2007

Young consumers' fair trade consumption: application of the theory of planned behavior to non-food fair trade purchases

Yoon Jin Ma

Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd

Part of the Home Economics Commons, and the Marketing Commons

Recommended Citation

Ma, Yoon Jin, "Young consumers' fair trade consumption: application of the theory of planned behavior to non-food fair trade purchases" (2007). Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. 15918.
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/15918

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.
Young consumers’ fair trade consumption:
Application of the theory of planned behavior to non-food fair trade purchases

by

Yoon Jin Ma

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Textiles and Clothing

Program of Study Committee:
Mary Littrell, Co-major Professor
Linda Niehm, Co-major Professor
Fred Lorenz
Roy Teas
Susan Torntore

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
2007

Copyright © Yoon Jin Ma, 2007. All rights reserved.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES ........................................................................................................ iv

LIST OF TABLES ..........................................................................................................v

ABSTRACT .................................................................................................................. vi

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ...................................................................................... 1
  Purpose ..................................................................................................................... 3
  Objectives of the Study ............................................................................................ 4
  Definitions ................................................................................................................. 5

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .......................................................................... 7
  Fair Trade .................................................................................................................... 7
  The Theory of Planned Behavior ............................................................................ 9
    Attitudes and Antecedents of Attitudes toward a Behavior .................................. 10
    Subjective Norms and Antecedents of Subjective Norms .................................. 12
    Perceived Behavioral Control and Antecedents of Perceived Behavioral Control 14
  Personal Values and Past Experiences regarding Fair Trade .................................. 16
    Values ................................................................................................................... 16
    Past Experience with Fair Trade Purchases ....................................................... 20
    Proposed Model ................................................................................................... 21

CHAPTER 3: METHODS .............................................................................................. 24
  Preliminary Study ................................................................................................... 24
  Sample ..................................................................................................................... 26
  Web Questionnaire Development ........................................................................ 26
    Exogenous Variables ........................................................................................... 27
    Endogenous Variables ......................................................................................... 28
    Demographic Information .................................................................................... 30
  Pretest ..................................................................................................................... 31
  Approval of the Use of Human Subjects ............................................................... 31
  Web Survey Data Collection Procedure ............................................................. 31
  Data Analysis ......................................................................................................... 31
    Preliminary Analysis ........................................................................................... 32
    Causal Model Analysis ....................................................................................... 33

CHAPTER 4: PRELIMINARY RESULTS ...................................................................... 35
  Sample Characteristics ........................................................................................... 35
    Demographic Profiles of Sample ....................................................................... 35
    Knowledge of Fair Trade ....................................................................................... 38
    Past Behavior with Fair Trade Purchases ........................................................... 38
    Factor Analysis ..................................................................................................... 41
Beliefs about Purchasing Fair Trade Products................................. 41
Favorable Attitudes toward Fair Trade Purchases............................... 43
Positive Subjective Norms for Fair Trade Purchases ......................... 43
High Perceived Behavioral Control over Fair Trade Purchases .......... 44
Personal Values: Universalism ......................................................... 45
Normative Beliefs ........................................................................... 46
Control Beliefs ................................................................................ 47
Intention to Purchase Fair Trade Products ...................................... 48
Summary of Research Variables ...................................................... 49
  Overall Mean Scores for Research Variables .................................. 49
  Correlations among Research Variables ......................................... 50
Non-response Bias ......................................................................... 50

CHAPTER 5:  ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH MODELS.............................. 56
Existing Model Testing ...................................................................... 56
  Operational Model ........................................................................ 56
  Operational Model Testing .............................................................. 57
  Hypothesis Testing.......................................................................... 60
Alternative Model Testing ................................................................. 63
  Model Respecification .................................................................. 66
  Model Validation .......................................................................... 67
Testing for Multi-group Invariance ................................................... 67

CHAPTER 6:  SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.................................... 74
Summary of Research........................................................................ 74
Summary of Results ......................................................................... 75
  Preliminary Analysis .................................................................... 75
  Model Testing ............................................................................... 77
Conclusions .................................................................................... 80
Implications ..................................................................................... 83
Limitations ...................................................................................... 86
Recommendations for Future Research ........................................... 87

APPENDIX A: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTION PROTOCOL ...... 90
APPENDIX B: APPROVAL OF THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS ....... 94
APPENDIX C: E-MAIL INVITATION LETTER ..................................... 97
APPENDIX D: WEB QUESTIONNAIRE ............................................ 99
APPENDIX E: E-MAIL FOLLOW-UP LETTER .................................... 110
REFERENCES .................................................................................. 112
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .................................................................. 120
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. Ajzen’s theory of planned behavior.................................................................11
Figure 2.2. Proposed model: Young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products
..............................................................................................................................................23
Figure 5.1. Operational model: Young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food
products......................................................................................................................................58
Figure 5.2. Analysis of operational model: Young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-
food products..........................................................................................................................59
Figure 5.3. Analysis of alternative model using the exploration sample .........................69
Figure 5.4. Analysis of alternative model using the validation sample .........................70
LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1. Demographic characteristics of young consumer respondents (N=835) .................. 36
Table 4.2. Knowledge of fair trade (N=835) .................................................................................. 38
Table 4.3. Shopping experience with fair trade non-food products (N=835) ......................... 39
Table 4.4. Types, occasions, and amount of money spent on fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835) ............................................................................................................ 40
Table 4.5. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of beliefs about fair trade non-food products (N=835).................................................................................................................. 42
Table 4.6. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of young consumers’ favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835) .................... 43
Table 4.7. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for positive subjective norms for young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835) .... 44
Table 4.8. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for young consumers’ high perceived control over purchasing fair trade non-food products (N=835) ............... 45
Table 4.9. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of young consumers’ personal values (N=835).................................................................................................................. 46
Table 4.10. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for young consumers’ weighted normative beliefs about fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835) 47
Table 4.11. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of young consumers’ weighted control beliefs about fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835) .......... 48
Table 4.12. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for young consumers’ intention to purchase fair trade non-food products (N=835) ......................................................... 49
Table 4.13. Summary of research variablesa ........................................................................... 52
Table 4.14. Correlation matrix for research variables (N=835) .............................................. 55
Table 5.1. Standardized maximum-likelihood estimates (with t-ratios) of fully recursive model for young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products .................. 64
Table 5.2. Paths hypothesized non-zero and paths hypothesized equal to zero of model for young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products ............................................. 65
Table 5.3. Standardized maximum-likelihood estimates (with t-ratios) of alternative model using the exploration sample ........................................................................................................ 71
Table 5.4. Standardized maximum-likelihood estimates (with t-ratios) of alternative model using the validation sample ..................................................................................................... 72
Table 5.5. Chi-square difference statistic for each model tested for multi-group comparisons ........................................................................................................................................ 73
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to understand and predict young consumers’ purchase behaviors related to fair trade products. Based on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), causal relationships among personal values, beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and purchase intentions associated with fair trade products were examined. Data were collected via Web-based surveys from a random sample of female college students at a large Midwestern U.S. university. Of 9,593 female older echo boomer students invited through e-mail to participate in the Web-based survey, 1,048 responses were returned for an overall response rate of 11%. Eight hundred and thirty-five complete surveys were used for the statistical analysis.

Two phases of data analysis were conducted: preliminary analysis and model testing. First, preliminary analysis of research data consisted of descriptive analysis, principal components analysis, internal reliability assessment of research variables using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, and correlation analysis. Second, model testing was conducted through two steps: existing model testing and alternative model testing. Model testing was performed through maximum-likelihood estimation procedures using AMOS 7.0. In the first step, hypotheses were tested based on results for the fully recursive model. The second step included re-specification and validation of an alternative model using a cross-validation technique. Multi-group invariance was tested for the alternative model using multi-sample path analysis.

Findings of the present study revealed that consumers’ personal values (i.e., universalism), past purchase behavior related to fair trade non-food products, beliefs about the fair trade non-food products and business mission, attitudes toward fair trade purchases, and social pressures to buy fair trade non-food products were all important factors in predicting young consumers’ willingness to purchase fair trade non-food products. First, the overall findings confirmed elements of the theory of planned behavior. Belief structures, such as behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs, were found to be determinants of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control related to non-food fair trade purchases. It was also found that attitudes and subjective norms were important predictors of behavioral intentions related to the purchase of fair trade non-food
products. However, there was no significant relationship between perceived behavioral control and the intention to purchase fair trade products, suggesting that purchasing fair trade products is largely under volitional control. Second, consumers’ previous experiences of shopping for fair trade products were critical determinants of the formation of beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions related to fair trade purchases for non-food products. Third, consumers’ beliefs about the fair trade mission were found to be an important predictor of attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and the intention to buy fair trade non-food products.

The present research provides useful insights into fair trade businesses targeting young consumers and also provides contributions to the academic literature. Fair trade businesses will benefit from knowledge of young consumers’ beliefs, attitudes, and purchase intention for fair trade non-food products. Theoretical contributions include an understanding of the significant roles that universalism values and previous purchase behaviors for fair trade non-food products have in formation of beliefs, attitudes, and future purchase intentions. The development of empirically tested model provides a theoretical understanding of the purchase of fair trade non-food products for young consumers.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Growing global markets and manufacturing systems have made fair exchanges between producers and retailers an increasingly important issue. Small scale producers struggle with their weak trading position in both local and world economies (Barratt Brown, 1993). To rectify this imbalance, Fair Trade Organizations (FTOs) promote alternative trade systems that more directly link artisan producers in underdeveloped countries with consumers in developed countries (Jaffee, Kloppenburg, & Monroy, 2004).

FTOs are businesses that support small scale artisan producers and farmers. With a mission of sustainable, people-centered development (Littrell & Dickson, 1999), fair trade businesses seek to pay a fair wage, to improve working conditions, and to build fair and respectful trade relationships with workers (IFAT Standards Working Group, 2002). FTOs actively participate as exporters and as retailers as they directly work with economically disadvantaged producers (Littrell & Dickson, 1999). FTOs market agricultural products, handcrafted clothing, household items, and decorative art. They distribute the imported products via mail-order catalogs, internet shopping sites, and specialty stores in the U.S., Canada, Europe, Australia, and Japan. According to the 2005 report on Fair Trade Trends, total sales for the fair trade industry reached $292 million in 2003 with a 52% increase over 2002 (Fair Trade Federation, 2005).

Ethical business practices of manufacturers and retailers appear to be a critical driver in consumer purchase decisions (Shaw & Shiu, 2003; Tallontire, Rentsendorj, & Blowfield, 2001). According to a multi-year study of cause-related consumption, the number of consumers who expected companies to support social issues has increased about 21% between 1993 and 2004. Nearly 86% of those surveyed in 2004 reported that they were willing to switch brands or retailers to companies that support important social causes, while 66% reported that they were willing to do the same in 1993 (Cone Communications Press Release, 2006). FTOs make efforts to meet the business expectations of socially conscious consumers by establishing a human-oriented trading partnership and providing fairly priced products and services.

A recent market survey (Littrell, Ma, & Halepete, 2004) revealed that the mean age of current fair trade consumers was 49 and about 74% were over 40. Consumers were most
likely to purchase fairly traded decorative housewares, coffee, apparel accessories, and holiday products. The survey disclosed that these consumers placed the greatest importance on fair trade philosophy and then considered the product attributes of high quality and handcraftsmanship when shopping for fair trade products.

However, in the context of shopping from FTOs, it is not clear what motivations underpin consumers’ future purchase intentions. Simply emphasizing the FTO mission of supporting fair wages and safe working conditions for artisans in developing countries may not be enough to enhance consumers’ purchase intentions from FTOs in today’s competitive marketplace (Littrell & Dickson, 1999). Likewise product-related characteristics such as quality and style may not explain consumers’ motivations for fair trade purchases. Furthermore, FTOs’ mainstream competitors provide similar high-quality products at comparable or lower prices. Therefore, it is necessary to offer a more detailed view of consumers’ motivations and purchase intentions concerning fair trade products.

An increasing number of young consumers are interested in fair trade. According to a 2005 poll of college students (Suchomel, 2005), nearly three-quarters of those surveyed had heard of fair trade. More than half of the respondents (57%) were willing to buy fair trade products either “whenever possible” or “sometimes”, while forty percent of respondents did not know of places where fair trade items could be purchased (Suchomel, 2005). Several organizations, such as United Students for Fair Trade (USFT), TransFair, Oxfam, Global Exchange: Campus and Community Activists, and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have been publicizing fair trade practices. By generating a demand for fair trade products on campuses and in communities, these organizations are raising awareness of the inequities in the current exploitive model of global trade (USFT, 2006).

The attitudes and beliefs of young consumers about fair trade products may be different from those held by older consumers. Preliminary research for this study (Ma, 2005) revealed that young consumers consider product attributes most important when they shop for fair trade products. Unique cultural products tend to draw young consumers’ attention before the mission of fair trade practices. This is in contrast to older consumers who attributed highest importance for the fair trade mission to their fair trade purchases (Littrell et al., 2004).
While it is apparent that young consumers are a sizable and significant market to socially conscious retailers (Martin, 2005; Suchomel, 2005), little research has focused on young consumers’ socially responsible consumption behaviors. FTOs need to understand the characteristics of young consumers and their purchase decision process in order to create marketing strategies that will appeal to this group.

**Purpose**

This study aims to understand influences on young consumers’ fair trade purchases by exploring older echo boomer consumers who are aged between 18 and 28 years. As a core of consumption cohorts, echo boomers are consumers born between 1977 and 1994, who are mostly the children of the baby boomers (*New Strategist*, 2004). This consumer group consists of about 81 million people, representing 28% of the population. Echo boomer consumers’ spending increased from $84 billion in 1997 to $94 billion in 1998 and to $153 billion in 1999 (Barrett, 2000, September). In the U.S., the older echo boomers represent over 15 million college students. They demonstrate average expenditures on discretionary purchases of $300-400 per month. These older echo boomer consumers exhibit a general liking for purchasing based on their ample discretionary time for shopping (Der Hovanesian, 1999; Gardyn, 2002). Consequently, this consumer segment has considerable buying power, which warrants the attention of marketers and retailers. In order to establish a more viable market position, FTOs must expand their markets to these young consumers. Understanding older echo boomer consumers’ attitudes toward and buying behavior from socially responsible businesses is critical for FTOs to develop relevant marketing strategies. However, little research has examined underlying factors in older echo boomer consumers’ decisions to make purchases from socially responsible businesses.

This research examined the older echo boomer consumers, ages 18-28, in relation to beliefs, attitudes and purchase intention regarding fair trade, in particular non-food products such as housewares, apparel, accessories, and holiday items carried by fair trade businesses. Applying the theory of planned behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1988, 1991) to fair trade consumption, the role of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control in purchasing fair trade products were examined. To arrive at a deeper understanding of older echo boomer consumers’ purchase decisions, the study examined consumers’ personal values
and previous experiences with fair trade purchases. Influences on the formation of beliefs, attitudes, and intentions for older echo boomer consumers to shop for fair trade products were also explored. A structural equation model was developed and tested to identify how personal values and previous purchase experiences affect attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, and furthermore behavioral intention to purchase fair trade products.

This study provides deeper understanding of older echo boomer consumers within the fair trade shopping context. This study may have both academic and practical implications. The study would contribute to the academic literature regarding development of the TPB perspective in fair trade purchases. Several studies have developed models to explain consumers’ purchase behaviors concerning fair trade (e.g., Dickson, 2000; Littrell & Dickson, 1999), but few have applied the TPB perspective to fair trade purchase decisions. Furthermore, the study incorporates underlying factors into the model to explain how variables of the TPB model are formed when applied to older echo boomer consumers. By testing the model, this study can explain and predict older echo boomer consumers’ fair trade consumptions. In addition, this study may help practitioners create marketing strategies that appeal to older echo boomer consumers. This consumer cohort has shown a growing interest in ethical consumption (Suchomel, 2005; USFT, 2006). However, no research has examined factors in older echo boomers’ decisions to purchase from fair trade retail stores. By understanding the factors that shape older echo boomer consumers’ behavior, fair trade retailers may be able to market their goods more effectively to their target consumers.

**Objectives of the Study**

The overarching objective of this study is to explore the factors which influence intention to buy fair trade non-food products for consumers between the ages of 18 and 28. Specific objectives are to:

1. Identify variables that impact older echo boomer consumers’ purchase of fair trade non-food products in relation to:
   a. personal values
   b. past shopping experience with fair trade businesses
   c. behavioral beliefs about purchasing fair trade products
d. normative beliefs about purchasing fair trade products  
e. control beliefs over purchasing fair trade products  
f. attitudes toward purchasing fair trade products  
g. subjective norms of purchasing fair trade products  
h. perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products  
i. intention to purchase fair trade products

2. Propose and operationalize a model integrating these variables.

3. Empirically test the proposed model using a sample of older echo boomer consumers.

**Definitions**

**Fair trade organization**: Fair trade organizations (FTOs) are businesses that support small scale artisan producers and farmers in non-industrialized nations (Littrell & Dickson, 1999). Based on equitable exchange between these producers and buyers, FTOs strive to raise living standards for poor producers, to promote sustainable business, and to preserve natural resources and cultural traditions in business decisions (Barratt Brown, 1993; Carpenter, 2000; Littrell & Dickson, 1999).

