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ABSTRACT

Thesis was carried out to make an estimation of the willingness of consumers to buy the clothes produced under eco-friendly and decent way. Neoclassic demand theory was used and basic idea was to know that either moral effects on a consumer’s individual decision while choosing the products manufactured under friendly environment or not; if yes, then how and how much. Survey method along with choice experiment analysis was used to collect the data. Selected area was Boras Sweden and 50 respondents were considered for the survey. To estimate the degree of willingness of a consumer to pay for a Swan labeled and/or Fairtrade labeled jeans, choice experiments was used. Afterwards, the collected data was used within econometric models. It has been observed from results that consumers were more willing to pay for a Swan labeled and/or Fairtrade labeled jeans than non-labeled jeans. The responsible individuals regarding environment were much more willing to pay for Fairtrade and/or Swan labeled clothes, considering the factor that production does not affect the environment in negative way and it was done under socially acceptable conditions.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In this chapter I present my subject, background to chosen subject and its problem statement. This chapter also includes the purpose of the study, limitations and method of study.

1.1 Background

Green products or environment friendly goods are becoming very prominent in the society during the last decade. Earlier studies have shown that consumers are now willing to pay for the labeled products because they want to be considered more socially responsible and they reveal their commitment for the environment through the choices they make on the market. But price is an important factor which affects their willingness to pay for the labeled products. The previous studies have shown a number of factors explaining the behavior of the typical “green” consumer. Many studies show that consumers are only willing to purchase environmental friendly goods within certain constraints (Bennet et al., 2001). The ancestor work on ‘Our Common Future’, otherwise it lead to as the Brundlandt report which was specially made by the United Nations Assembly ordered in 1982 and distributed in 1987. This report basically contains the plan of ‘sustainable development’ (Brundtland, 1987). It has been understood from the last twenty four years as deeply analyzed idea by contemporary researchers, the time when this report was presented. This idea was revolutionary at that time as resources were not inexhaustible in the world, continuous progress and development without destroying earth and collaboration more than government level was not new and solution of global issues seemed to be (and is) realistic. In spite of all that, many writers still believe on the oldest and the best definition of the Brundtland and consider ‘people, profit, and planet ‘as’ three pillars of sustainability’ (Bader, 2008).

Though, the idea of sustainability also includes the issues other than the environment. Sustainable development merges different strategies to achieve “Economic (profit), social (people), and environmental (planet) goals” (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, Page 1). Besides it is a “development that meets the needs of present without compromising the ability of future generation to meet their own needs” (Strong, C. 1997, Page 32). The economic aspect of sustainability relates to make sure the fair prices for consumers as well as for companies. The environmental or ecological feature covers to preserve natural resources and also to care about natural environment. Finally, social aspects refer to the needs of the society, as well as the
support and gratitude for the agriculture sector from the government and society (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). Hence, when talking about sustainability, one should be conscious that sustainable does not only mean environment-friendly, but also consider the social and economic welfare. Therefore, sustainable consumption is a notion that goes ahead of the traditional understanding of consumerism, defined as “the effects of gathering and purchasing material possessions to increase happiness and social position” (Hume, 2009, Page 7). Sustainable consumption is begun by a decision making process that “takes the consumer’s social responsibility into account in addition to individual needs and wants” (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, Page 170). A more solid definition of sustainable consumption is “Sustainable consumption is consumption that supports the ability of current and future generation to meet their material and other needs, without causing irreversible damage to the environment or loss of function in natural system...” (Britwistle & Moore, 2007, Page 211).

While reviewing the literature one can fairly often come upon the term such as “green” and “ethical” which are used to exemplify pro social or pro environmental consumption. Thus, before proceeding further, an issue needed to be addressed is up to what extent the term sustainable green and ethical can be interchangeable. Generally the term green is associated with the consumers who are concerned about environmental friendly consumption, e.g. they consider the consequences of purchase, use and disposal of their products and services on environment (Moisander, 2007; Newholm & Shaw, 2007). While defining the green consumerism it can also be defined in other words such as socially responsible or pro-social consumer behavior it is described as complex ethical issue and green consumer, being a social aware consumer “take into account the public consequences of his her private consumption and attempt to use his or her purchasing power to bring about social change” (Moisander, 2007, Page 2). So it is not rather clear the distinction between term ethical and green. In order to individual’s moral anxiety according to some writers “green consumers” was widened to “ethical consumers” (Newholm & Shaw, 2007). Nowadays sustainable consumption may pass on to a large number of products, such as organic food which can be divided into different categories as locally cultivated, organic grown or supporting Fairtrade principles (Tanner & Kast, 2003).

Sustainable agenda specifically referred the ideas of lessening the environmental effect seem to have been at the forefront of what has become known, moreover this idea and concept of sustainability was immediately considered implemented by government and educators. However, sustainability is not only to save the environment. To know the background and
purpose of sustainability it is recommended to revisit the basis of sustainability so that one can avoid becoming a user of what typically has been referred as ‘the ‘S’ word’; used to clarify the practice of confusing the word sustainability with terms for example organic, green or eco (Silverman, 2007).

