e. environmental protection) and/or animal rights, in order to see if the results correspond to ours. This is due to the existing environmental law (“Miljøinformasjonsloven”) in Norway, which has played a major role in a number of environmental issues (e.g. “palmeoljekampanjen”). Additionally, in regard to the fur industry in Norway, consumers have strong affections for animals. Thus, it would be interesting to investigate if consumers are more willing to seek additional information or avoid repurchasing, when the issue is of an environmental –and animal nature.

This study demonstrated that involvement with social consumption had little to no effect on consumers’ trust in firms and their behavioural intentions, in the context of an ethics law. Thus, due to the low explanation rate of involvement on the proposed relationship, future research could investigate other factors that affect trust in firms on consumers’ behavioural intentions. An example of such a factor could be how knowledge affects the relationship, as consumers’ who hold sufficient knowledge about ethical conditions are more willing to support and/or punish ethical business practices (Dickson, 2000; Khan et al., 2016; Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011), e.g. by seeking for additional information or avoid repurchasing.

Next, the proposed ethics law is an area worthy of further investigation. First and foremost, very few of the respondents were aware of the potentially upcoming law, which may have restricted the respondents’ subsequent answers to the questionnaire. However, if the Norwegian government accepts the law, it would be interesting to investigate the effect of the law on consumers’ actual behaviour, as our study is limited to only measure behavioural intentions. In addition, finding out how consumers would use an ethics law (e.g. by sending an e-mail to the firm, requesting in-store or review the firm’s webpage), and to what purpose (e.g. what kind of questions would they ask), is of great importance. This is because a prerequisite for an ethics law to function according to its purpose is that the public actively uses it (Regjeringen, 2014). Lastly, as this study focused on the outcome of the law on consumers’ behavioural intentions, we suggest that future research investigate how the law affects other outcomes (e.g. the effect on organisations). As an ethics law will ensure consumers’ right to information about the conditions
under which the goods are manufactured, it will most likely strengthen the firms who work seriously to improve conditions, and reveal those who do little or nothing. Therefore, it would be interesting to see whether the law initiate process whereby firms actually improve working conditions.

We believe that our recommendations for future research will be found interesting by other academics and marketing managers, which may lead to further investigation of an ethics law and its effect on different factors (i.e. trust and behavioural intentions). We anticipate that the law will lead to positive institutional change, as transparency can foster greater accountability by companies. Consequently, consumers may be able to make ethical purchasing choices, as the law ensure consumers’ right to information about under which conditions products are being manufactured.
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Appendix A: Positively Formulated Trust Scenario

The brand has an immense focus on creating jobs and better living standard for the textile workers. The brand is very concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs. The brand expects their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that commit to their values and sign their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company you can rely on.
Appendix B: Negatively Formulated Trust Scenario

The brand has an insignificant focus on creating jobs and better living standard for textile workers. The brand is not concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs. The brand allows their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that refrain from committing to their values and signing their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company that disclaims responsibility.
Appendix C: Manipulation Check of the Scenarios

Q1 I forbindelse med vår masteroppgave ved Handelshøyskolen BI, gjennomfører vi en pre-test som omhandler ditt forhold til etisk handel og kleskjeder i Norge. Alle svarene er anonyme og vil kun bli brukt videre i vår oppgave. På forhånd takk - vi setter stor pris på din deltagelse og hjelp.

Q2 Har du hørt om etikkinformasjonsloven - Initiativ for etisk handel?

- Ja
- Nei

Q3 Hvis ja, i hvilken grad synes du det er et skritt i riktig retning når det gjelder forbedringer i klesindustrien?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad

Q4 Før du begynner selve undersøkelsen, ber vi deg om å lese informasjonen nedenfor slik at du har et bedre grunnlag for å besvare spørsmålene i undersøkelsen:

I juni 2016 lanserte Kristelig Folkeparti, Miljøpartiet De Grønne og Senterpartiet et forslag i Stortinget om å utrede muligheten for å innføre en etikkinformasjonslov. Stortinget har ferdigbehandlet saken, og forslaget er nå oppe til debatt hos regjeringen. En slik lov vil gi pressen, organisasjoner,
forbrukere og alle andre som ønsker det krav på innsyn i leverandørene til klesbransjen.