**Fair trade consumers**: People who have purchased or have opportunities to shop for products offered by fair trade organizations (Dickson, 1994).

**Fair trade non-food products**: Fair trade non-food products are items such as clothing, jewelry, apparel accessories, household textiles, housewares, and holiday items carried by fair trade businesses. Most of these items have a high level of craftsmanship and are hand-made.

**Older echo boomer consumers**: Echo boomers are a generational group born between 1977 and 1994, who are mostly the children of baby boomers (New Strategist, 2004). Older echo boomer consumers are the older segment of echo boomers who are aged between 18 and 28. In the U.S., the older echo boomers segment contains over 15 million college students (Gardyn, 2002).

**Attitudes toward a behavior**: A person’s cognitive and affective orientations toward performing a behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

**Subjective norms**: An individual’s perceptions of social pressure in doing or not doing a particular behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).
**Perceived behavioral control:** A person’s perceived ease or difficulty of carrying out an intended behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

**Intention to purchase:** Consumers’ willingness to shop and buy products.

**Behavioral beliefs:** An individual’s beliefs about a behavior, which can be measured by the subjective probability that performing the behavior will lead to a certain outcome (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

**Normative beliefs:** A person’s beliefs about whether significant groups or individuals think she/he should perform a certain behavior (Ajzen, 1988).

**Control beliefs:** An individual’s perceived presence of factors that facilitate or inhibit performance of a behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

**Values:** A person’s concepts or global beliefs which guide actions, judgments, and choices (Rokeach, 1973; Williams, 1979).
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The aim of the study is to expand understanding of older echo boomer consumers, ages 18-28, in regard to their purchase decisions when shopping for fair trade non-food products. The approach to understanding characteristics of older echo boomers and their fair trade purchases is framed by the theory of planned behavior (TPB) (Azjen, 1988, 1991).

This chapter provides the theoretical framework and discussion of empirical literature for the study. The first section begins with a discussion about fair trade. In the second section, the TPB (Azjen, 1988, 1991) is introduced as the theoretical framework of this study. This section reviews the literature on attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, their antecedents, and the impacts on behavioral intention related to fair trade consumption. The third section explores personal values and past experience with fair trade purchases. Based on the literature review, a proposed model and research hypotheses are presented.

Fair Trade

Fair trade is a concept of trading partnership which fosters more direct linkages between producers and consumers (Jaffee et al., 2004). Based on respectful and co-operative relationships, fair trade ensures that workers, farmers, and artisans are fairly paid for their products or labor, provided with access to credit and technical assistance, use environmentally sustainable production methods, and are provided safe, non-exploitive working conditions (Fair Trade Federation, 2002; Suchomel, 2005). By cutting out unnecessary middlemen, fair trade organizations have been able to return up to 40% of the retail price of items to producers (Fair Trade Federation, 2002).

At the beginning stage of fair trade, handicrafts were the mostly frequently traded item, usually marketed through church-based initiatives (Stecklow & White, 2004). Handcraft production was a good source of supplementary income to landless peasants or households headed by women with limited employment opportunities (Kocken, 2003). In the early 1970s, coffee, the first fairly traded commodity, was imported by fair trade organizations in the Netherlands from cooperatives of small farmers in Guatemala. In response to the drastic reduction in the market price of coffee in the late 1980s, fair trade certification of food
commodities began in the Netherlands (Oxfarm America, 2007). Labeling fair trade commodities has assisted fair trade in entering mainstream businesses (e.g., supermarket). Soon, fair trade coffee played an important role as the dominant commodity in a larger fair trade movement (Jaffee et al., 2004; Kocken, 2003). After coffee, certification has expanded to other products such as tea, cocoa, sugar, honey, and bananas (Kocken, 2003; Murray, Raynolds, & Taylor, 2006).

Demand for fair trade products has grown impressively in recent years. Worldwide sales of fair trade certified products for 2006 were estimated to be $580 million with a 46% increase from 2005 (Fairtrade Foundation, 2006). Fair trade bananas, tea, and coffee grew 38% and have captured an important share of the fair trade market. In particular, that increase is largely due to consumption of fair trade coffee by consumers in the U.S. In addition, according to a report of fair trade businesses (FLO, 2006), the number of fair trade certified producers has grown by 127% between 2001 and 2005.

Many fair trade studies have been conducted regarding fair trade commodity production and markets (e.g., Jaffee et al., 2004; Murray et al., 2006; Raynolds, 2000). Raynolds explored the production and exchange relations of international organic agriculture and fair trade movements with regard to the global agro-food system (2000). In this study, the researcher argued that the fair trade movement has focused more on social conditions and equitable relations of exchange while the international organic movement has focused more on production processes under certified organic conditions. Although both movements represent a form of alternative trade in agriculture which emphasizes socially and ecologically responsible production conditions, the fair trade movement has taken a step forward in educating consumers about social and ecological justice in global trade and in lobbying for changes in policy and regulation of the conventional agro-food system (Raynolds, 2000).

Another study identified unresolved dilemmas facing the fair trade movement in broadening and deepening the impact of alternative trade among small-scale coffee producers in Latin America (Murray et al., 2006). The findings pointed out that fair trade has contributed to improvement in the well-being of farmers and their families, the quality of small-scale producer coffee and productivity, and strengthening farmers’ organizations.
While it is evident that the fair trade movement is expanding rapidly and has benefited a large number of small-scale farmers (Fairtrade Foundation, 2006), potential limits to the existing fair trade market due to the expansion of supply may be problematic to small-scale farmers at some point. Murray and his colleagues (2006) disclosed that there were a number of certified producers selling far more of their produce via the traditional coffee market rather than fair trade market due to the limited fair trade channels, which in turn led to their failure to obtain the full potential benefits of fair trade. This concern may be found in fair trade non-food markets as well. Unlike fair trade food commodities sold via supermarkets and other outlets outside fair trade retail businesses, fair trade non-food products (e.g., clothing, jewelry, apparel accessories, household textiles, housewares, and holiday items) are mainly distributed through fair trade mail-order catalogs, internet shopping sites, and specialty stores. To meet a potential increase in artisan producers’ participation in the fair trade movement, it is critical to extend the existing fair trade market, identify target consumers, and provide target consumers with appropriate products and services. Hence, the present study is conducted to profile older echo boomer consumers as a potential consumer cohort with considerable buying power. The research addresses the demand side of fair trade which has received limited attention for non-food products and in particular for fairly traded apparel-related products.

**The Theory of Planned Behavior**

The TPB (Ajzen, 1988, 1991) is used as the theoretical framework of this study. This theory evolved from the theory of reasoned action (TRA) (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) to take into account the volitional and non-volitional aspects of performing a behavior. Volitional control means that people are able to perform certain behaviors if they intend to do so, and to refrain from performing the behavior if they do not intend to do it (Ajzen, 1988). The TRA explains purely volitional behavior, assuming that people are likely to follow their intentions. However, personal deficiencies and external obstacles are among the factors that might prevent someone from engaging in the intended behaviors. Successful performance is contingent on an individual’s control over non-volitional factors. For that reason, Ajzen designed the TPB by adding a construct, perceived behavioral control, which is the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior (Ajzen, 1998). The TPB has been
applied to many modeling studies of determinants for human social behavior (e.g., Ajzen, 2001; Davis, Ajzen, Saunders, & Williams, 2002; Kidwell & Jewell, 2003; Lunday & Barry, 2004), including consumer behavior (e.g., Kidwell & Jewell, 2003; Shim, Eastlick, Lotz, & Warrington, 2001; Zanten, 2005). Specifically, the TPB models have proven useful in explaining and predicting purchase behaviors concerning ethical issues such as fair trade grocery purchases (Shaw & Shiu, 2002) and shopping for organic products (Sparks & Shepherd, 1992). Ajzen and Fishbein’s models were found to be relevant to several decision-making situations.

In this study, the TPB was applied to a conceptual model to predict older echo boomer consumers’ purchase intention in the context of shopping for fair trade non-food products. Because there might be behavioral control variables that influence young consumers’ fair trade purchases, it is important to explore perceived ease or difficulty in their purchase decisions for fair trade shopping beyond the basic constructs of the TRA. For example, store availability, budget, lack of information about fair trade, and product assortment may be concerns to consumers in their decision to buy fair trade products.

The TPB (Ajzen, 1991) posits that intentions are determined by three constructs: attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceptions of behavioral control (see Figure 2.1). Attitude toward behavior is the person’s positive or negative feeling of performing that behavior. Subjective norms refer to the individual’s perceptions of social pressure in doing or not doing a particular behavior. Perceived behavioral control is the person’s perceived ease or difficulty of carrying out the intended behavior. In general, people are more likely to perform a behavior when they have a favorable attitude toward the behavior, stronger beliefs that significant others think they should perform the behavior, and greater perceived behavioral control over anticipated impediments. Each of these factors is important, but varies in salience depending on behavioral intentions (Ajzen, 1988). A discussion of these determinants of intentions, their antecedents, and potential to predict intentions is presented in the next section.

**Attitudes and Antecedents of Attitudes toward a Behavior**

According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), the attitude toward a behavior is determined by two types of information—salient beliefs about the behavior and evaluation of the
expected outcomes associated with that behavior. Behavioral beliefs are beliefs about the consequences of a behavior, which can be measured by the subjective probability that performing the behavior will lead to a certain outcome (the belief strength).

A behavioral belief index is then constructed, in which each belief is weighted by the subjective evaluation of the outcome. This step is incorporated because some expected outcomes will be more influential than others in the decision to perform that behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Davis et al., 2002). A person’s attitude toward a behavior is directly proportional to the summative belief index over the number of salient beliefs. In general, favorable attitudes toward behaviors are formed when people associate desirable consequences with those behaviors, while unfavorable attitudes are formed when people associate undesirable consequences with the behaviors. This belief-based measure of an attitude corresponds well with a global measure of that attitude, which is obtained through semantic differential format questions (e.g., Fishbein, 1963; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1981).

Several studies have identified salient beliefs regarding shopping for fair trade products. A recent market survey (Littrell et al., 2004) revealed that fair trade consumers shared a belief about the high level of importance for the fair trade mission. These consumers were sensitive to the conditions of workers pertaining to fair wages and sustainable practices. They also believed that they could contribute to poverty alleviation.
and create a better world by purchasing fair trade products. Fair trade consumers mentioned the importance of product characteristics such as quality, fair trade certification, visual appeal, and hand-crafted production for their fair trade purchases. Other studies have found that fair trade consumers sought fair trade products due to their high level of workmanship and quality (Dickson & Littrell, 1996; Lee & Littrell, 2006; Littrell, Ogle, & Kim, 1999). Along with the high demand for quality products, some consumers expected fair trade products to be unique and to have an ethnic appearance. Knowledgeable sales associates and information about fair trade were also considered important in shopping at fair trade retail stores (Littrell et al., 2004).

Therefore, this study examined three categories of likely consequences of purchasing fair trade non-food products and salient attributes of fair trade products: a) fair trade mission (e.g., provide fair wages, help to create a better world, alleviate poverty, encourage environmentally sustainable practices), b) product characteristics (e.g., high quality, handcraftedness, uniqueness, authenticity, ethnic appearance), and c) retail venue (e.g., knowledgeable sales assistants, information about fair trade). Based on previous studies and the TPB, the following hypothesis was posited:

Hypothesis T₁: Young consumers who have more positive beliefs about purchasing fair trade products will have more positive attitudes toward fair trade purchases.

**Subjective Norms and Antecedents of Subjective Norms**

Subjective norms are determined by the combination of normative beliefs about certain reference groups and an individual’s motivation to comply with the referents. Normative beliefs are people’s beliefs about whether significant groups or individuals think they should perform a certain behavior (Ajzen, 1988). Important referents can be a person’s parents, relatives, friends, and co-workers who influence a person’s decision making. Depending on the behavior, experts such as sales associates may be normative others who play an important role in influencing one’s behavioral beliefs.

The normative belief index is formed by an individual’s normative belief about particular salient referent groups, multiplied by the individual’s motivation to comply with those referents (Ajzen, 1991). Motivation to comply will be measured by determining the
extent to which the person will comply with the wishes of referents. Then, these normative
belief factors are summed across the number of salient referents. The summative normative
belief index is highly correlated with the directly measured subjective norms for certain
behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

In the fair trade shopping context, significant referents include friends, religious
groups, and family members. A recent market survey (Littrell, et al., 2004) suggested that
more than 35% of fair trade consumers were acquainted with fair trade organizations through
word of mouth from friends. Especially among young adult consumers, friends are an
important peer group in their purchase decisions; this indicates their desire for social
affiliation through shopping behaviors (Taylor & Cosenza, 2002). Religion may be one of
the supportive references to influence fair trade purchase decisions. A study of religious
beliefs among young adults aged 21 to 28 revealed that 68% of those surveyed considered
religious faith important in their daily lives (Arnett & Jensen, 2002), although respondents in
their late teens and early twenties showed somewhat lower religious participation (Gallup &
Lindsay, 1999). More specifically, in the grocery shopping context, Shaw and Clarke found
that religious groups were a positive normative influence by creating awareness of fair trade
and concern for ethical issues (1999). According to research on consumption habits, young
consumers’ spending habits also appeared to be influenced by their parents (Morton, 2002;
Taylor and Cosenza, 2002). The young generation was found to be more similar to their
parents than were those of previous generations. For instance, the echo boomers have
socially responsible values, as do their parents, the baby boomers (Alch, 2000; Eisner, 2005).

Therefore, in this research, subjective norms were explored by including friends, faith
based groups, and family members as influential referents/groups in fair trade shopping. The
influence of normative beliefs on the subjective norm for purchasing fair trade products was
examined supported by the TPB. Thus, the following hypothesis was posed:

Hypothesis T2: Young consumers who have more positive normative beliefs about
purchasing fair trade products will have more positive subjective norms for purchasing fair
trade products.
Perceived Behavioral Control and Antecedents of Perceived Behavioral Control

A favorable attitude toward a behavior and/or strong social pressure to engage in the behavior may not be enough to predict an individual’s behavioral intention when the behavior is not completely under volitional control. In the TPB, Ajzen (1988, 1991) incorporated perceived behavioral control, which is the perception of control over performance of a given behavior. Control is treated as a continuous concept between easily executed behaviors at one end and behaviors demanding resources, opportunities, and specialized skills at the other (Conner & Armitage, 1998; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Behaviors which require resources, opportunities, and skills to execute are better predicted when one considers individuals’ perceptions of level of difficulty in performing the behavior (Ajzen, 1988, 1999).

The control belief index is formed by an individual’s perceived presence of factors that facilitate or inhibit performance of a behavior, multiplied by the perceived power of the particular control factor in performing the given behavior (Ajzen, 1991). These control belief factors are summed across the number of salient control beliefs to yield the perception of behavioral control.

The relationship between attitude and purchase behavior may be affected by the individual’s circumstances and the purchase situation. Contingency variables such as budget, product and store availability, and time constraints influence an individual’s plan to purchase products beyond the individual’s favorable attitude and social pressure in doing so (Blackwell, Szeinbach, Barnes, Garner, & Bush, 1999). In a study of attitudes towards the consumption of organically-produced vegetables, Sparks and Shepherd (1992) suggested that consumers’ perceptions about behavioral control, along with attitudes and subjective norms, predicted their intention to eat organically-produced vegetables. Consumers in their study claimed that lack of availability negatively affected their decision to purchase organically-grown vegetables.

Shaw and Clarke (1999) revealed that cost, availability of ethical alternatives, product quality, and relevant information were major concerns to purchasers of fair trade products. Although fair trade products are not necessarily more expensive than mainstream products, one-third of fair trade consumers perceived fair trade prices to be somewhat higher (Littrell,
et al., 2004). This perception may result in problems of adopting fair trade products. Another restraining factor is the limited number of stores selling fair trade products (Shaw & Clarke, 1999). More than 80% of college students surveyed were very positive toward fair trade purchases if they were available and comparable in price to mainstream products (Suchomel, 2005). An additional factor is the lack of information about fair trade and fair trade businesses. Location and time constraints also limit the choice of products and stores. According to the preliminary study for this research, college-age fair trade consumers stated that there is a smaller variety of merchandise in fair trade stores than in mainstream businesses (Ma, 2005). Because preserving cultural traditions are a consideration for artisans and retailers in the fair trade market system, fair trade stores mainly carry cultural crafts (Littrell & Dickson, 1999).

In this study, behavioral control variables which might facilitate or impede fair trade purchases included budget, store availability, lack of information about fair trade, and product variety. There is limited research on the association between control beliefs and global measures of perceived behavioral control as compared to studies on the relationship between belief-based and global measures of attitudes and subjective norms (Ajzen, 1991). Thus, this study examined the influence of control beliefs on the perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products. Based on findings from previous studies, the following hypothesis was posited:

Hypothesis T3: Young consumers who have more positive control beliefs about purchasing fair trade products will have greater perceived behavioral control for purchasing fair trade products.

Based on the TPB, the summative indices of behavioral, normative, and control beliefs are useful determinants in capturing attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1988, 1991). Measuring the constructs of attitudes, subjective norms, and perception of behavioral control in a direct manner, rather than using the summative indices, is recommended to predict behavioral intentions (Ajzen, 2006). Therefore, this study explored the influences of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control on intention to purchase fair trade products, suggesting the following hypotheses.
Hypothesis T4: Young consumers who have more positive attitudes toward fair trade purchase will have greater intention to purchase fair trade products.