Significant share of responsibility is on the shoulder of the textile and fashion industries in the world that they take the responsibility of the business practices which have been proved unsustainable in the past. Since the industrial revolution has been responsible for the massive environmental damage particularly manufacturing processes and dying processes are associated with textile industry (Sellappa, Prathyumnan, Joseph, Keyan, & Balachandar, 2010). As a result of textile dyeing many damages has been done. Mercury poisoning is the main example of this damage and it has long term affects. The result of a recent study done on small lake in Diss Mere, UK a town in Nothfolk shows that the mercury level in lake was at its highest level in the mid of 19th century and remained at high level and is considered to be contaminated over 150 year more (Yang, 2010). The process of tanning leather (used for jackets, bags and etc.) is a major source of poisoning the water sources with chemicals in developing countries and these harmful chemicals are known to cause carcinoma(Akan, Moses,Ogugbuaja, & Abah, 2007).

It is of relevance to put oneself at the consumer’s side, to understand the preferences of consumers at the time of purchase. In this field many studies have been made. It has been explained by Solomon & Rabolt in Fashion Consumer Behavior that Customers have different choices and needs and they make their decisions on the daily basis regarding the purchase. Different peoples have different attitude to same object and it can be linked to person’s consumption mold and firm lifestyle (Solomon & Rabolt, 2007). Consumption is depend on consumers because different people have different relation to consumption. An important factor we should consider that how different companies want to communicate their messages to the consumers because there are many consumer who wants to participate in more ecological future. It is very hard for consumers to know the truth that whether the companies are communicating truth in their marketing or not. Emergence of `eco` and `green` is the danger because brands used this as a marketing tool and sell more fashion: a practice referred to as greenwash (Arnold, 2009). Though it is very important to know that how consumers know the consequences of consumption and what are the reasons of their decisions.
1.2 Problem statement

As mentioned above, sustainable consumption emerged as an important issue in past years. It is investigated and discussed in media, societal, political and educational level. Today the western society is a society of over consumption which is the biggest problem. This issue leads to abolish the environment increasingly. It is need of the time that society must move towards sustainability. While looking at textile industry there is lots of things which are not up to the mark, such as working conditions and usage of harmful chemicals which have big impact on health as well as contaminated the underground water. So the industry has to take the responsibility and contribute in moving towards sustainability. As well as consumers have the big impact and also have the power to change because the ultimate users of products are consumers. When the consumers aware of the outcomes then they would try to contribute in moving towards more sustainable future. In order to understand and make it clear it is important to know how consumers endorse or obstruct sustainable development.

By buying Fairtrade and Swan labeled clothes consumers reflect that they care about sustainability or Fairtrade is important. Consumers’ interest and their willingness to pay for the environmental friendly products are influential factors, which compel the textile companies to take environmental responsibility in the production process. If the textile sector does not know the consumers preferences then they will not be able to know which environmental friendly actions they should take according to the consumers thought. Therefore consumers’ willingness to pay is a great interest for the textile companies to take the necessary environmental consideration in the production phase. So the research question is as follows:

Are consumers willing to pay more for Fairtrade or sustainable products? Has this ethical and environmental thinking extent to the consumers’ clothing shopping?

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate the consumers’ willingness to pay more for Fairtrade and Swan labeled Jeans.

1.4 Method

In this section I briefly explain the research method of data collection. The data will be collected in a survey. The researcher used this method to study a significant number of people
in their natural environment. In general, this method is used to determine about the current issue. In this method, the participation of users is very important. We can collect data from users through organized interviews or questionnaires using face to face meeting or by telephone. For comparison with the experience of the methodology of the survey does not include research varies, but may impose restrictions on the users through the survey tool. This method also allows analysis of the relationship between different variables (Kumar R., 2005).

After seeing advantages and disadvantages of different research methods I have decided to choose survey method. Because I think survey method is well matched with my research question and easy to carry out

The data will be analyzed in a random effects binary choices framework model to evaluate the willingness to pay more for Fairtrade or sustainable products.

1.4.1 Choice Experiments

The process of research contains three parts. First one is to screen the specifications according to the situation. Second part is to develop the experimental design, whose outcome is the combinations of attributes that will be presented in survey. The last one is to analyze the choice made. Focus groups are helpful for finding the appropriate number of levels and choosing the correct meaning for them where as component attributes are defined in terms of environmental services.

Choice experiment helps in measuring the value for an individual of a products specification. Characteristics of a product are defined in choice experiments and then they vary over choice card. Choice experiments are used for they have different advantages like they are efficient in response while comparing with open-ended questions. The reason for this is that you try to imitate the choices we make in routine life, which may cause the fully aware of the scope of the investigation for this right in their own interest of action. Therefore choice experiments reduce the biasness. When price varies, the individuals are inquired to choose different sets of specification of a good over different choices. And these choices are basis for the estimation of the willingness to pay for the positive change in environment. (Garrod& Willis, 1999)

Contingent valuation exercises can be used while examining a specific situation like particular environmental change. The researcher should provide the basic and sufficient knowledge to respondent about the scenario so that he or she may get able to judge the quality of the change. The outcome of choice experiments gives information about the total case study as
well as the changes in the attributes of the case too. Choice experiments are helpful in
separating the attributes, relevant to the situation and make the estimation of the preferences
possible over other. Another advantage of choice experiments is that the attributes and whole
scenario is evaluated. This thing enables a larger flexibility in the analysis as compared to
customary method of contingent valuation. (Garrod& Willis, 1999)