Vennligst se for deg en kleskjede som operer i Norge med salg av klær og tekstil, og som du foretrekker å handle hos og besøker ofte. Alternativet du har “valgt” vil i undersøkelsen bli omtalt som kleskjeden.

Q5 I hvilken grad synes du denne teksten er informativ?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad

Q6 Vi ber deg lese scenarioet nedenfor og svare på de tilhørende spørsmålene så godt du kan.

Q7 I hvilken grad synes du at situasjonen beskrevet i scenarioet er realistisk?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad

Q8 I hvilken grad synes du at kleskjeden viser medfølelse og bryr seg om andre?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad
Q9 I hvilken grad synes du at kleskjeden er en troverdig og pålitelig bedrift?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad

Q10 Vi ber deg lese scenarioet nedenfor og svare på de tilhørende spørsmålene så godt du kan.

Q11  I hvilken grad synes du at situasjonen beskrevet i scenarioet er realistisk?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad

Q12  I hvilken grad synes du at kleskjeden viser medfølelse og bryr seg om andre?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad
Q13 I hvilken grad synes du at *kleskjeden* er en troverdig og pålitelig bedrift?

- I meget liten grad
- I liten grad
- I mindre grad
- Nøytral
- I noen grad
- I høy grad
- I meget høy grad

Q14 Kjønn

- Kvinne
- Mann

Q15 Alder

- Under 20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- Over 50

Q16 Var det noe i undersøkelsen som var vanskelig å forstå? Vær vennlig og skriv i tekstlommen nedenfor.

(tekstlommen)

Q17 Var det noe i undersøkelsen du reagerte på? Vær vennlig og skriv i tekstlommen nedenfor.

(tekstlommen)
Appendix D: Pre-test 1

I forbindelse med vår masteroppgave ved Handelshøyskolen BI, gjennomfører vi en pre-test som omhandler ditt forhold til etisk handel og kleskjeder i Norge. Alle svarene er anonyme og vil kun bli brukt videre i vår oppgave. På forhånd takk - vi setter stor pris på din deltagelse og hjelp.

Q1 Har du hørt om etikkinformasjonsloven - Initiativ for etisk handel?

○ Ja
○ Nei

Q2 Hvis ja, i hvilken grad synes du det er et skritt i riktig retning når det gjelder forbedringer i klesindustrien?

○ I meget liten grad
○ I liten grad
○ I mindre grad
○ Verken stor eller liten grad
○ I noen grad
○ I stor grad
○ I meget stor grad
Først ber vi deg om å lese teksten under:


Vennligst se for deg en kleskjede som operer i Norge med salg av klær og tekstil, og som du foretrekker å handle hos og besøker ofte. Alternativet du har “valgt” vil i undersøkelsen bli omtalt som kleskjeden.

Vi ber deg lese teksten nedenfor og svare på de tilhørende spørsmålene så godt du kan.

**Q3** Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> er opptatt av at samfunnet skal ha det godt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at samfunnets behov virker å være viktige for <em>kleskjeden</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> ikke vil skade samfunnet med vilje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> vil strekke seg langt for å hjelpe samfunnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q4** Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at kleskjeden fremstår som en troverdig bedrift</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at kleskjeden fremstår som en pålitelig bedrift</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Q5** Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i bedrifters samfunnsansvar</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i å handle etisk</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Basert på tekst ovenfor og at etikkinformasjonsloven er tilgjengelig, hvor sannsynlig er det at du som forbruker vil:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ikke sannsynlig</th>
<th>Lite sannsynlig</th>
<th>Mindre sannsynlig</th>
<th>Sannsynlig</th>
<th>Meget sannsynlig</th>
<th>Svært sannsynlig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Søke etter mer informasjon om kleskjedens klesproduksjon og etiske initiativ?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unngå å handle hos kleskjeden i fremtiden?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 Vi ber deg lese teksten nedenfor og svare på de tilhørende spørsmålene så godt du kan.