Hypothesis T5: Young consumers who have more positive subjective norms for purchasing fair trade products will have greater intention to purchase fair trade products.

Hypothesis T6: Young consumers who have greater perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products will have greater intention to purchase fair trade products.

**Personal Values and Past Experiences regarding Fair Trade**

Recent research has explored factors in belief and attitude formation to provide better understanding of ethical consumer decision making (Shaw & Clarke, 1999; Shaw & Shiu, 2002). In this section, personal values and past experiences with fair trade purchases are discussed as potential influential factors in formation of beliefs, attitudes, and intention to purchase fair trade non-food products.

**Values**

According to Rokeach, values are “enduring beliefs that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to opposite or converse modes of conduct or end state” (1973, p. 5). Values are a person’s concepts or global beliefs which guide actions, judgments, and choices (Rokeach, 1973; Williams, 1979). Values have directional, cognitive, and affective aspects, in that values serve as criteria for the selection or evaluation of behavior and events (Schwartz, 1992; Williams, 1979). The type and importance of values varies among individuals or groups (e.g., Howard, 1977; Littrell & Dickson, 1999).

Values, unlike attitudes, are characterized by generality or abstractness (Schwartz, 1992). Values are the general beliefs about desirable conduct and goals that underlie attitudinal and behavioral processes (Connor & Becker, 1979). Researchers have revealed that values are associated with the formation of beliefs and attitudes, and influence the intention to behave in a certain way (e.g., Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Hrubes, Ajzen, & Daigle, 2001). Hrubes and his colleagues (2001) found that lifestyle values are indirectly related to behavioral intention through their influences on beliefs and attitudes. In their study of recreational activities framed by the TPB, Hrubes et al. provided evidence that
an individual’s lifestyle values such as self-transcendence afforded an improvement in predicting hunting intention (2001). For example, people’s concern for the welfare of others had a negative association with hunting behavior.

**Values and fair trade consumers**

Values have been considered as important antecedents to consumption decisions in the consumer behavior literature (e.g., Kahle, Beatty, & Homer, 1986; Littrell & Dickson, 1999; Rokeach, 1973; Shaw, Grehan, Shiu, Hassan, & Thompson, 2005). Several researchers have pinpointed consumers’ basic values (Dickson, 2000; Dickson & Littrell, 1996; Littrell, Ogle, & Kim, 1999) in order to predict consumption patterns in fair trade shopping.

In their research on the values and attitudes of fair trade consumers, Dickson and Littrell (1996) found that fair trade consumers have strong interest in human equality, a world at peace, and environmental security. These values generated more specific concerns about people in developing countries, which in turn increased positive beliefs in and attitudes toward fair trade businesses and products. Stronger beliefs and attitudes about fair trade influenced a willingness to purchase fair trade products. Similarly, global values had a direct influence on concerns about living conditions in a developing country (i.e., India) where fair trade products are produced, and an indirect influence on motivations for fair trade shopping (Kim, Ogle, & Littrell, 1999).

In a later study, Dickson (2000) found that personal societal values exerted different influences on consumers’ concerns about socially responsible business practices. The researcher suggested that ethical consumers held either macro or micro societal values. Macro societal values represent concerns for human welfare, education, environmental protection, and world peace. Micro societal values reflect more individual concerns such as family security, fairness, and tolerance for others’ beliefs. Dickson (2000) found that consumers who had broader societal values were more likely to be suspicious of business strategies. For example, consumers who sought a safe environment, world peace, and education would like to see the apparel industry be more socially responsible in its business practices.
Values are also used to determine specific attitudes about consumption. Littrell, Ogle, and Kim (1999) segmented fair trade consumers according to the meanings of ethnic apparel consumption. They found that the values of creative, culturally sensitive, and hedonic consumers were significantly different from the values of classic, pan-cultural consumers. Another study of the influence of fair trade labels in purchase decisions found that people with a stronger preference for fair-trade labeled products were more idealistic and less conventional than people without that preference (de Pelsmacker, Driesen, & Rayp, 2005). Based on previous studies, this research explored the personal values of young fair trade consumers and their role in formation of their beliefs and attitudes in order to understand their intention for fair trade consumptions.

**Dimensions of values: Schwartz Value Survey**

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) has been extensively used in social psychological research (e.g., Dickson, 2000; Shaw et al., 2005). The RVS examines 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values (1973). Instrumental values are desirable modes of conduct, such as honesty and helpfulness, which guide terminal values. Terminal values relate to desirable states of existence such as happiness, a peace, and accomplishment. To capture the value preference structure, respondents are asked to rank order the values by importance.

Using Rokeach’s value measurement, Schwartz and Blisky created a survey tool to identify the dimensional structure behind the values (1987). The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) is the most commonly used value scale in recent research on human values (Schwartz, 1992). The SVS consists of 56 value items representing 10 individual values: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, and universalism. Each value has its own motivational goal. The values are presented in a quasi-circular structure of relations, in that they are not equally spaced on a circle. The SVS and the value types have been validated through research conducted in specific contexts where values are important (e.g., Shaw et al., 2005) and in cross-cultural settings with samples from more than 60,000 individuals in 64 countries (Schwartz & Blisky, 1987, 1990; Schwartz, 1992).

Utilizing the SVS, Shaw and his colleagues explored the values of ethical consumers in their purchase decisions for grocery shopping (2005). Of the 10 types of values included
in Schwartz’s model (1992), eight types were found meaningful to these ethical consumers: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, security, conformity, benevolence, and universalism. More specifically, the universalism values appeared to be the most important in the decision making process of ethical consumers. The universalism values emphasize prosocial concerns such as equal opportunity, social justice, and the protection of the environment (Schwartz, 1992).

Concerns depicted in universalism values correspond with fair trade philosophy and its practices which seek to provide fair wages and safe work conditions and build respectful trade relationships (IFAT Standards Working Group, 2002). Thus, the present study explored universalism values of older echo boomer consumers using the SVS to understand their decision making when they shopping for fair trade purchases. In the next section, universalism values are discussed in terms of their impact on purchase decisions of fair trade consumers.

**Universalism.** The motivational goals of universalism values are “understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature” (Schwartz, 1992, p. 12). These goals can arise from the needs of individuals and groups who must compete for scarce resources (Schwartz, 1992). Universalism values emphasize the importance of accepting others in order to avoid life-threatening strife, and protecting environmental resources (Schwartz, 1992).

These values are linked to fair trade philosophy and practices. Fair trade empowers artisan producers through the establishment of sound and sustainable trade partnerships among retailers, producers, and consumers (Littrell & Dickson, 1999). Fair trade encourages environmentally responsible methods of production (IFAT Standards Working Group, 2002). Items carried in fair trade businesses, such as kitchen trivets made from recycled newspapers and apparel accessories produced from recycled aluminum cans, are good examples of fair trade that helps to preserve the environment.

In a study of socially responsible behavior, Dickson and Littrell (1996) found that societally-centered personal values, called Global Values, had a substantial influence on behavioral intentions to shop for fair trade products. Global Values included concerns about equality, a world at peace, equal educational opportunities for all, and environmental security.
These values are quite similar to universalism values of Schwartz’s value model. In addition, universalism values well represent fair trade consumers’ beliefs and attitudes toward fair trade. A recent market survey highlighted that fair trade consumers had high expectation for equal exchange between retailers and producers. Fair trade consumers cared about the environmental friendliness of fair trade products (Littrell et al., 2004). Therefore, the socially- and environmentally-directed nature of universalism values may contribute to the formation of positive beliefs and attitudes toward fair trade products. In turn, the universalism values of consumers may indirectly affect the decision to purchase from fair trade businesses. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was posited regarding the role of consumers’ universalism values in the formation of their beliefs about fair trade products.

Hypothesis UF\textsubscript{1}: Young consumers who exhibit higher levels of universalism will have more positive beliefs about fair trade businesses/products.

\textit{Past Experience with Fair Trade Purchases}

The TPB allows the inclusion of other variables to enhance predicting power for a given behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Past behavior is one of the variables that has been added to predictive models using the TPB (e.g., Ajzen, 2001; Bentler & Speckart, 1979; d’Astous, Colbert, & Montpetit, 2005; Ouellette & Wood, 1998). Frequent or repetitive performance was assumed to constitute a habit; then that habit was expected to influence the intention to engage in a given behavior. For example, in a study of students’ drug use, Bentler and Speckart (1979) explored the ability of previous behavior to predict subsequent behavior. They found that the added path from past behavior to intention explained substantial variance in the subsequent behavior. Similarly, Dickson found that past experience with a socially responsible business was a significant determinant of future purchase intentions (2000). Consumers having purchased a pair of jeans in the past from a socially responsible business demonstrated greater intentions to purchase again from socially responsible businesses.

Past behavior as an informational source can exert influence on one’s beliefs and attitudes toward a behavior (Bem, 1972). Bem argued that people observed their own behavior and they were likely to infer their attitudes from those past behaviors. Likewise, people who had prior experience and positive beliefs about shopping with a certain retailer
were more inclined to have positive attitudes toward purchasing again from that retailer (Yoh, Damhorst, Sapp, & Laczniak, 2003). Another research study about past behavior and ethical consumption revealed that previous experience of a behavior had a positive association with the attitude toward that behavior (d’Astous, Colbert, & Montpetit, 2005). Having shared music on the Web in the past had a strong influence on individuals’ intention to do it again. Based on these joint findings, the present study tested the influence of past purchase behavior with fair trade businesses on the formation of beliefs, attitudes, and perception of behavioral control factors. Furthermore the direct and indirect influences of past purchase behavior on future intention to buy fair trade products were tested, leading to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis UF$_2$: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have more positive behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases than those who do not.

Hypothesis UF$_3$: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have more positive attitudes toward fair trade purchases than those who do not.

Hypothesis UF$_4$: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have more positive control beliefs for purchasing fair trade products than those who do not.

Hypothesis UF$_5$: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have higher perceived behavioral control for purchasing fair trade products than those who do not.

Hypothesis UF$_6$: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have higher intention to purchase fair trade products than those who do not.

**Proposed Model**

The following model (Figure 2.2) is proposed to explore older echo boomer consumers’ intention to purchase fair trade products (Ajzen, 1988, 1991). Personal values were examined as antecedents of beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intention in the context of purchasing fair trade products. The effects of previous experience in shopping for fair trade products on purchase intentions were also explored in this model. The associations between
belief-based and direct measures of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control were also examined.
Universalism → UF₁ (+) → Behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases → T₁ (+) → Favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases → T₄ (+) → Intention to buy fair trade products

Normative beliefs for fair trade purchases → T₂ (+) → Positive subjective norms for fair trade purchases → T₅ (+) → Intention to buy fair trade products

Past behavior with fair trade purchases → UF₂ (+) → Control beliefs over fair trade purchases → T₃ (+) → High perceived behavioral control for fair trade purchases → T₆ (+) → Intention to buy fair trade products

Behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases → UF₃ (+) → Favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases → T₄ (+) → Intention to buy fair trade products

Control beliefs over fair trade purchases → UF₄ (+) → High perceived behavioral control for fair trade purchases → T₆ (+) → Intention to buy fair trade products

Figure 2.2. Proposed model: Young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products

a Normative beliefs formed by a function of normative belief strength multiplied by motivation to comply.
b Control beliefs formed by a function of control beliefs strength multiplied by power of control.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

The purpose of this research is to understand influences on older echo boomer consumers’ purchase intentions for fair trade non-food products. Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1988) and relevant literature, the role of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control in making purchase decision for fair trade products were examined. Consumers’ personal values and past shopping experience were identified and explored to examine their influences on the formation of attitudes toward the purchase of fair trade non-food products, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.

To meet the research objectives, the proposed model (Figure 2.2) was empirically tested. A random sample of college students from a large Midwestern U.S. university was invited by e-mail to participate in this study. Data were collected via Web-based surveys. Data were assessed initially using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, chi-square, and t-tests. Structural equation modeling was used to test the hypothesized research model. This chapter gives a detailed description of a preliminary study, sampling, questionnaire development, the data collection procedure, and proposed data analysis.

Preliminary Study

A preliminary consumer study was conducted to elicit a range of variables that influence consumers’ decisions to purchase from fair trade businesses (Ma, 2005). Two focus group interviews were conducted with nine current young fair trade consumers between the ages of 19 and 32. Participants in the focus group interviews were recruited through a purposive sampling method to identify consumers who have browsed for or purchased fair trade products within the past year. A gift certificate was offered to each participant as an incentive for completing the series of focus group questions.

A series of open-ended questions was developed, based on relevant literature (Dickson, 1994; Littrell et al., 2004) regarding fair trade purchases (See Appendix A). Participants were asked to describe and discuss their understanding of fair trade, non-food products from fair trade businesses, fair trade store experiences, and reasons they had or had not purchased fair trade products. Each focus group session lasted about one and one-half hours. The researcher introduced topics and facilitated discussion, with the assistance of a
faculty member. The interviews were tape-recorded for accuracy in transcription. The qualitative data in the form of transcripts were analyzed by the researcher through systematic categorizing and labeling to identify emerging themes and concepts.

Information generated from the focus group discussions aided in development of the questionnaire. The majority of participants described “fair trade” in terms of a fair business system and worker compensation. One stated, “…you don’t have so many middlemen taking share of the profits that the actual producer would end up with such little amounts of the return for making the product.” Another commented, “I’m just thinking about people that make products and …the money goes directly back to them.” Respectful treatment by store managers and volunteers and unique displays in fair trade retail stores drew young consumers into stores. Similar to findings of a previous study (Littrell et al., 2004), knowledgeable salespersons were useful in helping older echo boomer consumers to better understand products and make a purchase decision. As one respondent stated, “it was so interesting and service there was amazing and they were so knowledgeable on how it was made and what countries it came from.”

Older echo boomer consumers in the preliminary study claimed that product uniqueness and styling are of greatest important to them, but they also factor social responsibility into their consumption. For example, a respondent commented, “I guess what really drives me to buy their products in there is that knowing that it is different and personal so when you are looking for a gift it really makes a difference.” Another respondent stated, “I’m looking for something and if I can make a socially responsible purchase that’s a bonus and that makes it much cooler.” In response to the question “what reasons do you feel young people would have for not buying from fair trade businesses?” many participants pointed out financial constraints. On the one hand, young consumers hesitated to buy from fair trade businesses because they are looking for disposable and durable products suitable for a dormitory. On the other hand, some participants agreed that traditional and cultural crafts might make people hesitate to purchase products from fair trade stores. One commented, “I think a lot of people are just intimidated as to…how I am going to incorporate this item into my household.…” Findings of the focus group interviews were used to develop items for constructs of interest in the present study.
Sample

The sample for this study was comprised of 18-28 year old female college students from a large Midwestern university in which a total of 25,462 students were enrolled in 2006. The population of the city where the university is located was estimated at 52,263 in 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). The city has a fair trade retail shop not far from campus. Additionally, the store conducts an annual one-week sale in the university’s student union in conjunction with the university’s educational programming.

Using a list of e-mail addresses obtained from the school with the approval from the University Institutional Review Board, a random sample of 9,593 female students was invited to participate in the Web-based survey. The present study used females because most of the non-food products offered in fair trade businesses have been found to be more appealing to female rather than male consumers. In addition, most fair trade consumers are female (Littrell et al., 2004). Student samples have been successfully used in many theory testing studies in which multivariate relationships among constructs are examined (e.g., Caler, Philips, & Tybout, 1981; Kim, 2004). Caler et al. (1981) argued that a homogeneous pool of respondents is desirable in theory testing research because homogeneity allows for more exact theoretical predictions and reduces the chance of reaching a false conclusion. Furthermore, research on consumer behaviors has found no significant differences between the behavior of students and non-students (Lichtenstein & Burton, 1989; Yavas, 1994). Therefore, this study used a student sample to examine older echo boomer consumers’ decisions to purchase fair trade non-food products.

Web Questionnaire Development

A Web-based questionnaire assessed variables associated with fair trade purchases and personal characteristics. The questionnaire consisted of nine sections containing items to capture the exogenous and endogenous variables proposed in the model (Figure 2.2), and demographic information. An exogenous variable was defined as a variable whose variation is assumed to be causally independent from other variables in the model under consideration (Pedhazur, 1997). In this study, exogenous variables were the variables in the left side of the model (see Figure 2.2); personal values—universalism, normative beliefs, and past
experience associated with fair trade purchases. An endogenous variable is a variable whose variability is explained by exogenous and other variables within the model (Pedhazur, 1997). In this study, endogenous variables included intentions to purchase fair trade products and attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, behavioral beliefs, and control beliefs with regard to purchasing fair trade products. Prior to the first question, a short description of the terms fair trade and non-food products were provided to help ensure that all respondents understood how the terms were used in the questionnaire.

**Exogenous Variables**

**Personal values**

Values are a person’s closely held concepts or global beliefs which guide actions, judgments, and choices (Rokeach, 1973; Williams, 1979). In this study, nine items from the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992) were adopted to measure universalism. Universalism values emphasize the importance of accepting others in order to avoid life-threatening strife, and protecting environmental resources (Schwartz, 1992). Respondents were asked to rate the importance of the nine value items as life-guiding principles on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from extremely unimportant (1) to extremely important (7).