Respondents are frequently asked to make choices based on their own observation and
experience from the real world. Choice experiments are carried out with studies by asking the
respondent to make a comparison of two different alternatives pair-wise and then choose one
of them as per their preference. Most of the time, the choice also includes of not picking any
given profile. Levels of attributes of the environmental good are fetched by different
alternatives. The consumer will pick the best alternate according to his or her choice, based on
the constraints like knowledge and income. Individuals are convincing to trade-off between
different attributes, by using choice experiments again and again, from different set of
alternatives. (Garrod & Willis, 1999)

Choices are modeled as a method of attribute levels using the random utility theory. There is
possibility of it because respondents are asked to select one alternate from each set of options.
The choices the Respondents make are based on some degree of randomness and the
attributes i.e. because of randomness in preferences of the respondent or the lack of relevant
information of the respondent (Garrod & Willis, 1999). Choices consist of all possible set of
attributes and prices.

\[ U_{iq} = V_{iq} (\beta x_{iq}) + e_{iq} \]  

(3)

Here in above equation \( U_{iq} \) is the unobservable overall utility received from selecting
alternative \( q \), \( e_{iq} \) is the random component and \( V_{iq} \) is the observable objective component.
Here \( X_{iq} \) is a vector of different personal and socioeconomic characteristics and \( \beta \) is a vector
of parameters (Ek & Söderholm, 2008). \( V_{iq} \) is a conditional utility function and it is usually
presumed to be linear. If the respondent choose alternative \( i \) over \( j \) the utility of \( j \) is less than
the utility of \( i \) (Garrod & Willis, 1999). Binary choice with random effect econometric model
is used because the respondent makes repeated choices.
1.5 Limitation and Scope

The scientific study of consumer behavior is dynamic and miscellaneous. Different consumers have different preferences and consumption patterns towards different products. The study becomes more diversified when moral standards and ethics are added. Therefore the study will be conducted on consumers’ willingness to pay more for Swan and Fairtrade labeled products. As there are very few clothes are available with Swan and Fairtrade labeled yet. The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the willingness of consumers towards Swan and Fairtrade labeled jeans, I choose jeans as a product category. The item investigate in this thesis is a jeans. As this is a hypothetical created situation and may be respondents over estimate their willingness to pay extra. The choice experiment will only concern the Swan and Fairtrade label and it will be executed on 50 respondents. The target group will be the young consumers of age 17 to 40. The survey will be conducted in Boras Sweden outside H&M, ginatricot and Cubus. In addition the time constraint and relatively small group of respondent effectively means that the result of this study cannot be generalized. To understand this area of research further and more comprehensive study is required.

1.6 Previous research

The idea of Fairtrade and its background is described by Wilkinson (2007). He divides it into three different components it consist of Alternative trade organization (ATO), promotion and marketing. This is very important for this thesis as it helps to understand what Fairtrade and Fairtrade movement is. Fairtrade is reliant on political consumerism to survive and it is analyzed as a new economic social movement.

It is very important to know how Fairtrade works and also whether the trade concept can accomplish the social goals. Fairtrade provides an additional incentive to better living conditions to developing countries. When the quality of Fairtrade labeled products is equal to the non-labeled products then it gives the choice to consumer to prefer the labeled products. May be this is good sign that consumers feels better by purchasing Fairtrade because it is beneficial for their reputation. Understanding of extrinsic qualities of Fairtrade labeled products is an important factor to increase the demand of Fairtrade labeled products (Steinrücken & Jaenichen 2007).
Chapter 2

Background

In this chapter I explain the history and criteria for Fairtrade and Swan label.

2.1 Fairtrade and its History

Fairtrade was founded about 53 years ago in Europe and U.S.A it was combination of solidarity and charity. Initially Fairtrade organization started trading of food and drink products from Latin America as well as trading of handicrafts from Africa and Asia. United Nations conference was held in 1968 on trade and development and reached on a conclusion that the third world development should be based on trade not aid. This resulted so called Fairtrade need more political focus (Wilkinson, 2007).

In many European countries Alternative Trade Association was founded to neutralize the structural imbalances in trade between developed and developing countries by creating alternatives distribution channel. The basic aim of Fairtrade is to support the growers and to give the share of total profit to producers (Steinrücken & Jaenichen, 2007).

In late 1980s the International Fairtrade Association was founded the basic aim was to bring together prominent importers/traders from different parts of the World to provide a forum for Northern Fairtrade organizations. Later on International Fairtrade Association changed into the global expression of the movement to comprise the Southern producer groups. Dedicated shops started a Network of European shops in 1990 later on which led towards labeling initiatives. In result of struggle to access the mainstream market the Fairtrade Labeling Organization International came into being (FLO), (Wilkinson, 2007).

Fairtrade has three main components the first is Alternative Trade Organization and the second is marketing and the third is promotion. The main focus of marketing component is to increase the trade of Fairtrade labeled products. The primary objective of promotion component is to launch the different campaigns to take specific initiatives to increase the trade of Fairtrade Labeled products and also political campaigns to change the rules of conventional trade and make legislation for Fairtrade Products (Wilkinson, 2007).
The FLO is composing by the national labeling initiatives. The primary objective of FLO is to register producers and national labeling initiative provides licenses to retailers, manufacturers and service provider sector. This helps producers to enter into mainstream market. Initially the cost was borne by buyer but now due to increase in cost it is borne by producer groups (Wilkinson, 2007).