Q8 Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helt uenig</td>
<td>Uenig</td>
<td>Litt uenig</td>
<td>Verken uenig eller enig</td>
<td>Litt enig</td>
<td>Enig</td>
<td>Helt enig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> er opptatt av at samfunnet skal ha det godt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at samfunnets behov virker å være viktige for <em>kleskjeden</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> ikke vil skade samfunnet med vilje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> vil strekke seg langt for å hjelpe samfunnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at kleskjeden fremstår som en troverdig bedrift</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at kleskjeden fremstår som en pålitelig bedrift</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10 Basert på tekst ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i bedrifters samfunnsansvar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i å handle etisk</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q11** Basert på tekst ovenfor og at etikkinformasjonsloven er tilgjengelig, hvor sannsynlig er det at du som forbruker vil:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ikke sannsynlig</th>
<th>Lite sannsynlig</th>
<th>Mindre sannsynlig</th>
<th>Verken ikke sannsynlig eller sannsynlig</th>
<th>Sannsynlig</th>
<th>Meget sannsynlig</th>
<th>Svært sannsynlig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Søke etter mer informasjon om kleskjendens klesproduksjon og etiske initiativ?  
Unngå å handle hos kleskjeden i fremtiden?

**Q12** Kjønn

- ○ Mann
- ○ Kvinne

**Q13** Alder

- ○ Under 20
- ○ 21-30
- ○ 31-40
- ○ 41-50
- ○ Over 50
Appendix E: Final Survey (Norwegian Version)


Q1 Har du hørt om etikkinformasjonsloven - Initiativ for etisk handel?

☐ Ja

☐ Nei

Q2 Hvis ja, i hvilken grad synes du det er et skritt i riktig retning når det gjelder forbedringer i klesindustrien?

☐ I meget liten grad

☐ I liten grad

☐ I mindre grad

☐ Verken stor eller liten grad

☐ I noen grad

☐ I stor grad

☐ I meget stor grad
Først ber vi deg om å lese teksten under:


Nå ber vi deg tenke på en kleskjede som opererer i Norge med salg av klær og tekstil. Alternativet du har "valgt" vil gjennom hele undersøkelsen bli omtalt som kleskjeden.

Tekst 1:

Kleskjeden har et ekstra stort fokus på å skape arbeidsplasser og bedre livestandard for tekstilarbeiderne. Kleskjeden er svært opptatt av at tekstilarbeiderne skal få en rettferdig lønn som man kan leve av og som dekker arbeidernes grunnleggende behov.
Q3 Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at kleskjeden er opptatt av at samfunnet skal ha det godt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at samfunnets behov virker å være viktige for kleskjeden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at kleskjeden ikke vil skade samfunnet med vilje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at kleskjeden vil strekke seg langt for å hjelpe samfunnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Fortsettelse tekst 1):
*Kleskjeden* tillater kun at deres produkter blir produsert av leverandører og fabrikker som forplikter seg til deres verdier og signerer deres etiske retningslinjer, som viser at *kleskjeden* er en bedrift man kan stole på.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at <em>kleskjeden</em> fremstår som en troverdig bedrift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at <em>kleskjeden</em> fremstår som en pålitelig bedrift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Basert på tekst 1 (beskrevet nedenfor), vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i bedrifters samfunnsansvar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i å handle etisk</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kleskjeden har et ekstra stort fokus på å skape arbeidsplasser og bedre levestandard for tekstilarbeiderne. Kleskjeden er svært opptatt av at tekstilarbeiderne skal få en rettferdig lønn som man kan leve av og som dekker arbeidernes grunnleggende behov. Kleskjeden tillater kun at deres produkter blir produsert av leverandører og fabrikker som forplikter seg til deres verdier og signerer deres etiske retningslinjer, som viser at kleskjeden er en bedrift man kan stole på.
Q6 Basert på tekst 1 (beskrevet nedenfor) og at etikkinformasjonsloven er tilgjengelig, hvor sannsynlig er det at du som forbruker vil:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Søke etter mer informasjon om kleskjedens klesproduksjon og etiske initiativ?</th>
<th>Ikke sannsynlig</th>
<th>Lite sannsynlig</th>
<th>Mindre sannsynlig</th>
<th>Sannsynlig</th>
<th>Meget sannsynlig</th>
<th>Svært sannsynlig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unngå å handle hos kleskjeden i fremtiden?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kleskjeden har et ekstra stort fokus på å skape arbeidsplasser og bedre levestandard for tekstilarbeiderne. Kleskjeden er svært opptatt av at tekstilarbeiderne skal få en rettferdig lønn som man kan leve av og som dekker arbeidernes grunnleggende behov. Kleskjeden tillater kun at deres produkter blir produsert av leverandører og fabrikker som forplikter seg til deres verdier og signerer deres etiske retningslinjer, som viser at kleskjeden er en bedrift man kan stole på.
**Tekst 2:**

*Kleskjeden* har et mindre fokus på å skape arbeidsplasser og bedre levestandard for tekstilarbeiderne. *Kleskjeden* er ikke opptatt av at tekstilarbeiderne skal få en rettferdig lønn som man kan leve av og som dekker arbeidernes grunnleggende behov.

---

**Q7** Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> er opptatt av at samfunnet skal ha det godt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at samfunnets behov virker å være viktige for <em>kleskjeden</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> ikke vil skade samfunnet med vilje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg stoler på at <em>kleskjeden</em> vil strekke seg langt for å hjelpe samfunnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Fortsettelse tekst 2):
*Kleskjeden* tillater at deres produkter blir produsert av leverandører og fabrikker som avstår fra å forplikte seg til deres verdier og signerer deres etiske retningslinjer, som viser at *kleskjeden* er en bedrift som fraskriver seg ansvar.

**Q8** Basert på teksten ovenfor, vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at <em>kleskjeden</em> fremstår som en troverdig bedrift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg synes at <em>kleskjeden</em> fremstår som en pålitelig bedrift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Basert på tekst 2 (beskrevet nedenfor), vennligst ta så stilling til i hvilken grad du er uenig/enig i følgende utsagn, på en skala fra 1 til 7, hvor 1 = Helt uenig og 7 = Helt enig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt uenig</th>
<th>Uenig</th>
<th>Litt uenig</th>
<th>Verken uenig eller enig</th>
<th>Litt enig</th>
<th>Enig</th>
<th>Helt enig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i bedrifters samfunnsansvar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg er generelt interessert i å handle etisk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kleskjeden har et mindre fokus på å skape arbeidsplasser og bedre levestandard for tekstilarbeiderne. Kleskjeden er ikke opptatt av at tekstilarbeiderne skal få en rettferdig lønn som man kan leve av og som dekker arbeidernes grunnleggende behov. Kleskjeden tillater at deres produkter blir produsert av leverandører og fabrikker som avstår fra å forplikte seg til deres verdier og signerer deres etiske retningslinjer, som viser at kleskjeden er en bedrift som fraskriver seg ansvar.*
Q10 Basert på tekst 2 (beskrevet nedenfor) og at etikkinformasjonsloven er tilgjengelig, hvor sannsynlig er det at du som forbruker vil:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Såске etter mer informasjon om kleskjedens klesproduksjon og etiske initiativ?</th>
<th>Ikke sannsynlig</th>
<th>Lite sannsynlig</th>
<th>Mindre sannsynlig</th>
<th>Sannsynlig</th>
<th>Meget sannsynlig</th>
<th>Svært sannsynlig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unngå å handle hos kleskjeden i fremtiden?</th>
<th>Ikke sannsynlig</th>
<th>Lite sannsynlig</th>
<th>Mindre sannsynlig</th>
<th>Sannsynlig</th>
<th>Meget sannsynlig</th>
<th>Svært sannsynlig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kleskjeden har et mindre fokus på å skape arbeidsplasser og bedre levestandard for tekstilarbeiderne. Kleskjeden er ikke opptatt av at tekstilarbeiderne skal få en rettferdig lønn som man kan leve av og som dekker arbeidernes grunnleggende behov. Kleskjeden tillater at deres produkter blir produsert av leverandører og fabrikker som avstår fra å forplikte seg til deres verdier og signerer deres etiske retningslinjer, som viser at kleskjeden er en bedrift som fraskriver seg ansvar.
Q11 For å få litt bakgrunnsinformasjon, ønsker vi noen generelle opplysninger om deg.