**Normative beliefs**

Normative beliefs are people’s beliefs about whether significant groups or individuals think they should perform a certain behavior (Ajzen, 1988). In this research, three normative referent individuals or groups identified based on the literature and the preliminary study (Ma, 2005) were used: friends, faith based groups, and family members. Two types of items assessed normative belief strength and motivation to comply with the three referent individuals or groups. First, respondents were asked to complete the sentences, for example, “My family members think that I ________ purchase fair trade products” on a 7-point scale ranging from Should not (1) to Should (7). Second, to measure motivation to comply, respondents indicated the importance of each of these three sources of social pressure on a 7-point scale ranging from Not at all (1) to Very much (7). Normative belief strength multiplied by motivation to comply was summed over all referent individuals or groups to create an overall belief-based estimated subjective norm. Additionally, Non applicable
(N/A) was added for the items regarding religious congregation when respondents have no religious congregation in which to participate.

**Past experience associated with fair trade purchases**

Six items were used to assess the respondents’ previous experiences with fair trade purchases. Initially, respondents were asked to indicate whether they have ever visited fair trade retail stores or internet shopping websites and purchased fair trade products, along with the frequency of each experience in the past two years. Next, questions included: 1) items that they purchased, 2) occasions for which fair trade products were purchased, and 3) the amount of money spent on fair trade shopping during the past 12 months. The frequency of experiences during the past 2 years was measured on a scale of *Once or twice* (1), *Every few months* (2), *Every month* (3), and *At least once a week* (4). Respondents were asked to check all non-food fair trade items which they previously purchased: clothing, jewelry, apparel accessories, household textiles, home decoration items, functional items, stationery, and holiday items. They were also asked to check all occasions for which they have made fair trade purchases: *Never* (1), *For everyday use* (2), *For special occasions* (3), *Gift* (4), and *Others* (5). The amount of money spent on fair trade non-food products during the past 12 months was asked in an open-ended question.

**Endogenous Variables**

**Intentions to purchase fair trade products**

Two items were used to assess consumers’ willingness to purchase fair trade products. Respondents were asked to indicate on a 7-point scale the extent to which they 1) intend and 2) will try to purchase fair trade products within the next six months. The scale items ranged from: 1) *Extremely unlikely* (1) to *Extremely likely* (7) and 2) *Definitely false* (1) to *Definitely true* (7).

**Attitudes**

Attitudes are defined as a person’s cognitive and affective orientations toward performing a behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Global attitudes toward purchasing fair trade non-food products were assessed by asking respondents to answer a
series of 7-point semantic differential questions. The anchors of these scales were: 1) Bad-Good, 2) Negative-Positive, 3) Difficult-Easy, and 4) Not enjoyable-Enjoyable.

**Subjective norms**

Subjective norms refer to an individual’s perceptions of social pressure in doing or not doing a particular behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). In this study, subjective norms were directly measured by three items on 7-point scales. For the first question, respondents were asked to complete the sentence “Some people who I care about think that I should (1)/should not (7) purchase fair trade non-food products.” The second item asked respondents the degree of agreement with the statements: “I feel that I am expected to purchase fair trade non-food products.” Ajzen argued that important others are perceived to approve of desirable behaviors and to disapprove of undesirable ones (2002). To solve this problem, Ajzen suggested the inclusion of questions asking whether important others perform the given behavior. Thus, the third item asked “Some people who are important to me purchase fair trade non-food products” on a 7 point scale ranging from Definitely false (1) to Definitely true (7).

**Perceived behavioral control**

Perceived behavioral control is defined as a person’s perceived ease or difficulty of carrying out an intended behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products was directly assessed by three items: 1) “I am confident that if I wanted to I could purchase fair trade products”, 2) “For me to purchase fair trade products”, and 3) “Whether or not I purchase fair trade products is completely up to me.” These three items capture respondents’ perceived ability to perform the behavior and its controllability (Ajzen, 2002). Seven-point scale items ranging from 1) Definitely false (1) to Definitely true (7), 2) Definitely impossible (1) to Definitely possible (7), and 3) Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (7) were used to measure the three items.

**Behavioral beliefs**

Behavioral beliefs are beliefs about the consequences of a behavior, which can be measured by the subjective probability that performing the behavior will lead to a certain outcome (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). In this study, 11 salient outcomes of purchasing fair
trade products were identified on the basis of previous research (Littrell et al., 2004) and the preliminary focus group interviews. The outcomes included fair wages, alleviating poverty, creating a better world, safe and clean work environment, product of high quality, hand-crafted, uniqueness, authenticity, ethnic appearance, knowledgeable sales people, and information about fair trade at stores. Respondents were asked to rate belief strength by indicating the likelihood that shopping for fair trade products would lead to each of the outcomes on a 7-point scale ranging from *Strongly disagree* (1) to *Strongly agree* (7). Belief strengths were summed to produce an overall belief-based estimate of attitude (Ajzen, 1992).

**Control beliefs**

Control beliefs are an individual’s perceived presence of factors that facilitate or inhibit performance of a behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Four factors that might facilitate or inhibit individuals from purchasing fair trade products were identified on the basis of the preliminary study and literature: budget, store availability, product assortment variety, and lack of information about fair trade. Two types of questions measured the strength of each of the four control beliefs and power of the control factors. First, respondents were asked to answer questions regarding each control factor on a 7-point scale, ranging from *Extremely unlikely* (1) to *Extremely likely* (7). Second, control belief power assessed the ease or difficulty of overcoming each control factor on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from *Strongly disagree* (1) to *Strongly agree* (7). Control belief strength multiplied by power of control factor was summed to yield a belief-based estimate of perceived behavioral control.

**Demographic Information**

Respondents’ personal information was obtained from 13 items asking concerning demographic characteristics. Age and academic major were asked in open-ended questions. Respondents then checked self-descriptive categories about their gender, ethnicity, year in school, household income, annual expenditure on non-food products, and knowledge of fair trade and related issues.
Pretest

Prior to collecting data, a pretest was conducted with ten college students between the ages of 18 and 28 to examine wording of the questionnaire and length of time needed to complete the Web survey. A pretest was used to assess the clarity of items, as well as length, format, and instructions for the overall survey (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2002). Based on the results of the pretest and comments from the participants, necessary corrections were made in the questionnaire before data collection commenced.

Approval of the Use of Human Subjects

Prior to collecting data, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) evaluated the study including the questionnaire and e-mails requesting responses, and approved the use of human subjects (Appendix B). The rights and welfare of the human subjects were protected from any risks or discomfort to the participants. Voluntary participation and confidentiality of data were assured.

Web Survey Data Collection Procedure

This study followed the modified method for Web survey design suggested by Dillman (2000). During a 10-day period, respondents were contacted two times via e-mail. The first e-mail invitation letter explained the purpose of the study, its potential implications, requested participation, and assured confidentiality. A hyperlink to a website for the survey was provided in the e-mail invitation. Respondents were directed to a website by clicking on the URL. About 10 days after the first invitation letter, a second e-mail was sent to thank those who had responded and to remind those who had not responded to complete the survey. As an incentive to increase participation, a drawing was held in which 10 randomly-selected respondents would be awarded a $10 gift certificate. The initial e-mail invitation included information about this incentive. The e-mail invitation letter, Web questionnaire, and e-mail follow-up letter can be found in Appendix C, D, and E.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consisted of two phases of analysis: preliminary analysis and causal model analysis. First, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 14.0
was used to conduct preliminary analyses such as frequencies, Pearson correlation, reliability, regression, and factor analysis. Second, causal models were tested by the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure using the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 7.0. Causal model testing was conducted through two steps: existing model testing and alternative model testing. In the first step, hypotheses were tested first based on the results for the fully recursive model. As a second step, the theoretical driven model was re-specified and validated using a cross-validation technique and then multi-group invariance was tested using multi-sample path analysis.

Preliminary Analysis

Missing data and distributional shape

Before analyzing the data, frequencies for all variables were examined to clean the data and to remove unusable questionnaires. To reduce the bias caused by missing data, significant case missing and item missing were detected and handled. The central tendency and the dispersion of key items and key indices were examined to see the distributional shape of the data. Simple regression analysis with bivariate plots of key items was used to detect any outliers, non-linear relationships, and influential data points.

Construct validity and internal consistency

The measures were next examined for construct validity and internal consistency. As a first step, principal components analysis was performed to assess the construct validity of multiple item measurements. Item loadings above .55 were considered as evidence for construct validity (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The internal consistency of multiple indicators was next examined using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). By convention, an acceptable level of coefficient alpha to retain an item in a scale is at least .70 (Peterson, 1994), while .60 or higher is acceptable in social psychology research (Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991). The number of items tends to influence coefficient alpha, as the larger number of items included, the higher coefficient alpha obtained (Bohrnstedt, 1983). High alpha values are evidence of high reliability of multiple indicator measures within a factor. The means of the sums of multiple items were entered into data analysis after the dimensions of multiple indicator measures were examined.
**Non-response error**

Non-response bias for the study was assessed by two approaches: a) comparing responses of early respondents to those of late respondents and b) examining differences between the respondents and the population on known proportions. To determine differences between the early and late responses, the demographic characteristics and key variables from the first and last 30% of respondents were compared using chi-square and t-tests (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). In addition, the sample composition was compared to those for the population on known proportions—year at school and college—and then proportionate difference between the sample and the population was used to compare influence of the proportionate difference on responses to questions about the research variables by chi-square and t-tests.

**Descriptive statistics and correlations**

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all continuous variables used in testing the proposed model were examined. Descriptive statistics focus on respondents’ demographic profile and the major variables of interest: values, past behaviors, beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and intention to purchase fair trade products. Descriptive statistics include frequencies, percents, means, and standard deviations.

Correlation analysis using Pearson correlation coefficients was conducted to measure the association between continuous variables. Correlations among indicators within constructs were compared to those between constructs to demonstrate interrelationships among constructs. In general, greater magnitude of correlations between indicators within constructs as compared with those across constructs can be considered evidence of convergent validity, while a low to moderate correlation between two constructs will be evidence of discriminant validity (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2002).

**Causal Model Analysis**

The proposed model was tested through structural equation modeling (SEM), which permits examination of the path structures of the latent model. The maximum-likelihood estimation procedure was used to analyze the structural model with AMOS 7.0. The overall fit of the model to data was examined through chi-square statistics, goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normed fit index (NFI), comparative fit index
(CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). Chi-square measures the difference between the sample variance-covariance matrices. A smaller chi-square indicated a better fit of the model, but the chi-square statistic is known to be sensitive to sample size, especially when $N \geq 200$ (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Kline, 2007). By convention, models with a good fit have fit statistics above .90 for GFI, AGFI, NFI, CFI, and below .05 for RMSEA (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2007). There is reasonable fit if the RMSEA value is between .05 and .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). A t-statistic was used to determine the statistical significance of parameter estimates; greater than 2.00 was considered an indicator of statistical significance (Byrne, 1998). The t-value is obtained by dividing the parameter by its standard error. The path coefficients were used to test the proposed hypotheses.
CHAPTER 4: PRELIMINARY RESULTS

This chapter presents the sample profile, the results of descriptive statistics of research variables, and preliminary analyses of the research data. First, sample characteristics are described. Second, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the research variables that were measured using multiple items: universalism, normative beliefs, product beliefs, mission beliefs, control beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control regarding fair trade purchases, and intention to purchase fair trade products. Internal consistency of multiple indicators was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Overall mean responses were created for all research variables and correlations among the research variables were examined. Non-response bias was assessed by comparing the responses of early and late respondents using chi-square and t-tests and by examining differences between the respondents and the population on known proportions.

Sample Characteristics

Of the 9,593 female older echo boomer students invited through e-mail to participate in the Web survey, 1,048 responses were returned for a response rate of 10.9%. Of these returns, 835 complete questionnaires were employed for the data analyses after the exclusion of the questionnaires with missing data (n = 213). Description of the samples includes respondents’ demographic profiles, knowledge of fair trade, and previous shopping experiences with fair trade non-food products.

Demographic Profiles of Sample

A demographic profile of the sample and the population is summarized in Table 4.1. All of the respondents were female. The mean age of respondents was 21, with ages ranging from 18 to 28 years. The majority of respondents were white or European American (88.4%), and between the ages of 18 and 23 (85.0%). About a third of the respondents (29.7%) were college seniors, followed by juniors (18.4%), freshmen (18.2%), and graduate students (16.3%). Respondents attended various colleges. Approximately 30% reported that they were associated with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and 22.2% were from Human Sciences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26-28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White or European</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>u.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Mixed/bi-racial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>u.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>u.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school</td>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school</td>
<td>Special students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$150,000 and over</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As depicted in Table 4.1, the sample distribution was found to be similar to the population distribution in age, ethnicity, year in school and college. In the total population of 9,593 female students, 87% were between the ages of 18 and 23 and the majority was White or European (82.6%). Approximately 27% of the population were college seniors, followed by freshmen (22.4%) and juniors (21.2%). The sample for this study consisted of more graduate students than in the population (16.3% and 10.0%, respectively). In addition, there were more White/European respondents in the sample than in the population (88.4% and 82.6%, respectively). About 31% of the population was associated with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and 23.9% were from Human Sciences, which was very similar to the sample.

Most respondents (91.0%) were single. Half of the respondents (50.0%) reported family household incomes up to $50,000. However, 16.5% had incomes of $50,000 to $74,999. When asked to indicate annual spending on non-food products, over one-third of the respondents (38.3%) reported that they spend $250 to $749 on non-food items such as housewares, apparel, accessories, and holiday items on an annual basis, while 13.4% spend over $2,000 on non-food items. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents were from a city whose population exceeded 100,000, about 19% were from towns with a population of.
10,000 to 49,999, and another 19% were from small towns with a population of 2,500 to 9,999.

**Knowledge of Fair Trade**

The majority of respondents (74.0%) indicated that they had heard of the term “fair trade” (see Table 4.2). They learned about fair trade through a variety of informational sources, with about forty percent of the respondents (38.3%) having seen the term “fair trade” in a newspaper or magazine article, heard it from word of mouth from a friend (33.7%), or learned about it while shopping in a fair trade retail store (31.6%). About 28.1% of the respondents learned about fair trade through a class or program at school.

### Table 4.2. Knowledge of fair trade (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (a) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you heard of the term “Fair Trade”?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where have you heard about “Fair Trade”?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a newspaper or magazine article</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through word of mouth from a friend</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I shopped in a fair trade retail store</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a class or program at a university</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a café or coffee shop</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through local advertising</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a purchase experience with family members</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a grocery store</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a community group or program</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a place of worship</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\)Sum of percents may not be equal to 100 due to non-responses.

\(b\)Respondents could check more than one category.

**Past Behavior with Fair Trade Purchases**

Respondents’ previous shopping experiences with fair trade non-food products were examined (see Table 4.3). Within the sample, approximately 43% of respondents had visited a fair trade retail store. More than 24% of those reported that they had visited a fair trade retail store once or twice during the past two years, and 12.6% had visited every few months.
However, only 18.4% of the respondents had browsed the Internet shopping sites for fair trade non-food products. About 8% had browsed the Internet shopping sites once or twice during the past two years while only four respondents reported they had browsed at least once a month. In addition, 39.2% of the respondents had purchased fair trade non-food products. In general, 25.5% of those respondents had purchased them once or twice in the past two years.

Table 4.3. Shopping experience with fair trade non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever visited a fair trade retail store?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of visiting a fair trade retail store (past 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever browsed the Internet shopping sites for fair trade non-food products?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of browsing the Internet shopping sites for fair trade non-food products (past 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever purchased fair trade non-food products?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of purchasing fair trade non-food products (past 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSum of percents may not be equal to 100 due to non-responses.
bQuestion was asked to those who said yes to the previous question.
Table 4.4. Types, occasions, and amount of money spent on fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Fair Trade Non-Food Products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel accessories</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home decoration items</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional items</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary, note cards, other paper products</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday items</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household textiles</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*b</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasions to Purchase Fair Trade Non-food Products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For everyday use</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For special occasion (e.g., holiday season)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Money Spent on Fair Trade Non-Food Products (past 12 months)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1-20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21-50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51-100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101-200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$201-500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501-1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Respondents could check more than one category.

*b*Others include: beauty products (9), coffee/teas (8), arts and crafts (2), toys, musical instruments, furniture, and music CD.

cSum of percents may not be equal to 100 due to non-responses.

dTwo hundred and sixty-six respondents (31.9%) did not answer the question.

Table 4.4 presents types of fair trade non-food products that the respondents had previously purchased, the occasions for which they had shopped for fair trade products, and the amount of money that they had spent on fair trade non-food products during the past 12 months. Jewelry was the most commonly purchased fair trade non-food product (22.9%). About 20% of the respondents had purchased accessories such as bags, scarves, and belts, and 18.9% had purchased home decoration items such as picture frames, candleholders, and vases. In general, the older echo boomer respondents had purchased fair trade non-food...
products as gifts (23.6%), for everyday use (22.0%), and for special occasions such as the holidays (14.0%).