The Fairtrade label is social label and marked through internet or through traditional distribution and marketing channel. The market of developed counties can be accessed by producers of under developing countries by using conventional marketing and retail structure (Steinrücken & Jaenichen, 2007). Fairtrade and the Swan are on the basis of new forms of collective action, such as non-governmental organizations and other communities, and therefore considered as a new form of social mobility in commerce area, but it focuses on traditional issues such as redistributive justice (Wilkinson, 2007). Fairtrade tries to redefine the relationship between producers and consumers and its main focus is on producer community rather than on the product.

2.2 The Criteria for Fairtrade

Licenses are issued by FLO CERT for Fairtrade Label and the criterion is decided by FLO for labeling a product. Some criteria are specific for each product type but there are criteria which are same for all product groups and producers. Based on ILO’s convention on basic social economic conditions there are eight basic criteria which are same for all producers. Such as legislation on child labor, discrimination, union rights and against forced labor (International Labor Organization, 2006)

Other than the requirements of working conditions there are also some criteria about environment which differ with the size of the producers. The criteria on the product ensure the minimum price and the premium which can be invested on different projects to boost the economic, social and environmental development. And it also provides finance in advance if producers required. It enables the mutual long term relationship between producers and buyers. Finally it set minimum and clear criteria to ensure that social and economic conditions for production and trade are fair and environmental friendly (Fairtrade Sverige). The minimum price for Fairtrade products are set by FLO that purchasers of the fairtrade products has to pay to a producer organizations of the products. FLO tries to set the price as lowest as possible but it is not a fixed price. If the Fairtrade product price is lower than the market price
than purchaser has to pay the market price for Fairtrade product. The price is set to a level that ensures the producer organizations get a reasonable price which covers the sustainable production cost. Price can be higher producer organizations and traders can negotiate it which depends on the basis of type, quality, quantity and origin (Fairtrade).

FLO controls all different phases involved in production to certify that all mandatory criteria have been fulfilled. Certification is also mandatory for importer, exporter, packer or extra producer and processing unit. Only those products can get Fairtrade label which are certified from FLO-CERT and products must be bought from certified producers or importers. Fairtrade control and continuously monitor the records of purchase and payment of importers, exporters, producer associations and licensees (Fairtrade, 2011).

### 2.3 Swan and its History

In Swedish market there are lots of different eco-labels are available, in this thesis only Swan will be explored. The reason for choosing Swan for eco labels representation because it is well recognized in Sweden and its meaning is known by consumers. Swan was established in 1989 by the Nordic council of ministers and it is official Ecolabel for Nordic countries. A recent survey in Nordic market showed that 94% in Nordic countries recognized Swan as eco label (Nordic Ecolabelling, 2011). The criteria for labeling a product are decided by Ecolabelling Board with representation from each country. In Nordic countries Swan is one the leading eco labeling organization as today with 63 different product groups. Its aim is to encourage producers to produce environmental friendly products and also helps consumer to contribute in achieving more sustainability. Eco labeling Sweden is a nonprofit government owned organization (Ecolabel, 2011).

However Eco labeling Sweden is a nonprofit organization but it charges the application to cover the administration expenditure such as the control of the products, marketing and development of the criteria. The application fee for Swan label is 20 000 SEK plus value added tax, and after approval of the product the company has to pay the 0.3% annual turnover of Nordic eco labeled products. The license is need to be reviewed when the criteria have been reviewed. The company has to pay 10 000 SEK to Swan for review of license. For expansion of license the company has to pay 9000 SEK to Swan.
2.4 The Criteria for the Swan label

Nordic countries jointly decided the criteria for Swan label which are based on EU environmental labeling of textiles established by the Commission’s decision on ecological criteria for textile, 2002/371/EC of 15 May 2002 (Nordic Ecolabelling, 2010). Professional from Nordic Ecolabelling organization builds up proposal for criteria. And then expert from other organizations are also invited to give their views. Before final approval the criteria are available for general public and also sent out for review. Finally criteria are approved by Nordic Ecolabelling Board. To reduce the environmental impact the criteria are continuously reviewed around every three to five years (Nordic Ecolabelling, 2011).

In order to place the Swan label on clothes, under the EU regulation the material in the garments must be organically grown and the textile may not contain any health or environmental hazardous elements. To certify the quality of clothes in wear and tear and to light exposure will be tested. Producer must follow the national environmental and working regulation in the production country; the use of health and environmental hazardous elements are must be restricted to a low level and also the release of water and air to low level. Swan label ensures that the environmental demands are fulfilled in entire production chain (Nordic Ecolabelling, 2010).

The criteria are different for different fibers; there is no need to fulfill the criteria if a product has less than 5% of same fiber. However 85% of the fiber in a product must fulfill the specific-fiber criteria or are recycled fibers. There are particular criteria for natural vegetable fiber for example cotton, it means that they must be grown organically under the definition made by EU. To market a product in Nordic countries producers must give a plan for reducing energy and water consumption and the packing essential to satisfy the regulation. To get the Swan license companies must state the code of conduct how they work with working hours, discipline, discrimination, health and safety, child labor, forced labor, freedom of association and right to collective bargaining and compensation and how all these will be handled by the company. It is also a requirement that the plan cover whole production and also sub-contractors. If it seems that the published requirements are not fulfilled the license may be cancelled (Nordic Ecolabelling, 2010).
Chapter 3

Theoretical and Methodological Framework

In this chapter I explain the require theory in order to answer the research question. This includes neoclassical theory of demand and some moral motivation for green products.