Q12 Kjønn

- Mann
- Kvinne

Q13 Alder

- Under 20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- Over 50

Q14 Inntekt (forrige år)

- Under 150 000 NOK
- Mellom 150 001 og 250 000 NOK
- Mellom 250 001 og 350 000 NOK
- Mellom 350 001 og 450 000 NOK
- Mellom 450 001 og 550 000 NOK
- Over 550 001 NOK
Q15 Utdanning

- Grunnskole
- Videregående
- Høyskole/universitet (bachelorgrad eller lavere)
- Høyskole/universitet (mastergrad eller høyere)
Q16 Bosted (om du før tiden bor i utlandet, velger du hjemfylket ditt)

- Østfold
- Akershus
- Oslo
- Hedmark
- Oppland
- Buskerud
- Vestfold
- Telemark
- Aust-Agder
- Vest-Agder
- Rogaland
- Hordaland
- Sogn og Fjordane
- Møre og Romsdal
- Sør-Trøndelag
- Nord-Trøndelag
- Nordland
- Troms
- Finnmark

Q17 Hvis du ønsker, kan du legge igjen telefonnummeret ditt og du er automatisk med i trekningen av 500 NOK (vil bli sendt via vipps).
Appendix F: Survey (English Version)

In appliance with our Master's thesis at BI Norwegian Business School, we have made a survey that concerns your relationship with ethical purchasing and clothing brands in Norway. The survey will take about 5 minutes to complete. All the answers are anonymous and will only be used in our study. Thank you in advance - we appreciate your participation and help.

Q1 Have you heard about the ethics law/etikkinformasjonsloven – Initiativ for etisk Handel?

- Yes
- No

Q2 If yes, to what extent do you think it is a step in the right direction, in regard to improvements in the clothing industry?

- To a very small extent
- To a small extent
- To a lesser extent
- Neither large nor small extent
- To some extent
- To a large extent
- To a very large extent
First, we ask you to read the text below:

In June 2016, Kristelig Folkeparti, Miljøpartiet De Grønne, and Senterpartiet launched a proposal in the parliament to investigate the possibility of introducing a Norwegian ethics law. The parliament has finalized the matter and the proposal is now up for debate within the government. Such a law will give the press, organizations, consumers, and anyone else, the opportunity to require transparency in the production chain of the suppliers.

Now we ask you think of a clothing brand that operates in Norway with textile and apparel. The option you have "chosen" will be referred to as the brand throughout the survey.

Text 1:
The brand has an immense focus on creating jobs and better living standard for the textile workers. The brand is very concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs.
**Q3** Based on the text above, please state the extent to which you disagree/agree with the following statements, on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the brand is concerned about the society’s welfare</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the society’s needs seem to be important to the brand</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the brand would not knowingly hurt the society</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the brand will go out of its way to help me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continuation text 1):
*The brand* expects their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that commit to their values and sign their ethical guidelines, which show that *the brand* is a company you can rely on.