On average, respondents had spent $55 on fair trade non-food products during the past 12 months. About 30% of the respondents reported that they had spent less than $100 on fair trade non-food items. The reported amount of money spent on fair trade non-food products during the past 12 months was most often between $21 and $50 (12.1%). However, about 33% of the respondents indicated that they had not purchased any fair trade non-food products over the past 12 months, while 32% did not respond to that question.

**Factor Analysis**

In order to determine underlying dimensions of multi-item measurement scales, principal components analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the subsequent multi-item variables: beliefs about purchasing fair trade non-food products, normative beliefs and control beliefs associated with fair trade purchases, attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control for fair trade purchases, personal values, and intention to buy fair trade products. Minimum eigenvalues of 1.0 helped determine the number of factors for each scale. Items loadings above .50 on one factor and with a minimum difference of .20 on all other factors were retained (George & Mallery, 2007). Internal consistency of multiple indicators was examined using Cronbach’s standardized alpha. A Cronbach’s alpha of .60 was considered acceptable to retain an item in a scale (Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991). Summated mean scores of multiple items were created for the research variables and used in subsequent analyses.

**Beliefs about Purchasing Fair Trade Products**

Factor analysis of 11 beliefs about young consumers’ purchasing fair trade non-food products revealed two factors that accounted for 66.99% of the variance. Table 4.5 presents the results of factor analysis and the detailed description of each item. Factor loadings ranged from .62 to .82. The first factor consisted of five items that measured the product-related beliefs of fair trade non-food goods such as ethnic appearance, hand-craftedness, unique and authentic style, and information about fair trade provided by sales people or
brochures at stores. Hence, the first factor was named Product Belief. Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the items included in this factor was .87.

Table 4.5. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of beliefs about fair trade non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Titles and Items</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Belief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trade products have an ethnic appearance.</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trade products are hand-crafted rather than machine</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair products are of unique style.</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair products are authentic.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about fair trade is provided by sales people or</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brochures when I buy the product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Belief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My purchase will help to create a better world.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trade products are produced in a safe, clean work</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My purchase will help to alleviate poverty.</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing fair trade products will help the workers who</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produced the product to be fairly paid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue = 4.97
Cronbach’s alpha = .87
Total variance explained = 35.98%

Total Percent of Variance = 66.99

*Item scores range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The second factor included four items that captured fair trade mission-related beliefs. The second factor was named Mission Belief, as it included beliefs about creating a better world, safe and clean work environment for artisan producers, poverty relief, and fair price associated with purchase of fair trade non-food products. Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the items consisting of this factor was .84.

Overall, respondents exhibited positive beliefs about purchasing fair trade products. Respondents in this study most strongly agreed that purchasing fair trade products would
help the workers who produced the product to be fairly paid (M=5.59 on a scale of 1 being strongly disagree to 7 being strongly agree, SD=1.22). Fair trade products were perceived to be of unique style (M=5.32, SD=1.33) and authentic (M=5.04, SD=1.21). Respondents also believed that fair trade products are produced in a safe, clean work environment (M=5.06, SD=1.25).

**Favorable Attitudes toward Fair Trade Purchases**

Table 4.6 presents young consumers’ attitudes toward fair trade purchases. In general, respondents had a favorable attitude toward purchasing fair trade non-food products. One underlying factor was revealed for attitudes toward fair trade purchases. This factor included three items with an eigenvalue of 2.61 and explained 87.05% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged from .88 to .96 and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .92.

Table 4.6. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of young consumers’ favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Title and Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable Attitudes toward Fair Trade Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad (1)/ Good (7)</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (1)/ Positive (7)</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enjoyable (1)/ Enjoyable (7)</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue = 2.61
Cronbach’s alpha = .92

Total Percent of Variance = 87.05

aScores were obtained using 7-point semantic differential items.

**Positive Subjective Norms for Fair Trade Purchases**

One underlying factor emerged from principal components analysis of the three items measuring young consumers’ perceptions of social pressure in purchasing fair trade non-food products (see Table 4.7). The factor was labeled Positive Subjective Norms for fair trade purchases. Internal consistency of the items within a factor was examined using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. However, the third item, “I feel I am expected to purchase fair trade non-food products”, revealed low internal consistency within a factor. Thus, the correlation
analysis was further performed to examine the association among the three items. The results of an analysis of the correlations between the items revealed that the third item did not correlate with the other two. Therefore, the third item was excluded for further analysis. Cronbach’s alpha of .65 was obtained from the correlation between the other two items. In general, respondents felt medium social pressure to purchase fair trade non-food products.

Table 4.7. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for positive subjective norms for young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Subjective Norms for Fair Trade Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Some people I care about think that I should purchase fair trade non-food products</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some people who are important to me purchase fair trade non-food products</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I am expected to purchase fair trade non-food products</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha of the items 1 and 2= .65

*a* Item scores range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

*b* Item scores range from 1 (I should not) to 7 (I should).

* p < .05; ** p < .01

**High Perceived Behavioral Control over Fair Trade Purchases**

Principal components analysis was conducted with three items measuring perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products (see Table 4.8). A single factor emerged from the principal components analysis, explaining 76.60% of the total variance. This factor was named High Perceived Behavioral Control over Purchasing Fair Trade Products. Internal consistency of the items within a factor was examined using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. However, the third item, “Whether or not I purchase fair trade non-food products is completely up to me”, indicated low internal consistency within a factor, thus correlation analysis was conducted to examine the association among the three items. Results of the Pearson correlations coefficients revealed that the third item had weak and
marginal correlations with the other items. Accordingly, the third item was excluded from further data analysis. Cronbach’s alpha of .69 was obtained for the other two items. Overall, respondents felt medium to moderately high perceived control over purchasing fair trade non-food products.

Table 4.8. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for young consumers’ high perceived control over purchasing fair trade non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Perceived Behavioral Control over Purchasing Fair Trade Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am confident that if I wanted to I could purchase fair trade non-food products.</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For me to purchase fair trade non-food products is __________</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whether or not I purchase fair trade non-food products is completely up to me.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha of the items 1 and 2 = .69

a Item scores range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

b Item scores range from 1 (extremely difficult) to 7 (extremely easy).

** p < .01

**Personal Values: Universalism**

One underlying factor was revealed from principal components analysis with nine items measuring personal values with emphasis on universalism (see Table 4.9). The factor had an eigenvalue of 5.49 and explained 61.0% of the variance. This factor consisted of all nine items that corresponded to the universalism values of Schwartz (1992). Hence, the factor was labeled Universalism. Factor loadings ranged from .75 to .84. Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the items consisting of this factor was .92. In general, respondents had strong concerns about equal opportunities, tolerance of different ideas and beliefs, mature understanding of life, and protection of environment resources.
Table 4.9. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of young consumers’ personal values (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Title and Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the environment (preserving nature)</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice (correcting injustice, care for the weak)</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner harmony (at peace with myself)</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A world at peace (free of war and conflict)</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity with nature (fitting into nature)</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality (equal opportunity for all)</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-minded (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue = 5.49
Cronbach’s alpha = .92

Total Percent of Variance = 61.00

*aItem scores range from 1 (extremely unimportant) to 7 (extremely important).

Normative Beliefs

Normative beliefs about purchasing fair trade non-food products represented respondents’ beliefs about whether significant groups or individuals think they should purchase fair trade products. Principal components analysis was performed for the weighted scores (see Table 4.10). Following Fishbein and Ajzen’s formula (1980), the weighted scores were obtained through measures of salient referents multiplied by the corresponding motivation to comply with those referents. Principal components analysis revealed one underlying factor with three weighted normative belief items. This factor accounted for 72.64% of the total variance and was labeled Normative Beliefs. The third item regarding faith-base group was found to have low internal consistency within a factor. Results of Pearson correlations between the items revealed that the third item correlated with the other variables marginally.

Thus, the third item was excluded for further analysis. Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .62 was obtained from the correlation between the two items regarding influences from family members and friends. In general, the older echo boomer respondents had low normative expectations of faith-based groups in purchasing fair trade products. Family
members had some normative influence over the respondents; however, friends’ influence on their fair trade purchases was limited.

Table 4.10. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for young consumers’ weighted normative beliefs about fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Weighted Score Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative Beliefs about Fair Trade Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My friends _________ purchase fair trade non-food products. (^b)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My family members think that I _________ purchase fair trade non-food products. (^c)</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.45** 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My faith-based group think that I _________ purchase fair trade non-food products. (^d)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.25** .28** 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha of the items 1 and 2 = .62

\(^a\)The weighted score was obtained through measures of salient referents multiplied by the corresponding motivation to comply with those referents; motivation to comply with referents item scores range from -3 (not at all) to 3 (very much).

\(^b\)Item scores range from 1 (do not) to 7 (do).

\(^c\)Item scores range from 1 (should not) to 7 (should).

\(^d\)Item scores range from 1 (do not) to 7 (do); 0 represents not applicable.

\(^**\) p < .01

**Control Beliefs**

Control beliefs represented respondents’ perception of factors or circumstances that would make it difficult or impossible to purchase fair trade non-food products. Principal components analysis was conducted for the weighted scores. Following Ajzen’s formula (1991), the weighted scores were obtained from control belief strength about salient control factors multiplied by their perceived power to influence such purchases. One underlying factor emerged from principal components analysis with four weighted control belief items associated with purchasing fair trade non-food products. This factor consisted of three items with an eigenvalue of 1.68 and explained 59.10% of the variance (see Table 4.11). The factor included store availability, product variety, and lack of information about fair trade.
This factor was labeled Control Belief. Factor loadings of the items ranged from .59 to .85 and Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the items was .60. One item was not included due to its low reliability within a factor. Overall, respondents felt a marginal level of negative control over fair trade purchases, suggesting that purchasing fair trade products was moderately difficult for the older echo boomer respondents. They found more difficulties with purchasing fair trade products due to the lack of information about fair trade, rather than limited store availability and product variability.

Table 4.11. Results of factor analysis and descriptive statistics of young consumers’ weighted control beliefs about fair trade purchases for non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Title and Items</th>
<th>Weighted Score Meana</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs about Fair Trade Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trade non-food products are available for purchase at a retail store(s) where I live (R)b.</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to find the types of fair trade non-food products that interest me.</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know where to buy fair trade non-food products.</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue = 1.68
Cronbach’s alpha = .60
Total Percent of variance = 59.10

aThe weighted score was obtained from control beliefs ranging from 1 to 7 multiplied by their perceived power to influence such purchases ranging from -3 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree).
bReverse coded item.

Intention to Purchase Fair Trade Products

Intention to buy fair trade non-food products represented respondents’ willingness to purchase fair trade non-food products within the next six months. In general, to identify a factor model, at least three measures are required for each factor (Russell, 2002). However, only two items were used to measure young consumers’ intention to buy fair trade non-food products in this study. Thus, only internal consistency was examined for the two items. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .92 was obtained from the correlation between the items (see
Table 4.12. Overall, respondents were slightly more likely to buy a fair trade non-food product than not to buy within the next six months.

Table 4.12. Results of descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for young consumers’ intention to purchase fair trade non-food products (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Purchase Fair Trade Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. I intend to purchase a fair trade non-food product within the next six months.  
   a Item scores range from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 7 (extremely likely). | 3.96 | 1.85 | 1.00         |
| 2. I will try to purchase a fair trade non-food product within the next six months.  
   b Item scores range from 1 (definitely false) to 7 (definitely true). | 4.36 | 1.76 | .85** 1.00  |

Cronbach’s alpha of the items 1 and 2 = .92

** p < .01

Summary of Research Variables

In this section, overall mean scores for research variables and correlations among research variables are discussed.

Overall Mean Scores for Research Variables

Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, and the minimum and maximum values of research variables are summarized in Table 4.13. Summated scores were created for all research variables except past behavior with fair trade purchases, which was measured using a single item, and divided by the number of items included in the variable. Overall, the older echo boomer respondents had moderately positive beliefs (M = 4.95) about fair trade products in terms of unique style, authenticity, and ethnic appearance. They also attached some importance to the fair trade mission (M = 5.10). It is interesting to notice that these older echo boomer respondents attributed less importance to the fair trade mission than fair trade consumers of food and non-food products in other generation cohorts. In the study of fair trade consumers’ purchase behaviors (Littrell et al., 2005), fair trade consumers in the generation X, baby boomer, and swing cohorts attributed much higher level of importance for the fair trade mission to their fair trade purchases (M = 6.52-6.61).
The older echo boomer respondents felt low normative influence by their friends and family members in purchasing fair trade products (M = 3.79 on a weighted score ranging from -21 to 21) and found a marginal level of difficulty with fair trade purchases due to the lack of information about fair trade, limited store availability and product variability (M = -3.66 on a weighted score ranging from -21 to 21). Furthermore, the older echo boomer consumers had favorable attitudes (M = 5.41), some social pressure (M = 4.41), and moderate perceived behavioral control associated with purchasing fair trade products (M = 4.85). As for universalism values, the older echo boomer respondents expressed strong concerns regarding equal opportunities, tolerance of different ideas and beliefs, mature understanding of life, and protection of environment resources (M = 5.83). In addition, the majority of older echo boomer respondents had never purchased a fair trade non-food product (60.8%) or had purchased once or twice during the past two years (25.5%). The older echo boomer respondents were somewhat more likely than not to buy fair trade products within the next six months (M = 4.16).

**Correlations among Research Variables**

Correlations among research variables are summarized in Table 4.14. Pearson correlations were used to examine whether there was an association among variables for the proposed model: universalism values, past behavior with fair trade purchases, normative beliefs, product beliefs, mission beliefs, control beliefs, attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control regarding fair trade purchases, and intention to purchases fair trade products. All correlations were significant for the hypothesized relationships.

**Non-response Bias**

Non-response bias was assessed by two approaches: a) comparing responses of early respondents to those of late respondents and b) examining differences between the respondents and the population on known proportions. Assuming that late respondents are more similar to non-respondents (Armstrong & Overton, 1977), the first 30% of respondents (n = 251) and the last 30% (n = 251) were selected to compare their responses concerning demographic characteristics and research variables: universalism values, past behavior with fair trade purchases, product and mission beliefs, normative beliefs, control beliefs, attitude,
subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and intention to purchase fair trade products. Chi-square tests and t-tests were employed to examine for significant differences between the two groups. No significant differences were found in the frequencies and means of examined variables between the early and late respondents (p = .001).

Second, the composition of the sample was compared on known proportions to that of the university population where the sample was collected: year at school and college. The sample for this study consisted of proportionately more graduate students (16.3%) than undergraduate students (81.3%) when compared to the population distribution by year at school (graduate students = 10.0%; undergraduate students = 90.0%). Therefore, data were examined to identify whether graduate students differ from undergraduate students in their responses regarding the research variables. Results of the t-tests revealed that there were no statistical differences in the means of research variables between graduate and undergraduate students at the .001 confidence level. Based on these combined results, it was assumed that there was no significant non-bias error in the present study.
Table 4.13. Summary of research variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Beliefs</td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair trade products have an ethnic appearance.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair trade products are hand-crafted rather than machine produced.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair products are of unique style.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair products are authentic.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information about fair trade is provided by sales people or brochures when I buy the product.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beliefs</td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My purchase will help to create a better world.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair trade products are produced in a safe, clean work environment.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My purchase will help to alleviate poverty.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchasing fair trade products will help the workers who produced the product to be fairly paid.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Beliefs</td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>-18.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My friends _________ purchase fair trade non-food products. (Do not/ Do)</td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My family members think that I _________ purchase fair trade non-food products. (Should not/ Should)</td>
<td>-15.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs</td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>-3.66</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair trade non-food products are available for purchase at a retail store(s) where I live (R)^d.</td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is hard to find the types of fair trade non-food products that interest me.</td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know where to buy fair trade non-food products.</td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bad/ Good</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Negative/ Positive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not enjoyable/ Enjoyable</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective norms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some people I care about think that ________ purchase fair trade</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-food products. (I should not/ I should)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some people who are important to me purchase fair trade non-food</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Behavioral</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>• I am confident that if I wanted to I could purchase fair trade</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-food products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For me to purchase fair trade non-food products is ___________.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Extremely difficult/ Extremely easy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universalism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall mean response</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protecting the environment (preserving nature)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social justice (correcting injustice, care for the weak)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inner harmony (at peace with myself)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A world at peace (free of war and conflict)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unity with nature (fitting into nature)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equality (equal opportunity for all)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broad-minded (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Variables</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Past behavior with fair trade purchases                 | Have you ever purchased fair trade non-food products? How often during the past 2 years if yes?  
|                                                         | 1 = No (60.8%)                                                       | 1.00| 5.00| 1.56 | .80 |
|                                                         | 2 = Yes; once or twice (25.5%)                                       |     |     |      |     |
|                                                         | 3 = Yes; every few months (11.1%)                                    |     |     |      |     |
|                                                         | 4 = Yes; every month (2.2%)                                          |     |     |      |     |
|                                                         | 5 = Yes; at least once a month (0.4%)                                 |     |     |      |     |
| Intention to purchase fair trade products               | Overall mean response                                                | 1.00| 7.00| 4.16 | 1.73|
|                                                         | • I intend to purchase a fair trade non-food product within the next six months. |     |     |      |     |
|                                                         | • I will try to purchase a fair trade non-food product within the next six months. |     |     |      |     |

aBased on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree, extremely unlikely, extremely unimportant, or definitely false) to 7 (strongly agree, extremely likely, extremely important, or definitely true).
bThe weighted score was obtained through measures of salient referents ranging from 1 to 7 multiplied by the corresponding motivation to comply with those referents ranging from -3 (not at all) to 3 (very much).
cThe weighted score was obtained from control beliefs ranging from 1 to 7 multiplied by their perceived power to influence such purchases ranging from -3 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree).
dReverse coded item.
Table 4.14. Correlation matrix for research variables (N=835)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Universalism (UNI)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Past behavior with fair trade purchases (PBFTP)</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Normative Beliefs (NB)</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Product Beliefs (PB)</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mission Beliefs (MB)</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Control Beliefs (CB)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitude (ATTI)</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Subjective norms (SN)</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perceived Control Behavior (PBC)</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intention to purchase fair trade products (Intention)</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Correlation is significant at p < .01; * Correlation is significant at p < .05.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH MODELS

This chapter presents results from the analyses of path models depicting young consumers’ non-food fair trade purchases. Based on results from preliminary analyses, the theoretical model and hypotheses proposed in Chapter 2 were refined. Research model analyses were conducted through two steps: 1) existing model testing and 2) alternative model testing. In step 1, the existing model (i.e., operational model) was analyzed by maximum-likelihood estimation procedures using AMOS 7.0. Hypotheses were tested based on the results for the fully recursive model. In step 2, the alternative model was tested using model respecification and validation procedures through a cross-validation strategy. Multi-group path analysis was conducted to test invariance of the alternative model estimation across groups.