3.1 The Demand for Clothes

Demand of clothes depends on many different factors such as income, price and quality. Demand function and demand curve is assumed that the benefits of individuals’ effort maximize (Nicholson, 2005).

The demand curve shows the link between the price of a particular product and the quantity of the product bought, on the assumption that all other variables are said constant. An individual’s demand curve expresses the link of how much that particular person purchases of the product and the price for the particular product, supposing ceteris paribus. The demand curve is generally shown as a linear negative slopping curve, as the price increases were the quantity demanded decreases. Movement along the curve occur with the price change of the product whereas a change in other variables for example price of complements (Pc), the price of substitutes (Ps), the income (I), preference and self-image (S) (see next chapter) moves the demand curve. The demand function for Jeans can be specified as below where QJeans is the quantity demanded (Nicholson, 2005).

\[ Q_{\text{Jeans}} = f (P, \text{Preferences}, Ps, Pc, I, S) \]  (1)

If the preferences change and the distinct unexpectedly need more jeans the demand curve moves out, as shown in the figure below. The distinct wants more quantity at the same price.
Figure 3.1 Demand Curve, Source: Nicholson (2005)

Here in above figure D1 represents the demand of Jeans at particular price level and D2 also represents the demand of jeans on the same price level. Individual might be ready to pay little more for labeled clothes if he or she has a preference for Swan and Fairtrade labeled products. It is may be due to the distinct gets a superior utility from the labeled substitutes as concluded earlier the distinct attempt to maximize his or her utility. The utility maximizing individual will chose the Swan and/or Fairtrade labeled substitute providing that the extra utility obtains is equal to the extra cost.

3.2 Moral Motivation for Green Products

Environmental friendly products or green products are becoming more popular among the consumers in the present decade. Even consumers are ready to pay a private cost for the green products to make the environment better rather that the non-environmental products which also known as brown products. According to Nyborg et al (2006) moral motivation can play an important role in the publicity of the green consumer phenomenon as it affects the consumers’ behavior also. This can be explained further by “warm glow” effect that if an individual prefers to public goods he or she will enjoy some kind of private benefit. This private benefit provided to the consumer will depend on his or her personal belief that to what extent his or her action will be useful for the other people in his or her surroundings and to what extent his or her action gets a valuable importance in the community. Nyborg et al (2006) introduced the concept of self-image that each individual want to become a socially
responsible person and wants to maintain it in the society. This self-image becomes more improved when individual’s behavior comes very near to the morally ideal behavior. The selection of the morally superior alternative becomes easy when the individual is provided with subjective benefit S. The subjective benefit represents the degree of achieving a favorable self-image. According to Nyborg et al self-image can be improved by selecting the ecological alternative and it increases with the beliefs that the individual has about the external effects. The value of S is directly proportional to the personal responsibility the person feels for the specified issued. (Nyborg et al, 2006).

In our everyday life there are different choices to make considering green consumption. As participation to every public good is not possible in every possible way, no individual feel obligated to participate in every possible way. There are different factors which affects individual perceived responsibility such as Descriptive norms, fairness and reciprocity. Descriptive norms are described as “people's perceptions of how other people are actually behaving in a given situation, regardless of what behaviors are socially sanctioned”. Individuals in environmental conscious population are likely to perceive a great responsibility (Nyborg et al, 2006). If an individual have faith in that other individuals would choose Swan or Fairtrade labeled jeans as an alternative of non-labeled, this might affect his or her choice.

The perceived utility for the individual is a function of his or her environmental quality (G), the consumption of brown products (CB), the consumption of green products (CG) and the individual’s self-image (S). In the meantime an individual prefer a positive self-image it is an argument in the utility function (Ek & Söderholm, 2008).

\[ U = u (CB, CG, G, S) \] (2)

S is increased by choosing the choices of the green alternative and S is zero if consumer does not choose green alternative. The utility function is quasi -concave and increasing in S, G, CG and CB. The brown product which is the no Swan and Fairrdae labeled jeans and the green product which is the Swan and Fairtrade labeled jeans are perfect substitute (Ek & Söderholm, forthcoming). So by choosing green alternative the individual increases his or her perceived utility, to maximize his or her utility individual will choose green alternative, providing that the marginal utility is equal to the marginal cost. If individual choose Fairtrade labeled
products or green products over the non-labeled or brown products it shows that individual has a preference for green products.
Chapter 4

Survey Design

In this chapter I explain how the survey was designed and conducted.

Choice experiments technique is used in this thesis to estimate the degree of willingness to pay for Fairtrade and Swan labeled clothes. Initially the plan was to execute the questionnaire on 100 consumers but due to low response of consumers it was reduced to 50 respondents. During the survey I found that many consumers do not want to fill the questionnaire, most of them stated that they don’t have time and some of them stated they don’t care about labels. The questionnaire was executed by different type of consumers outside of H&M, ginatricot and Cubus. The focus group was of young consumers of age 17-40. Boras was selected to gather data and analysis was done through a binary random effects model, econometrically. Respondent was provided with two choices; either to select jeans which are Fairtrade and/or Swan labeled and the other one is not Fairtrade or Swan labeled, while both have same appearance. The respondent also has the choice to select none of options. Aim behind this, is to mimic the scenario as real as possible.