**Q4** Based on the text above, please state the extent to which you disagree/agree with the following statements, on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that <em>the brand</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appears to be trustworthy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that <em>the brand</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appears to be reliable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Based on text 1 (described below), please state the extent to which you disagree/agree with the following statements, on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am generally interested in corporate social responsibility (CSR)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am generally interested in ethical purchasing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The brand has an immense focus on creating jobs and better living standard for the textile workers. The brand is very concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs. The brand expects their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that commit to their values and sign their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company you can rely on.
**Q6** Based on text 1 (described below) and that the ethics law is available, how likely is it that you as a consumer will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Less likely</th>
<th>Neither not likely nor likely</th>
<th>A bit likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would seek for additional information about the brand’s clothing production and ethical initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would avoid purchasing from the brand in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The brand has an immense focus on creating jobs and better living standard for the textile workers. The brand is very concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs. The brand expects their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that commit to their values and sign their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company you can rely on.*
Text 2:
The brand has an insignificant focus on creating jobs and better living standard for textile workers. The brand is not concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs.

Q7 Based on the text above, please state the extent to which you disagree/agree with the following statements, on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the brand is concerned about the society’s welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the society’s needs seem to be important to the brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the brand would not knowingly hurt the society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that the brand will go out of its way to help me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The brand allows their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that refrain from committing to their values and signing their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company that disclaims responsibility.

Q8 Based on the text above, please state the extent to which you disagree/agree with the following statements, on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that the brand appears to be trustworthy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the brand appears to be reliable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9 Based on text 2 (described below), please state the extent to which you disagree/agree with the following statements, on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am generally interested in corporate social responsibility (CSR)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am generally interested in ethical purchasing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The brand has an insignificant focus on creating jobs and better living standard for textile workers. The brand is not concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs. The brand allows their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that refrain from committing to their values and signing their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company that disclaims responsibility.

**Q10** Based on text 2 (described below) and that the ethics law is available, how likely is it that you as a consumer will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Less likely</th>
<th>Neither not likely nor likely</th>
<th>A bit likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely is it that you would seek for additional information about the brand’s clothing production and ethical initiatives?

How likely is it that you would avoid purchasing from the brand in the future?

The brand has an insignificant focus on creating jobs and better living standard for textile workers. The brand is not concerned with providing textile workers with a fair living wage that meets the worker’s basic needs. The brand allows their products to be manufactured by suppliers and factories that refrain from committing to their values and signing their ethical guidelines, which show that the brand is a company that disclaims responsibility.
Q11 In order to get some background information, we would like to have some general info about you.

Q12 Gender

- Male
- Female

Q13 Age

- Below 20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- Over 50

Q14 Income (last year)

- Below 150 000 NOK
- Between 150 001 and 250 000 NOK
- Between 250 001 and 350 000 NOK
- Between 350 001 and 450 000 NOK
- Between 450 001 and 550 000 NOK
- Over 550 001 NOK
Q15 Education

- Primary School
- High School
- College/university (bachelor degree or lower)
- College/university (master degree or lower)
Q16 Place of residence (if you currently live abroad, choose your hometown)

- Østfold
- Akershus
- Oslo
- Hedmark
- Oppland
- Buskerud
- Vestfold
- Telemark
- Aust-Agder
- Vest-Agder
- Rogaland
- Hordaland
- Sogn og Fjordane
- Møre og Romsdal
- Sør-Trøndelag
- Nord-Trøndelag
- Nordland
- Troms
- Finnmark

Q17 If you wish, you can leave your phone number and you are automatically in the draw of 500 NOK (will be sent via vipps)
Appendix G: Structural Equation Model 1

Positively Formulated Trust Scenario
Appendix H: Structural Equation Model 2

Negatively Formulated Trust Scenario

[Diagram showing the relationships between variables with arrows and correlation coefficients]