Existing Model Testing

**Operational Model**

Factor analysis indicated that two dimensions existed in beliefs about purchasing fair trade non-food products: Product beliefs and mission beliefs. Thus, the concept of behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases proposed in the theoretical model (Figure 2.2) was divided into two different constructs. Figure 5.1 shows the operational model and refined hypotheses. Refined hypotheses were:

Behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases $\rightarrow$ Favorable attitude toward fair trade purchases

Hypothesis $T_{1-1}$: Young consumers who have more positive beliefs about fair trade products will have more positive attitudes toward fair trade purchases.

Hypothesis $T_{1-2}$: Young consumers who have more positive beliefs about fair trade mission will have more positive attitudes toward fair trade purchases.

Universalism $\rightarrow$ Behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases

Hypothesis $UF_{1-1}$: Young consumers who exhibit higher levels of universalism will have more positive beliefs about fair trade products.

Hypothesis $UF_{1-2}$: Young consumers who exhibit higher levels of universalism will have more positive beliefs about fair trade mission.
Past behavior with fair trade purchases → Behavioral beliefs about fair trade purchases

Hypothesis UF\textsubscript{2-1}: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have more positive beliefs about fair trade products than those who do not.

Hypothesis UF\textsubscript{2-2}: Young consumers who have more previous experience in shopping for fair trade products will have more positive beliefs about fair trade mission than those who do not.

**Operational Model Testing**

The operational model consisted of three exogenous constructs (universalism, past behavior with fair trade purchases, and normative beliefs) and six endogenous constructs (product beliefs, mission beliefs, attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control in relation to purchasing fair trade products, and intention to buy fair trade non-food products. Causal model analyses were conducted by maximum-likelihood estimation procedures using AMOS 7.0. Standardized path coefficients and t-ratios for each path as well as the fit indices of the model are presented in Figure 5.2. Squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) for each endogenous construct ranged from .02 to .41.

The results of AMOS analysis for the operational model revealed that all of the hypothesized paths with one exception were as predicted and were statistically significant at the level of .001. The positive relationship predicted in Hypothesis $T_6$ from high perceived behavioral control over fair trade purchases to intention to purchase fair trade products was not supported by the data ($t = 1.55, p \leq .12$).

To assess model fit to the data, chi-square statistics, goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normative fit index (NFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were examined. The criteria used for model fit analysis were above .90 for GFI, AGFI, NFI, CFI, and below .08 for RMSEA (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2007). The results revealed a Chi-square of 450.37 (df = 21, p = .000), GFI of .915, AGFI of .777, NFI of .851, CFI of .856, and RMSEA of .157. These overall fit indices indicated only marginal fit of the model to the data (see Figure 5.2).
Figure 5.1. Operational model: Young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products
Note. Product beliefs and mission beliefs are added to the operational model instead of behavioral beliefs in the theoretical model (see Figure 2.1).
Figure 5.2. Analysis of operational model: Young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products

Note: t-ratios are in parentheses (t ≥ 2.00) and dotted arrow indicates insignificant path; the residuals from product beliefs are correlated 0.55 with the residuals from mission beliefs and 0.11 with control beliefs, and the residuals from mission beliefs and control beliefs are correlated -0.06; the residuals from attitude are correlated 0.34 with the residuals from subjective norms and 0.33 with perceived behavioral control, and the residuals from subjective norms and behavioral control are correlated .39.
Hypothesis Testing

In this section, a fully recursive model was analyzed to test hypotheses. The fully recursive model considered all possible relationships among the constructs in the model, which provided a perfect fit to the data (Bollen, 1989). Table 5.1 presents standardized maximum-likelihood estimates of the fully recursive model. Based on the results of AMOS analysis for the fully recursive model, a 2 x 2 table was constructed to show statistically significant paths and non-significant paths that were hypothesized (see Table 5.2). Table 5.2 also presents paths that were not originally hypothesized. Hypotheses were tested using results from causal analysis for the fully recursive model. Overall, all the hypothesized paths, except one (hypothesis T_6), were strongly supported at the level of .001 (see Tables 5.1, 5.2).

Hypotheses T_1-1 and T_1-2 were tested to examine relationships between behavioral beliefs and favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases. The path coefficients from product beliefs and mission beliefs to favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases were significant (t = 6.41 and 11.34, respectively). Respondents who had more positive beliefs about fair trade products in terms of ethnic appearance, hand-craftedness, unique and authentic style, and information about fair trade provided by sales people or brochures when they shop had more positive attitude toward fair trade purchases. Respondents who had stronger beliefs about the fair trade mission such as creating a better world, alleviating poverty, and ensuring a fair price had a more positive attitude toward purchasing fair trade products. Therefore, hypotheses T_1-1 and T_1-2 were supported.

Hypothesis T_2, testing the relationship between normative beliefs and positive subjective norms for purchasing fair trade products, was supported (t = 5.17, p < .001). There was a significant positive association between normative beliefs and positive subjective norms for fair trade purchases, suggesting that consumers who had a higher normative influence by their friends and family members had more positive social pressure in purchasing fair trade products. Hence, hypothesis T_5 was supported.

Hypothesis T_3 examined positive effect of control beliefs about fair trade purchases on perceived behavioral control for purchasing fair trade products. The path from control beliefs to high perceived behavioral control was highly significant (t = 11.37, p < .001). Consumers who felt more control in purchasing fair trade products in such factors as limited
store availability, information about fair trade and product variability, had greater confidence in their ability to purchase fair trade products. Therefore, hypothesis T3 was supported.

Hypothesis T4 proposed that positive attitudes toward fair trade purchases would predict intention to purchase fair trade products. As expected, there was a significant and positive association between attitude toward fair trade purchases and intention to buy such products (t = 4.56, p < .001). Consumers who had more positive attitudes toward shopping for fair trade products also had a greater willingness to purchase fair trade products. Thus, hypothesis T4 was supported.

As hypothesis T5 proposed, positive subjective norms for purchasing fair trade products significantly impacted purchase intention of fair trade products (t = 5.76, p < .001). Respondents who experienced social pressure to purchase fair trade products had greater willingness to shop for fair trade products. Therefore, hypothesis T5 was supported.

Hypothesis T6 proposed that perceived behavioral control over fair trade purchases would positively predict intention to buy fair trade products; however, no significant relationship was found. This may be explained by the idea that purchasing fair trade products is largely under volitional control. When volitional control over a particular behavior is greater, the perceived behavioral control is less important in predicting that behavior (Hrubes, Ajzen, & Daigle, 2001; Madden, Ellen, & Ajzen, 1992). For young consumer respondents, their perceptions of easiness or capability in purchasing fair trade products did not lead to the actual intention to buy fair trade products. Hence, hypothesis T6 was not supported.

Hypotheses UF1-1 and UF1-2, testing the effect of universalism values on behavioral beliefs associated with fair trade purchases, were supported. Both path coefficients from universalism to product beliefs and to mission beliefs were statistically significant (t = 7.64, p < .001; t = 10.48, p < .001, respectively). Consumers who attached high importance to equal opportunities, protection of environment resources, and social justice had more positive beliefs about the fair trade products and fair trade missions. Therefore, hypotheses UF1-1 and UF1-2 were supported.

Hypotheses UF2-1 and UF2-2 proposed that consumers who have previous experience in shopping for fair trade products would have more positive behavioral beliefs about fair
trade purchases. As expected, both relationships from past behavior with fair trade purchases to product beliefs and to mission beliefs received strong statistical support (t = 11.42, p < .001; t = 9.03, p < .001, respectively). Consumers who had purchased more fair trade products had more positive beliefs about fair trade products and fair trade practices.

As hypothesis UF3 proposed, consumers’ past fair trade purchase behaviors were statistically related to positive attitude toward fair trade purchases (t = 10.78, p < .001). Consumers who had purchased more fair trade products had a more positive feeling about shopping for fair trade products. Therefore, hypothesis UF3 was supported.

Hypotheses UF4 and UF5 tested the relationships among past fair trade purchase behaviors, control beliefs, and high perceived behavioral control for purchasing fair trade products. Both path coefficients from past behavior with fair trade purchases to positive control beliefs and from past behavior to higher perceived behavioral control associated with fair trade purchases were significant (t = 8.92, p < .001; t = 6.29, p < .001, respectively). Consumers who had purchased more fair trade products felt in higher control of purchasing fair trade products in such circumstances as limited store availability, lack of information about fair trade, and product variability. In addition, consumers who had purchased more fair trade products had greater confidence in their ability to purchase fair trade products. Thus, hypotheses UF4 and UF5 were supported.

Hypothesis UF6 examined the effect of past fair trade purchase behaviors and intention to shop for fair trade products. The positive relationship between past behavior with fair trade purchases and intention to shop for fair trade products was statistically significant (t = 8.45, p < .000). Consumers who had purchased more fair trade products had greater willingness to shop for fair trade products. Hence, hypothesis UF6 was supported.

There were statistically significant paths which have not been hypothesized (see Table 5.2). Universalism values, past fair trade purchase behaviors, and mission beliefs were positively associated with subjective norms regarding fair trade purchases, respectively. Young consumers who had stronger desire for equal opportunities, protection of environmental resources, and social justice felt greater social pressure to purchase fair trade products. Likewise, consumers who had purchased more fair trade products felt greater
social pressure to do so. In addition, young consumers who had stronger beliefs on fair trade practices experienced greater social pressure to purchase fair trade products.

Normative beliefs for fair trade purchases were positively related with product and mission beliefs, perceived behavioral control, and intention to buy fair trade products. Consumers who had higher normative influence from their friends and family members regarding the purchase of fair trade products had positive beliefs about fair trade products and the fair trade mission. Young consumers also had greater confidence that they are able to buy fair trade products and accordingly were more willing to buy such products.

Product and mission beliefs were also associated with high perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products, suggesting that consumers who had more positive beliefs about fair trade products and fair trade practices were more confident in purchasing fair trade products. Similarly, mission beliefs had a positive influence on intention to buy fair trade products. Young consumers who had stronger beliefs on fair trade practices were more likely to purchase fair trade products. Control beliefs were positively related to favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases. This finding suggested that young consumers who felt greater control over purchasing fair trade products regardless of limited store availability, information about fair trade, and product variability, had a more positive attitude toward fair trade purchases.

**Alternative Model Testing**

When researchers’ initial models do not correspond well to the data, they should re-specify the model and assess the fit of the revised model to the same data (Kline, 2007). To develop an alternative model, cross-validation strategy was used. The cross-validation method involves randomly splitting a sample into two groups (Cudeck & Browne, 1983). The first half of the sample, as an exploration sample, is used to build a model through a series of testing and refining procedures. The resulting model is confirmed in the other half of the sample, as a validation sample, without further model modification. This strategy has been used to solve problems which may arise from sample dependent models (i.e., a model created based on sample-specific results) by combining exploring and validating analyses (Bollen, 1989).
Table 5.1. Standardized maximum-likelihood estimates (with t-ratios) of fully recursive model for young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>ATTI</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>Intention to Purchase Fair Trade Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universalism (UNI)</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Beliefs (NB)</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Behavior with Fair Trade Purchases (PBTTP)</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Beliefs (PB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beliefs (MB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs (CB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (ATTI)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms (SN)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t-ratios are in parentheses and significant effects were in bold font (t ≥ 2.00)
Table 5.2. Paths hypothesized non-zero and paths hypothesized equal to zero of model for young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Paths</th>
<th>Paths Hypothesized Non-Zero</th>
<th>Paths Hypothesized Equal to Zero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UF_{1-1}</td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Product beliefs</td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Control beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{1-2}</td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Mission beliefs</td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{2-1}</td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Product beliefs</td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Perceived behavioral control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{2-2}</td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Mission beliefs</td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{3}</td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Attitude</td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Control beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{4}</td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Control beliefs</td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{5}</td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td>Product beliefs $\rightarrow$ Subjective norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF_{7}</td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
<td>Product beliefs $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{2}</td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Subjective norms</td>
<td>Control beliefs $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{1-1}</td>
<td>Product beliefs $\rightarrow$ Attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{1-2}</td>
<td>Mission beliefs $\rightarrow$ Attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{3}</td>
<td>Control beliefs $\rightarrow$ Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{4}</td>
<td>Attitude $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{5}</td>
<td>Subjective norms $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-significant paths</th>
<th>UF_{6}</th>
<th>Perceived behavioral control $\rightarrow$ Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Universalism $\rightarrow$ Subjective norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Past behavior $\rightarrow$ Subjective norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Product beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Mission beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Perceived behavioral control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normative beliefs $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product beliefs $\rightarrow$ Perceived behavioral control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission beliefs $\rightarrow$ Subjective norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission beliefs $\rightarrow$ Perceived behavioral control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission beliefs $\rightarrow$ Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control beliefs $\rightarrow$ Attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, the sample data set was randomly split into two groups, consisting of 418 and 417 respondents, respectively. Using the exploration sample, the most parsimonious model was found through the model-trimming process (see Figure 5.3). The model-trimming process involves deletion of non-significant paths one by one from the fully recursive model until achieving a model that fits the data reasonably well (Kline, 2007). The results of AMOS analysis for the re-specified model revealed that overall fit indices were acceptable; a chi-square of 31.53 (df = 17, p = .02), GFI of .99, AGFI of .95, NFI of .98, CFI of .99, and RMSEA of .04. Table 5.3 presents standardized maximum-likelihood estimates of the re-specified model using the exploration sample. T-ratios and R-squared values are shown in Table 5.3.

When compared to the previous theoretical driven model (see Figure 5.1), the paths from mission beliefs to positive subjective norms, to high perceived behavioral control, and to intention associated with fair trade purchases were indicated. In addition, the paths from product beliefs to high perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products and from past behavior with fair trade purchases to positive subjective norms for fair trade purchases were added. However, the path between high perceived behavioral control and intention to purchase fair trade products was trimmed. These results indicated that consumers who had positive beliefs about fair trade products in terms of their ethnic and unique appearance, hand-crafted quality, and access to information about fair trade when they shop had greater confidence in their ability to purchase fair trade products. Consumers who had stronger beliefs about the fair trade mission such as creating a better world, alleviating poverty, paying a fair price, and ensuring a safe work environment for artisan producers had stronger social influence in purchasing fair trade products. They were also more confident that they can purchase fair trade products. In addition, consumers who had stronger beliefs about the fair trade mission were more willing to purchase fair trade products. This direct influence from mission beliefs to intention to buy fair trade products shows that consumers’ support for the fair trade mission in itself was important in shaping consumers’ plan to purchase products from fair trade businesses without considering positive attitudes and subjective norms for purchasing fair trade products. The study also found that
consumers who had previously purchased more fair trade products had more positive social pressure to buy fair trade products.

**Model Validation**

In the next step, the fit of the alternative model obtained from the exploration sample was re-examined in the validation sample. The overall fit indices for this model in the validation sample revealed a chi-square of $.5701$ (df $= 17$, p $= .00$), GFI of $.97$, AGFI of $.92$, NFI of $.96$, CFI of $.97$, and RMSEA of $.08$. All paths in the model for the exploration sample were almost identical to those for the validation sample, with one exception of the path from mission beliefs to high perceived behavioral control. Results of the validation sample confirmed the effects of mission beliefs on positive subjective norms and intention to buy fair trade products. The influences of past fair trade purchase behavior on positive subjective norms for fair trade purchases and of product beliefs on high perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products were also validated. However, the path from mission beliefs to high perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products was not confirmed.