The questionnaire was tested many times on a focus group consisting of five consumers. And before asking to fill the questionnaire sufficient knowledge about Fairtrade and Swan labeled jeans was provided. On the basis of the feedback by the focus group, the questionnaire was changed and rewritten several times before being executed by the respondents. Few more statements were added to the explanatory statements and scale of approved or disapproved was added instead of the option of YES or NO. As the members of the focus group declared that 850 was an enough maximum price so the willingness of the respondent to pay for Fairtrade or Swan labeled was decreased from 850 SEK to 700 SEK, with the difference of 150 SEK. According to the focus group, the survey was easy to understand and response. Moreover, questions were felt to be related and were not biased.

The questionnaire typically contained two parts. In first part profile data were collected like age, gender and profession of respondent. In second part, 15 questions were included, each having three options. First one was the status quo and assumed to be constant during the whole questionnaire. It consisted of a fixed price of 500 SEK without Fairtrade or Swan label. Second choice was not constant like first one as attributes changed over alternatives. The third
option was to choose neither option one nor two. The monetary attributes in the choices were as follows: In option one, the price of the jeans was 500 SEK while in second option it varied from 500 – 700 SEK, with the difference of 50 SEK per price level. The order of the choices was assorted.

Table 4.1: A sample of the choice questions from the questionnaire can be seen below.

Sample 1

If you would ask to choose one of the following options for a jeans, which one would you choose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling</td>
<td>Price SEK 700kr with Fairtrade Labeling</td>
<td>Neither option 1 nor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Swan Labeling</td>
<td>Without Swan Labeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sets of choices were followed by some questions in which respondent were asked about his or her reasons when making the choices. Fourteen different statements were presented and the respondent were asked to mark their answers on a scale ranging 1-5 (1 for not agree and 5 for completely agree). Sample questionnaire can be found in appendix 1.
Chapter 5

Empirical Results and Analysis

In this chapter empirical results will be shown and analysis will be made.

I will apply the best regression model for analysis. As I know that, we have binary variables for analysis. There are two regression models for analysis that are Logistic and probit model. In my research I have lot of independent variables, some of them are significant and some of them are insignificant. But for best fitted model I will sort out the potential variable with the help of statistical tests and I will keep only significant variables and exclude the insignificant variables from the model.

There are two methods that are used mostly to find out the best fitted regression Model. One method is General to specific in this method we include the all variables in our model and test the significance of these variables. Other method is from specific to General, with the help of this model we include one by one variable if it’s significant for the model. In my analysis I will apply the General to specific method for the selection of variables in first model. I will include all variable after that will exclude the insignificant variables and keep only significant variables
5.1 Survey Logistics

The Logistics model is the most one the best model for the analysis of binary variables. Following is the form of logistics Model.

\[
\text{Logit } [\pi(x)] = \alpha + \beta x
\]

This is the general form of Logistic Model

\[
\pi(x) = \frac{\exp(\alpha \ + \beta x)}{1 + \exp(\alpha \ + \beta x)}
\]

The LOGISTIC Procedure and the results are the following.

Table 5.1 Socio-demographic proportions and Random Effects Binary Probit Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>Pr &gt; Chi-Sq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8726</td>
<td>2.4110</td>
<td>0.6033</td>
<td>0.4373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4016</td>
<td>0.5887</td>
<td>0.4653</td>
<td>0.4951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0472</td>
<td>0.0711</td>
<td>0.4400</td>
<td>0.5071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1987</td>
<td>0.5281</td>
<td>0.1416</td>
<td>0.7067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3450</td>
<td>0.2186</td>
<td>2.4917</td>
<td>0.1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2646</td>
<td>0.3393</td>
<td>0.6083</td>
<td>0.4354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairtrade and/or Swan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.5669</td>
<td>0.3020</td>
<td>3.5235</td>
<td>0.0605**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0722</td>
<td>0.2417</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>0.7652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairtrade responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8286</td>
<td>0.2987</td>
<td>7.6932</td>
<td>0.0055**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to pay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2745</td>
<td>0.2626</td>
<td>1.0920</td>
<td>0.2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2808</td>
<td>0.2660</td>
<td>1.1144</td>
<td>0.2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.4902</td>
<td>0.2569</td>
<td>3.6403</td>
<td>0.0564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Believe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.6452</td>
<td>0.3098</td>
<td>4.3377</td>
<td>0.0373**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1967</td>
<td>0.2421</td>
<td>0.6600</td>
<td>0.4166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0471</td>
<td>0.1958</td>
<td>0.0580</td>
<td>0.8097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1383</td>
<td>0.2538</td>
<td>0.2970</td>
<td>0.5858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairtrade Believe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2779</td>
<td>0.2063</td>
<td>1.8145</td>
<td>0.1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeled clothe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2855</td>
<td>0.2691</td>
<td>1.1260</td>
<td>0.2886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here we will build a hypothesis for each variable.

**Null Hypothesis: BETA=0**

In the above results, we have statistic values of each variable and on other hand we have also probability of them. The most common and reliable method to check the significance of variables to compares the actual probability with level of significant. Here I will let that I have 10% level of significant and I will analyze the results. If we keep only one variable that is the following the probability shows that this is significant and contributes to determine the dependent variable.

Fairtrade responsibility 1 0.8286 0.2987 7.6932 0.0055**

Pr > Chi-Sq=0.0055 is less than 10% level of significant.

Only marked variable are significant at 10% level. Like below results. I will include these variables that are significant for model.

Some time we have to check the overall fitness of model rather than individual variable. Following results shows the performance of whole model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2</th>
<th>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>22.4511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>17.5925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald</td>
<td>13.9229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we know that we have 10% level of significant. Here we have three different Statistics like Likelihood Ratio, Score and Wald the actual probabilities of them 0.1680, 0.4150 and 0.6726 respectively are greater than our level of significant. This mean our model is fitted poorly. For the search of good fitted model, we will keep significant variables. Following model is the model with significant variables.

\[
\text{logit}[\pi(x)] = \alpha + \beta_1\text{Fairtrade and/or Swan} + \beta_2\text{Fairtrade responsibility} + \beta_3\text{Swan Believe} + \epsilon_i
\]
The LOGISTIC Procedure

Table 5.3 Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Pr &gt; ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4463</td>
<td>0.9353</td>
<td>0.2278</td>
<td>0.6332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Fairtrade and Swan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1877</td>
<td>0.1520</td>
<td>1.5247</td>
<td>0.2169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairtrade responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4379</td>
<td>0.1788</td>
<td>5.9983</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Believe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3262</td>
<td>0.1810</td>
<td>3.2467</td>
<td>0.0716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I observed that both Fairtrade responsibility and Swan Believe variables are significant at 10% level. But Both Fairtrade and Swan variable is insignificant. But before excluding the insignificant variable we will analysis the Global test of model.

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Pr &gt; ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.3188</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>8.8992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald</td>
<td>8.1210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The probability of Likelihood Ratio, Score and Wald are 0.0253, 0.0307 and 0.0436 respectively are less than level of significant and we will reject the Null hypothesis. This mean this model is good fit.
As table 5.1 shows that the average age of respondents was about 25 years as the questionnaire was executed on young consumers. And the average number of children was low, as it was expected since the respondents were consisted of young consumers.

5.4 Results from survey

![Graph showing gender distribution of respondents considering labeled jeans.](image)

Total numbers of respondents were 50 as above graph 5.4 shows that 54% were female and 46% were male respondents. As above graph shows that 59.26% females among total care about labeled jeans during shopping, whereas 40.74 didn’t care about Swan and Fairtrade labels. The above graph also represents that 56.52% male among total care about Swan and Fairtrade labeled jeans, whereas 43.48% buy jeans without Swan and Fairtrade labels. The alternatives labeled with Swan and Fairtrade were generally more often chosen by females as compared to men. The potential explanation may be that females buy clothes more often and more conscious about environment therefore willing to pay a higher premium.

The results from estimating the Random Effect Binary Probit Model are shown above in Table 5.1. The statistical sample of the survey was stratified. Numbers of statements are included in the questionnaire on which how the respondent reasoned when making their choices. The respondents were asked to choose the option from scale 1-5, one for “completely disagree” and five from scale was “completely agree”. The results from chi square test shows that these are statistically significant at 10% level. As it was expected that price variable have a negative impact on the willingness to pay and the survey result does not prove this. This
means that when the price is higher the individuals will choose that alternative, but the results are not statistically significant. As it is discussed in chapter three, the received utility for the consumer is increased from Fairtrade and Swan certified products so it has positive effect on demand. Results are not statistically significant for age so it cannot be concluded that it has any effect on the options between non-labeled and labeled products. As the results are positive for both Fairtrade and/or Swan which indicates that the consumers are willing to pay for Fairtrade and/or Swan, and the results are statistically significant. As the results from Fairtrade responsibility are positive, which means consumers feel personal responsibility and willing to pay for Fairtrade label, the results are statistically significant. The results are positive for consumers are willing to pay but they cannot afford to pay extra for Swan and/or Fairtrade labeled jeans, which indicates that consumer are willing to pay more for Fairtrade and/or Swan labeled jeans, but the results are not statistically significant. The results are positive for Swan responsibility which indicates that consumer feel personal responsibility for Swan labeled jeans and willing to pay more, but the results are not statistically significant. As the results shows that individuals think that other individuals should not pay for environmental friendly products, but the results are not statistically significant. As the results are positive for individuals believe on Swan labeled jeans, which indicate that the consumers willing to pay for Swan labeled jeans, the results are statistically significant. As the results are positive for Swan label which indicates that individuals are willing to pay, but the results are not statistically significant. As the results are positive for personal responsibility that the individuals feel personal responsibility for good working conditions and willing to pay more, but the results are not statistically significant. Individuals believe that many other consumers are buying the Fairtrade labeled products and the results are positive which indicates that consumers are willing to pay more, but the results not statistically significant. Individuals believe that many other consumers are buying Swan labeled jeans, the results are positive which indicates consumers are willing to pay more, but the results are not statistically significant.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

In this chapter I conclude the study. Thus the purpose of the research is answered.

The basic concept of the thesis was to evaluate the willingness of the consumer to pay for Fairtrade and/or Swan labeled jeans. The purpose of this study is to know that either only price is important for the consumers or they also care about the moral aspects. Consumers are eager to show themselves as socially responsible persons and prefer for Fairtrade and Swan labeled products to improve their self-image in the society which is the most important benefit of these products. Therefore demand for the environment friendly products has been increased in the society in the recent years.