**Testing for Multi-group Invariance**

Results of AMOS analysis for the alternative model in the exploration sample were next compared to those in the validation sample using the multi-group comparison technique. A multiple-sample path analysis was conducted to identify potential differences in path estimates of the alternative model across the groups. A multi-group comparison technique consists of three steps: a) estimating the model across each group simultaneously (unconstrained model), b) estimating the model across each group, constraining the path coefficients to be equal (constrained model), and c) comparing the model fit of the constrained model to that of the unconstrained model. In order to test the invariance of the model fit to the groups, differences in chi-square statistics ($\Delta \chi^2$) in changing degrees of freedom between the constrained and unconstrained models were identified. Observed significant difference in $\Delta \chi^2$ indicates variance across the groups, which means that the model fits the validation sample significantly worse than does the exploration sample. Likewise, insignificant difference in $\Delta \chi^2$ indicates invariance across the groups, meaning that the model does not fit the validation sample significantly worse than does the exploration
sample (Byrne, 2004; Kline, 2007). Multi-group comparison fit indices of the suggested model are reported in Table 5.5.

First, the suggested model was estimated across the exploration sample and the validation sample at the same time and without a constraint. Path coefficients of the model were freely estimated across both samples. The results of AMOS analysis for the unconstrained model revealed a chi-square of 88.54 (df = 34). The overall chi-square value and degree of freedom obtained from the multi-group analysis are, respectively, equal to the sum of the chi-square statistics and degrees of freedom generated when the model is tested separately for each group of the sample (Byrne, 2004). The chi-square of 88.54 (df = 34) for the unconstrained model was the sum of the two models’ chi-square values: the model in the exploration sample and in the validation sample ($\chi^2 = 31.53$, df = 17; $\chi^2 = 57.01$, df = 17, respectively). The chi-square value with degree of freedom provides the baseline value that is to be compared to that of the subsequent test for examining the invariance between the two samples (Byrne, 2004).

Second, the alternative model was re-estimated across each sample by constraining path coefficients to be equal. The chi-square value increased to 116.87 (df = 53), which is a change in chi-square of 28.33 with a change in 19 degrees of freedom when compared to those for the unconstrained model ($\chi^2 = 88.54$, df = 34). The differences in chi-square values and degrees of freedom were found to be not significant between the models ($\Delta \chi^2 = 28.33$, $\Delta$df = 19; p = .077). This means that the alternative model was valid for both exploration and validation samples. In other words, the results from the multi-group analysis indicated that the alternative model is invariant between both samples. Therefore, it is concluded that the model is cross-validated.
Figure 5.3. Analysis of alternative model using the exploration sample
Note: t-ratios are in parentheses (t ≥ 2.00); single headed arrows ( -> ) indicate significant a priori paths; oval arrows ( --- ) indicate significant non-a priori paths; double dotted arrow ( - - ) indicates insignificant a priori path; the residuals from product beliefs are correlated 0.60 with the residuals from mission beliefs and 0.08 with control beliefs, and the residuals from mission beliefs and control beliefs are correlated -0.03; the residuals from attitude are correlated 0.31 with the residuals from subjective norms and 0.33 with perceived behavioral control, and the residuals from subjective norms and behavioral control are correlated .35.
Figure 5.4. Analysis of alternative model using the validation sample

Note: t-ratios are in parentheses (t ≥ 2.00); single headed arrows (→) indicate significant a priori paths; oval arrows (○→) indicate significant non-a priori paths; double dotted arrow (←→) indicates insignificant a priori path; the residuals from product beliefs are correlated 0.50 with the residuals from mission beliefs and 0.14 with control beliefs, and the residuals from mission beliefs and control beliefs are correlated -0.09; the residuals from attitude are correlated 0.25 with the residuals from subjective norms and 0.24 with perceived behavioral control, and the residuals from subjective norms and behavioral control are correlated .24.
Table 5.3. Standardized maximum-likelihood estimates (with t-ratios) of alternative model using the exploration sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>ATTI</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>Intention to Purchase Fair Trade Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universalism (UNI)</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.54)*</td>
<td>(6.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Beliefs (NB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Behavior with Fair Trade Purchases (PBTTP)</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.38)</td>
<td>(5.75)</td>
<td>(7.44)</td>
<td>(8.35)</td>
<td>(9.88)</td>
<td>(4.69)</td>
<td>(5.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Beliefs (PB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beliefs (MB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs (CB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (ATTI)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms (SN)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* t-ratios are in parentheses and significant effects were in bold font (t ≥ 2.00)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>ATTI</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>PBC</th>
<th>Intention to Purchase Fair Trade Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universalism (UNI)</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Beliefs (NB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Behavior with Fair Trade Purchases (PBTTP)</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Beliefs (PB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beliefs (MB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs (CB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (ATTI)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms (SN)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a t-ratios are in parentheses and significant effects were in bold font (t ≥ 2.00)
Table 5.5. Chi-square difference statistic for each model tested for multi-group comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained</td>
<td>88.535</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained (All paths to be equal)</td>
<td>116.869</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in values between the models</td>
<td>$\Delta\chi^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta$df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.334</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes the research and discusses its results. Based on the findings, conclusions, implications, and limitations of the present study are presented. Recommendations for future research are also delineated.

Summary of Research

Expanding global markets and manufacturing systems have made the issue of fair exchange between producers and retailers more important. Small scale producers and workers struggle with their weak trading position in both local and world economies (Barratt Brown, 1993). Fair trade promotes sustainable business relationships with artisan producers and farmers in developing countries in order to achieve greater equity in global trade (Krier, 2006). Fair trade movements encourage organizations and individual groups to provide a fair wage, improve working conditions, and build fair and respectful business partnerships with small scale producers and farmers (IFAT Standards Working Group, 2002; Littrell & Dickson, 1999).

Fair trade consumption has been rising steadily around the world (Fair Trade Federation, 2005; Krier, 2006), and the ethical business practices of manufacturers and retailers appear to be critical in consumer purchase decisions (Shaw & Shiu, 2003; Tallontire, Rentsendorj, & Blowfield, 2001). An increasing number of college-aged consumers show a growing interest in fair trade. A study on college students’ fair trade awareness revealed that almost 75% of the respondents had learned about fair trade (Suchomel, 2005). Furthermore, more than half of the respondents (57%) were willing to purchase fair trade products, while forty percent of the respondents did not know of places where fair trade items could be purchased. Understanding these young consumers’ attitudes and buying behavior related to socially responsible businesses is critical for FTOs in order to develop relevant marketing strategies. However, there has been limited research examining the underlying factors related to young consumers’ decisions to make purchases from socially responsible businesses.

The purpose of this study was to understand influences on young consumers’ purchase behaviors related to fair trade non-food products. Based on the theory of planned
behavior (Ajzen, 1991), causal relationships among personal values, previous fair trade purchase experiences, attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and purchase intentions associated with fair trade products were developed and tested. Specific objectives were: a) to identify variables that affect college-aged consumers’ purchase of fair trade products, b) to propose and operationalize a model integrating research variables, and c) to test and evaluate the operational model empirically.

Older echo boomer consumers between the ages of 18 and 28 were invited to participate in this study. Data were collected via Web-based surveys from a random sample of female college students at a Midwestern university. Of 9,593 female older echo boomer students invited through e-mail to participate in the Web-based survey, 1,048 responses were returned for an overall response rate of 11%. Eight hundred and thirty-five complete surveys were used for the statistical analysis.

Two phases of data analysis were conducted: preliminary analysis and model testing. Preliminary analysis of research data consisted of descriptive analysis, principal components analysis, internal reliability assessment of research variables using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, and correlation analysis. Model testing was conducted through two steps: existing model testing and alternative model testing. Model testing was performed through maximum-likelihood estimation procedures using AMOS 7.0. In the first step, hypotheses were tested based on the results for the fully recursive model. The second step included re-specification and validation of an alternative model using the cross-validation technique. Multi-group invariance was tested for the alternative model using multi-sample path analysis.

Summary of Results

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive Analysis

The majority of respondents (88.4%) were white or European American, single (91.0%), and between 18 and 23 years old (85.0%). A large majority of the participants were undergraduate students (81.3%). Half of the respondents (50.0%) reported family household incomes up to $50,000. Over one-third (38.3%) annually spend $250 to $749 on non-food items, while 13.4% spend over $2,000 on non-food items. The vast majority of the
respondents (74.0%) had heard of the term “fair trade”. Older echo boomer respondents learned about fair trade through a variety of informational sources, with about forty percent of the respondents (38.3%) having seen the term “fair trade” in a newspaper or magazine article, heard it from word of mouth from a friend (33.7%), or learned about it while shopping in a fair trade retail store (31.6%). These findings are, to some extent, consistent with the results of a study based on how general fair trade consumers learned about fair trade. According to previous fair trade market research (Littrell et al., 2004), general fair trade consumers also heard about fair trade from word of mouth through a friend (36.0%) or when they shopped in a fair trade retail store (28.5%).

Forty-three percent of the respondents had visited a fair trade retail store during the past two years, while about 18% had browsed Internet shopping sites for fair trade products. Although about three fourths of the older echo boomer respondents (74.0%) had heard of fair trade, only 39.2% of those surveyed had actually made purchases for fair trade non-food products. The most commonly purchased type of fair trade non-food products was jewelry (22.9%). In general, the older echo boomer respondents purchased fair trade products as gifts (23.6%) and for everyday use (22.0%).

**Factor Analysis**

To identify the dimensionality of research variables, principal components analysis with varimax rotation was conducted for multi-item research variables: beliefs about purchasing fair trade products; normative and control beliefs associated with fair trade purchases; attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases; and personal values. Two other research variables, past behavior related to fair trade purchases and intention to buy fair trade products, were excluded for factor analysis because they were measured with a single item and two items, respectively.

Beliefs about fair trade purchases had two dimensions: product beliefs and mission beliefs. Product beliefs represent consumers’ beliefs about fair trade products regarding ethnic appearance, hand-craftedness, a unique and authentic style, and information about fair trade provided by sales representatives or brochures at stores. Mission beliefs reflected consumers’ integrated beliefs about creating a better world, as well as providing a safe and clean work environment for artisan producers, poverty relief, and a fair price associated with
the purchase of fair trade products. Principal components analysis revealed that the other research variables had a single dimension. The internal consistency of multiple indicators was examined using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, which were acceptable for all of the research variables ($\alpha = .60$ to $.92$).

**Model Testing**

**Existing Model Testing**

The research variables included in the analysis of the operational model were: universalism values; normative beliefs for fair trade purchases; past behavior related to fair trade purchases; product beliefs, mission beliefs, and control beliefs related to fair trade purchases; attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases; and intention to buy fair trade products. Except for past behavior related to fair trade purchases, which was measured by a single item, the mean scores for all of the research variables were created and used for path analysis.

The operational model was analyzed with a maximum-likelihood estimation procedure using AMOS 7.0. To assess overall model fit to the data, the chi-square statistics, goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normative fit index (NFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were examined. The model fit indices indicated that the operational model did not fit the data well, although the results of the AMOS for the model revealed all of the hypothesized paths except for one, the path from high perceived behavioral control to the intention to buy fair trade products, to be statistically significant ($p < .001$).

The results of AMOS analysis for the fully recursive model were analyzed to test the hypotheses. All of the hypothesized paths were as expected and statistically significant, except for Hypothesis $T_6$. Hypotheses $T_{1-1}, T_{1-2}, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5, \text{ and } T_6$ focused on testing relationships among the research variables as postulated in the theory of planned behavior in the context of older echo boomers’ fair trade purchases. The research variables included in the testing of the hypotheses were: product beliefs, mission beliefs, normative beliefs, control beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and purchase intentions associated with fair trade products. As expected, the favorable attitudes toward the purchase of fair trade products were predicted by more positive behavioral beliefs, including product
beliefs (Hypothesis T1-1) and mission beliefs (Hypothesis T1-2). Normative beliefs related to fair trade purchases had a significant positive effect on the subjective norms for doing so (Hypothesis T2). In addition, consumers’ positive control beliefs over fair trade purchases were significantly associated with their high perceived behavioral control for purchasing fair trade products (Hypothesis T3). It was also found that the favorable attitudes toward fair trade purchases and positive subjective norms for fair trade products had significantly positive impacts on the intention to buy fair trade products (Hypotheses T4 and T5, respectively). However, there was a marginal influence of high perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases on the intention to buy fair trade products (Hypothesis T6). Overall, these findings are concordant with the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), with the exception of the weak relationship between high perceived behavioral control over fair trade purchases and the intention to buy fair trade products.

Hypotheses UF1-1, UF1-2, UF2-1, UF2-2, UF3, UF4, UF5, and UF6 explored the influences of universalism values and past behavior related to fair trade purchases on the formation of beliefs, favorable attitudes, and intentions regarding the purchase of fair trade products. All of the proposed hypotheses were statistically supported, which suggests that consumers who placed higher importance on equal opportunities, the protection of environmental resources, and social justice had more positive beliefs about fair trade products and its related business practices (Hypotheses UF1-1 and UF1-2, respectively). In addition, consumers who had purchased more fair trade products were more likely to have positive beliefs about fair trade products and mission (Hypotheses UF2-1 and UF2-2, respectively). Consumers with more fair trade purchases in the past had more positive control beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases (Hypotheses UF3, UF4, and UF5, respectively). Furthermore, consumers who purchased more fair trade products in the past were more willing to purchase fair trade products (UF6).

**Alternative Model Testing**

The operational model did not fit the data well, so an alternative model was developed and validated using cross-validation techniques. A cross-validation strategy has been used to solve problems which may arise from models created based on a sample’s
specific results (Bollen, 1989). As a first step, the data were randomly split into two groups: an exploration sample (n = 418) and a validation sample (n = 417). The first group, the exploration sample, was used to build a model through a series of testing and refining procedures. The resulting model was then validated with another half, the validation sample, without further model modification.

Using the exploration sample, the most parsimonious model was found in terms of deleting non-significant paths one by one from the fully recursive model. The re-specified model provided acceptable overall fit indices: a chi-square of 31.53 (df = 17, p = .02), GFI of .99, AGFI of .95, NFI of .98, CFI of .99, and RMSEA of .04. In this model, there were significant effects of past behavior related to fair trade purchases, product beliefs, and mission beliefs on the formation of positive subjective norms, high perceived behavioral control, and the intention to buy fair trade products, which had not been originally hypothesized. Consumers’ previous fair trade shopping experiences were positively associated with subjective norms related to the purchase of fair trade products. Product beliefs had a positive effect on perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases. In addition, mission beliefs were positively related to subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and the intention to buy fair trade products.

The fit of the alternative model was confirmed in the validation sample. The overall fit indices for this model in the validation sample were acceptable, with a chi-square of 57.01 (df = 17, p = .00), NC of 3.35, GFI of .97, AGFI of .92, NFI of .96, CFI of .97, and RMSEA of .08. All of the paths in the model were confirmed in the validation sample, as they were for the exploration sample, with one exception: the path between mission beliefs and high perceived behavioral control over purchasing fair trade products was not statistically significant.

A multi-group comparison technique was utilized to identify potential differences in the path estimates of the alternative model across the exploration and validation samples. First, the model was estimated across both samples at the same time and without a constraint, which allowed free estimation of path coefficients in the model across two samples (unconstrained model). The results of AMOS analysis for the unconstrained model revealed a chi-square of 88.54 (df = 34). Second, the model was re-estimated across each sample by
constraining the path estimates to be equal (constrained model). The chi-square value for the constrained model was 116.87 (df = 53). Finally, to identify invariance, the model fit of the constrained model was compared to that of the unconstrained model in terms of the chi-square difference statistic ($\Delta\chi^2$) in changing degrees of freedom (Byrne, 2004; Kline, 2007). The differences in the chi-square values and degrees of freedom were not significant between the unconstrained and constrained models ($\Delta\chi^2 = 28.33, \Delta df = 19; p = .077$). This finding revealed that the alternative model does not fit the validation sample significantly worse than does the exploration sample.

**Conclusions**

This study was the first attempt to examine the interrelationships among personal values, past purchase behavior, beliefs, attitudes, and shopping intentions of older echo boomer consumers regarding fair trade non-food products based on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). The primary goal of the present study, to examine the influences on young consumers’ fair trade purchases for non-food products, revealed that young consumers’ personal values (universalism), past purchase behavior related to fair trade products, beliefs about products and the business mission, and social pressures to buy fair trade products were all important factors in predicting consumers’ willingness to purchase a fair trade non-food product.

The overall findings confirmed the elements of the theory of planned behavior. As proposed in the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), attitudes toward fair trade purchases and subjective norms were important predictors of behavioral intentions related to older echo boomers’ fair trade consumptions. Young consumers’ favorable attitudes toward non-food fair trade purchases directly influenced their future intention to buy such products. Positive social pressure which young consumers experienced regarding non-food fair trade purchases also led to greater willingness to buy non-food products from fair trade businesses. These findings are supported by Sparks and Shepherd’s study of green consumerism (1992). Consumers’ intention to buy organic vegetables was significantly influenced by the favorable attitudes consumers and positive subjective norms consumers held related to their green consumerism.
However, there was a weak relationship between perceived behavioral control and the intention to purchase fair trade non-food products. This finding indicates that purchasing fair trade non-food products may be largely under volitional control. A number of studies have argued that when volitional control over a particular behavior is greater, the perceived behavioral control is less important in predicting that behavior (Hrubes, Ajzen, & Daigle, 2001; Madden, Ellen, & Ajzen, 1992). Therefore, it may be concluded that circumstances such as limited fair trade store availability, lack of variability in the products of a fair trade store, and limited information provided about fair trade were not major concerns for older echo boomer consumers in regards to being reluctant to purchase fair trade products.