The results showed that individuals were positively willing to pay for the Fairtrade and/or Swan labeled alternatives. The average respondent had a higher willingness to pay for Swan labeled alternatives compared to Fairtrade labeled alternatives. But the price was an important factor which had great influence on the demand for labeled products. When the price increased, the respondents who were willing to pay for the labeled alternatives decreased. The result also showed that the individuals need motivation and awareness about these green products because when they came to know that the clothes they buy are produced under decent working conditions and that the production of the clothes they buy does not harm the environment. They feel themselves more socially responsible and pay more for Fairtrade and/or Swan labeled jeans. The beliefs about other individual’s purchases of Fairtrade and Swan labeled clothes have proved to have a positive effect on individuals own willingness to pay for Fairtrade and Swan labeled clothes. On the contrary the beliefs of other individuals’ purchases of labeled clothes seemed to have a positive effect on the willingness to pay for the labeled alternatives; these results did however not prove to be statistically significant.

Thus the results indicates that there is a optimistic willingness to pay for Swan and Fairtrade labeled jeans, which means that there is a demand in Sweden for Swan and Fairtrade labeled clothes. It could though be interesting to investigate which factors affect the decision to choose Swan and Fairtrade labeled jeans more thoroughly. These results can be interesting and fruitful for clothing companies as well as the labeling organizations, as they shows that there may be a willingness to pay for Fairtrade and Swan labeled jeans.
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### Appendix 1

**Questionnaire:**

1) Your Gender?
   i) Male
   ii) Female

2) How old are you?---------- Years

3) What is your profession?-------------

4) How many children do you have?
   i) No Children
   ii) 1-2 children
   iii) 3 or more children

5) Assuming you could choose one of these three options the next time you are buying a jeans, which would you choose?

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling Without Swan Labeling</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Price SEK 550kr with Fairtrade Labeling Without Swan Labeling</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Neither option 1 nor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Option 1" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Option 2" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Option 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling Without Swan Labeling</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling With Swan Labeling</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Neither option 1 nor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Option 1" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Option 2" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Option 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling Without Swan Labeling</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling With Swan Labeling</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Neither option 1 nor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Option 1" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Option 2" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Option 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Option 1: Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling
- Option 2: Price SEK 550kr with Fairtrade Labeling
- Option 3: Neither option 1 nor 2
Option 1
Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling Without Swan Labeling
☐ Option 1

Option 2
Price SEK 550 with Fairtrade Labeling With Swan Labeling
☐ Option 2

Option 3
☐ Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1
Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling Without Swan Labeling
☐ Option 1

Option 2
Price SEK 600 with Fairtrade Labeling with Swan Labeling
☐ Option 2

Option 3
☐ Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1
Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling without Swan Labeling
☐ Option 1

Option 2
Price SEK 600 with Fairtrade Labeling without Swan Labeling
☐ Option 2

Option 3
☐ Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1
Price SEK 500 without Fairtrade Labeling without Swan Labeling
☐ Option 1

Option 2
Price SEK 600 with Fairtrade Labeling without Swan Labeling
☐ Option 2

Option 3
☐ Neither option 1 nor 2
Option 1

Price SEK 500
without Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 2

Price SEK 500
with Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 3

Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1

Price SEK 500
without Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 2

Price SEK 500
with Fairtrade Labeling
with Swan Labeling

Option 3

Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1

Price SEK 500
without Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 2

Price SEK 650
without Fairtrade Labeling
With Swan Labeling

Option 3

Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1

Price SEK 500
without Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 2

Price SEK 650
with Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 3

Neither option 1 nor 2

Option 1

Price SEK 500
without Fairtrade Labeling
without Swan Labeling

Option 2

Price SEK 650
with Fairtrade Labeling
with Swan Labeling

Option 3

Neither option 1 nor 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Price SEK 500  
without Fairtrade Labeling  
without Swan Labeling  
☐ Option 1 | Price 700  
with Fairtrade Labeling  
without Swan Labeling  
☐ Option 2 | ☐ Neither option 1 nor 2 |
| Price SEK 500  
without Fairtrade Labeling  
Without Swan Labeling  
☐ Option 1 | Price 700  
without Fairtrade Labeling  
With Swan Labeling  
☐ Option 2 | ☐ Neither option 1 nor 2 |
| Price SEK 500  
without Fairtrade Labeling  
Without Swan Labeling  
☐ Option 1 | Price 700  
with Fairtrade Labeling  
With Swan Labeling  
☐ Option 2 | ☐ Neither option 1 nor 2 |
Which of the following statements best explains your reasoning when you choose between the options on the questions above? Describe to what extent you agree or distance themselves from each of the allegations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly distance from</th>
<th>Take part Distance From</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Partly Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I chose the option giving me most value for the money.  
I see no reason to change my shopping habits of clothing.  
I do not care at all if in case your clothes I'm wearing is Fairtrade, is Swan-marked.  
I cannot afford to pay higher price for my clothes.  
I think it's important that clothes are Fairtrade and chose only such alternatives.  
I would like to pay more for clothes which are produced in a more equitable way but I cannot afford.  
I think it's important that clothes are made of environmentally friendly materials and therefore chose only Swan-labeled options.  
I do not think the public should have to pay more to get environmentally friendly goods.  
I would like to pay more for clothes that the Swan-labeled but I cannot afford.  
I chose the Swan label options because I do not want my clothes to be contain residues of chemical agents.  
I feel a personal responsibility to contribute to the garment producers have good working conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel a personal responsibility to contribute to the garment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production is not harmful to the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that many other consumers buying Fairtrade products.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that many other consumers buy Swan labeled clothing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>