In addition, belief structures, such as behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs, were found to be significant determinants of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases for non-food products. In accordance with the theory of planned behavior, favorable attitudes toward shopping for fair trade non-food products were directly influenced by behavioral beliefs, positive subjective norms by normative beliefs, and perception of behavioral control by control beliefs in the context of older echo boomers’ fair trade consumptions. These joint empirical findings support the ability of the theory of planned behavior as a useful framework for research of explaining and predicting older echo boomer consumers’ fair trade consumptions.

Consumers’ previous experiences of shopping for fair trade non-food products were critical determinants of the formation of beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions related to fair trade purchases. The frequency with which a consumer had previously purchased a fair trade product was an important factor in determining favorable attitudes toward the purchase of fair trade products, as well as positive subjective norms and perceived behavioral control over that behavior. Furthermore, consumers’ previous shopping experiences were found to directly affect their positive willingness to buy fair trade products. Consistent with other studies testing an increase of predictive power in the theory of planned behavior (e.g., Ajzen, 2001; Bentler & Speckart, 1979; d’Astous, Colbert, & Montpetit, 2005; Ouellette & Wood, 1998), these findings provide evidence that the inclusion of past conduct in the theory of planned behavior helps account for variance in explaining and predicting the intention to buy fair trade non-food products.
Consumers’ beliefs about the fair trade business mission were found to be important predictors of favorable attitudes, positive subjective norms, high perceived behavioral control, and the intention to buy fair trade products. This is consistent with a previous empirical study by Ma and Littrell (2005), which suggested that consumers who place more importance on fair trade practices would be more inclined to purchase products from fair trade businesses. This is, to some degree, different from the effects of product beliefs emphasizing fair trade product attributes, such as ethnic appearance, hand-craftedness, and a unique and authentic style, on future intentions to buy fair trade products. Product beliefs appeared to have an indirect influence on purchase intentions mediated by favorable attitudes toward fair trade products. Consumers who had more positive product beliefs were more likely to have favorable attitudes toward purchasing products from fair trade businesses, which in turn shaped their intention to buy fair trade products. However, consumers’ strong beliefs about the fair trade mission in themselves influenced their willingness to buy fair trade products. These findings suggest that fair trade businesses should place more emphasis on providing information about the fair trade mission to appeal to older echo boomer consumers.

Results of this study confirmed earlier findings that suggest societally-centered personal values have an important influence on consumers’ purchase intentions for fair trade products (Dickson & Littrell, 1996). As expected, young consumers’ concerns about equal opportunities, protection of environment resources, and social justice impacted their positive beliefs about fair trade products and the fair trade mission, which in turn indirectly affected greater willingness to buy fair trade non-food products through positive attitudes and subjective norms regarding that behavior. The social and environmental concerns of consumers are expressed in many ways such as participation in recycling, using organic products, donation to the Third world, and green campaigns. As found in this study, young consumer respondents had strong social and environmental concerns and they showed positive beliefs and attitudes toward fair trade. These combined findings show strong potential for expanding the fair trade market to this specific young consumer segment. Young consumers’ rising awareness of and interest in the fair trade movement (Suchomel, 2005) provide rich evidence of market opportunities, thus fair trade producers and retailers
need to make efforts to attract this consumer cohort and to provide desired by this consumer group.

**Implications**

The present research provided valuable insights into fair trade businesses and also provided contributions to academic literature. Several important merchandising and marketing implications emerged from this study for fair trade retailers targeting older echo boomer consumers. First, older echo boomer consumers were found to be most likely to purchase fair trade products in those categories such as jewelry, apparel accessories, and home decoration items. They also had strong expectations about fair trade products having an ethnic appearance, and being unique and authentic. Therefore, it is recommended that fair trade retailers emphasize the distinctive and genuine features of hand-crafted fair trade products, particularly in such product categories as jewelry, apparel accessories, and home decoration items, to appeal to older echo boomer consumers, which may increase their competitiveness in the market against mainstream businesses. For example, casting college aged models in fair trade catalogs or on websites may be helpful to feature young images of consumers of fair trade products.

Second, consumers’ past shopping experiences for fair trade products were a critical determinant in the formation of positive beliefs, attitudes, and the intention to purchase fair trade products. Once consumers were introduced to fair trade products, they seemed to be more likely to have positive beliefs and favorable attitudes toward the purchase of fair trade products and, moreover, exhibited a greater willingness to repeat their purchases for such products. Thus, fair trade retailers aimed at older echo boomer consumers need to make efforts to attract this age cohort and enhance their adoption of fair trade products. For example, distributing coupons or gift certificates through school newspapers may be one possible marketing strategy to draw these young consumers to fair trade stores. However, despite finding that previous purchases are a good predictor of future purchasing, it should be noted that a limited number of older echo boomer respondents actually purchased a fair trade non-food product. Taking into consideration that the vast majority of respondents were aware of fair trade and had favorable attitudes toward purchasing fair trade products, fair trade businesses need to strive for tapping a younger consumer cohort. A possible strategy to
get more young consumers into fair trade stores or on websites could be incorporating
information about the fair trade movement into classes since many young consumer
respondents in this study had heard of fair trade through classes or programs at school. For
example, visiting a fair trade retail store with students as a field trip or class assignment
could give young consumers an opportunity not only to learn about fair trade but also to take
a look at fair trade products. Another example could be encouraging student consumers to
participate in volunteer work at fair trade stores since similar aged sales associates may be
more appealing to younger consumers. As Krier (2006) addressed in a study of European
fair trade, expanding fair trade markets to younger consumers is deemed the only way for fair
trade businesses to survive and further develop what they have been gained so far. This will
be a big challenge for fair trade businesses to overcome.

Another empirical finding from this study leads to interesting suggestions for
attracting these younger consumers. Considering the importance of mission beliefs on the
formation of favorable attitudes and the intention to purchase fair trade products, fair trade
retailers should focus on advertisements of the fair trade principles and a larger mission for
older echo boomer consumers. For example, supporting fair trade campaigns on campus or
promoting programs or events, especially those focused on college-aged students, may be
useful to bring their attention to fair trade and increase awareness of sustainable fair trade
practices. These consumer involved campaigns or events can give more opportunities for the
older echo boomer consumers to experience fair trade products.

Fair trade research concerning commodities such as organic coffee has been
carried out mainly from producers’ or international business perspectives such as benefits of
fair trade participation to producers, producer organizations, and communities (e.g., Hopkins,
2000); fair trade commodity networks (e.g., Raynolds, 2002); and characteristics of exporters
and producers (e.g., Mutersbaugh, 2002). These fair trade commodity studies have addressed
the supply side rather than the demand side of fair trade. In contrast, the results of this study
reflect the demand side perspective of fair trade non-food products for young consumers. A
major thrust of this study was to examine young consumers’ beliefs, attitudes, and purchase
intentions in the context of shopping for fair trade non-food products. As shown in Table
4.13, the older echo boomer respondents had positive beliefs about fair trade products and
attributed some importance to the fair trade mission, but less than fair trade consumers of food and non-food products in the other generational cohorts (Littrell et al., 2005). Overall, they had favorable attitudes, some social pressure, and moderate level of perceived behavioral control related to fair trade purchases. As for purchase intention, the older echo boomer respondents were more likely than not to buy fair trade non-food products within the next six months. These findings on the consumer side will help fair trade retailers and producers to identify a set of marketing and merchandising strategies that may encourage older echo boomer consumers’ fair trade purchases. As discussed earlier in this section, possible strategies may include incorporating information about the fair trade movement into the classroom, casting college aged models in fair trade catalogs or on websites, and employing school newspaper to distributing coupons or gift certificates.

Although this study focused on providing important demand side insight for a previously unaddressed fair trade consumer segment (i.e., younger consumer group), the results of this study may also provide artisan producers and workers with a greatly expanded opportunity to market their products. Total sales for the fair trade industry show continuous growth (Fair Trade Federation, 2005), but fair trade markets are still very small (Tallontire et al., 2001). Considering a way to increase artisan producers’ participation in the fair trade movement, it is necessary to explore new fair trade markets. Based on the young consumers’ knowledge of fair trade and favorable attitudes toward purchasing fair trade products found in this study, there is considerable potential for expanding the existing fair trade markets by including these young consumers. Furthermore, the fact that there is a growing market for fair trade products may ensure that small scale producers and workers can be offered a sustainable trade relationship with fair trade organizations. To gain a complete understanding of young consumers’ fair trade consumption and to develop efficient business strategies particularly for artisan producers and workers, a follow-up study could examine young consumers’ preference for and satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with fair trade products.

This study has also made significant contributions to the academic literature. The present study indicated significant roles of universalism values and previous purchase behaviors within the structure of the theory of planned behavior. Relationships between
universalism values and behavioral beliefs regarding older echo boomers’ fair trade consumptions were found to be strongly supported. Their universalism values, in turn, indirectly influenced attitudes and future purchase intentions. This supports the previous literature (Shaw et al., 2005) that highlighted the importance of universalism values within the context of ethical consumerism. Moreover, consumers’ previous shopping behaviors were important in predicting older echo boomer consumers’ fair trade purchases, both directly and indirectly through positive beliefs about and attitudes toward fair trade purchases. This finding also confirms prior research that found consumers’ past behaviors to add predictive power of the theory of planned behavior model in understanding the subsequent behavior (e.g., Bentler & Speckart, 1979; d’Astous, Colbert, & Montpetit, 2005). These valuable empirical results provide evidence that the inclusion of universalism values and past purchase behaviors offers the improvement in understanding and predicting older echo boomer consumers’ fair trade purchases.

A further significant contribution of this study is the path model predicting fair trade purchases, which was built and validated using the cross-validation technique and multi-group path analysis approach. The cross-validation method helped avoid sample dependent models by replicating the results for the suggested model in an independent sample. The multi-group path analysis confirmed invariance of path estimates across two independent samples: the exploration and validation samples. These joint approaches clearly indicated that the suggested model fit the data well and better explained the interrelationships among personal values, past purchase behavior, beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions related to fair trade purchases. It is expected that the empirically tested model will contribute to the limited literature in fair trade consumption by providing a theoretical understanding of the purchase of fair trade products for younger consumers.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. This study was based on a sample of older female echo boomers who were enrolled in a large Midwestern university. Although a random sampling approach was employed to collect the data, the generalizability of the findings to the U.S. population may be limited. Since the data were collected from a small to medium size community with a fair
trade store in contrast to larger urban areas, the salience of fair trade for these student respondents may be greater than if the study was conducted where the community surrounding the university is much larger. Furthermore, because the accessibility to fair trade businesses and the variability of fair trade products in a store may vary by region, the findings may differ when conducting the study in other geographic areas. Additionally, the product category used in the present study was fair trade non-food items such as housewares, apparel, accessories, and holiday items. Therefore, the generalizability of the findings to fair trade food products may be limited.

Another limitation of this study is that the measures of behavioral beliefs—product beliefs and mission beliefs—did not employ a weighting method as suggested in the theory of planned behavior. For the present study, behavioral belief strength was solely used to see their influence on attitudes toward fair trade purchases, rather than using weighted scores obtained from belief strength multiplied by outcome evaluations. As Lee (2002) discussed in her research, there was limited variability in responses to outcome evaluations, which consequently did not have much affect on the formation of attitudes toward a behavior. Thus, the unweighted method for behavioral beliefs may limit the application of the results to the theory of planned behavior.

The direct measures of subjective norms and perceived behavioral control for fair trade purchases had Cronbach’s alpha coefficients below .70, which indicates lower reliability in the measures. In addition, two weighted measures in the model—normative beliefs and control beliefs for fair trade purchases—had marginal Cronbach’s alpha coefficients below .70. Although Ajzen (2002) has argued that internal consistency may not reasonably be applied to the belief-based measures of the theory’s constructs because consumers may have ambivalent beliefs about a behavior, further refinements are necessary to improve these scales.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Based on findings of this study, several recommendations for future research are suggested. First, this study primarily focused on the prediction of fair trade purchases of female older echo boomer consumers. Future research could be conducted based on more diverse consumers, including other generational cohorts and both males and females, in order
to increase generalizability of the findings and to identify other underlying factors and their influences on the interrelationships among beliefs, attitudes, and purchase intentions.

In addition, future researchers may be interested in exploring the effects of personal values in more detail to predict purchase intentions in the context of fair trade purchases. The operational model in this study centered on a single personal value—universalism—as one of the underlying factors due to a relatively large number of variables. There are other personal values which may affect consumers’ purchase behaviors for fair trade products. Shaw and his colleagues (2002) disclosed that for example, self-direction values pursuing independent thought and action, hedonism values seeking pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself, and security values pursuing safety, harmony, and stability of society or relationships influenced consumers’ purchase decisions for grocery shopping. This recommendation is supported by Shaw et al.’s another work (2005) concerning ethical consumer decision making, in which the nature and pertinence of personal values important in ethical consumption were explored. Therefore, an investigation of comprehensive personal values may improve predictive models in the theory of planned behavior in the context of fair trade shopping.

The relationships among personal values, past purchase behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes related to fair trade purchases were examined in the present study in order to predict behavioral intentions to buy fair trade products. However, there may be a gap between behavioral intentions and actual behavior. Therefore, future research could extend its scope to examine subsequent actions, and it may be interesting to investigate the mediating effects of attitudes and behavioral intentions associated with the purchase of fair trade products to predict actual subsequent purchase behaviors. This recommendation is supported by Tallontire et al.’s (2001) work and Hurtado’s (1998) work concerning a disparity between increased awareness and ethical purchase behavior (e.g., fair trade purchases), which have posited that some people are more likely to respond to ethical surveys according to acceptable norms rather than their actual behavior. In particular, information concerning differences in what young consumers say they do and what they actually do related to fair trade purchases can be a valuable tool for fair trade businesses in development of effective strategies for young consumers.
This study proposed an alternative model which was re-specified and validated using the cross-validation technique. The alternative model included relationships outside of the theory of planned behavior such as from behavioral beliefs to subjective norms, to perceived behavioral control, and to behavioral intention. Although the alternative model was not only developed but also validated using sample set, future researchers may be interested in testing the alternative model with a different sample to determine the generalizability of the model.

Future extension of this study may require further scale refinement for items measuring beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control in regard to fair trade purchases for non-food products, where significant relationships were found outside of the theoretical model. Since this study was conducted in the specific shopping context of older echo boomer consumers’ non-food fair trade purchases, the existing scales were adapted to the particular context and some measurement scales were developed based on the focus group studies and relevant literature. Based on the empirical testing of the measurement scales in this study, a future study should be conducted to refine the scales to develop more reliable scales which can be applied to a broader range of fair trade studies.

Finally, this study was conducted to profile young consumers in their fair trade consumption by understanding their beliefs, attitudes, and future intention to buy fair trade non-food products. Next steps of research may include further examination of young consumers’ preferences for fair trade products. It will be important to expand into research that explores young consumers’ needs from fair trade products and their evaluation criteria when they shop for non-food products either from fair trade businesses or mainstream businesses. In-depth analysis of the young consumer market will provide insightful information for fair trade artisan producers as well as fair trade retailers.
APPENDIX A: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTION PROTOCOL
Good afternoon and welcome to our session today. Thank you for taking the time to join our discussion of consumers of fairly traded products. My name is Yoon Jin Ma and I am a doctoral candidate in the program of Textiles and Clothing here at Iowa State University. Assisting me to facilitate discussions is Dr. Linda Niehm who is a faculty member in Textiles and Clothing. We are attempting to gain information about the variety of reasons people, especially who are in the age range between 18 and 35 years old, buy products from fair trade businesses.

You were selected because you are current fair trade customers and have purchased fairly traded products within the last year or so. We are particularly interested in your views because of your experience with purchasing products from fair trade businesses.

Today, we will discuss your shopping experience of lifestyle products. By lifestyle products, we are talking about functional and/or decorative products including home furnishings (e.g., picture frames, candle holders, pillow, wall art, box, etc.), tabletop (tableware, placemats, linens, etc.), baskets, apparel, accessories, holiday items, and so on. We are particularly interested in the type of ethnic appearing products which are imported from the developing countries. We will discuss your impression of the fairly trade lifestyle products, of a fair trade business’s catalog, and of the website of the fair trade business.

There are no right and wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Please feel free to share your opinion even if it is different from what other participants have said. You should feel free to refrain from discussing any topics about which you feel uncomfortable.

Before we begin let me remind you of some of the ground rules in the discussion. This is strictly a research project. No sales or solicitations will be made. Please speak up but only one person should talk at a time. We are tape recording the session because we don’t want to miss any of your comments.

We will be on a first name basis today, but in our reports there will not be any names attached to the comments. You can be assured of complete confidentiality. We would like you to keep our discussion confidential as well as so that comments taken out of the context of the group are not misunderstood by others. Keep in mind that we are just as interested in negative comments as positive ones.

The session will last about one and a half hour. Let’s begin. There are name tags on the table in front of you to help us remember each other’s names. Let’s find out more about each other by going around the table one at a time.
**Fair Trade**

Let’s start by discussing your understanding of “FAIR TRADE”. When you hear the word “fair trade”, what ideas come to your mind? What do the words mean to you?

How did you first visit fair trade businesses such as Worldly Goods?

**Purchase experience**

Think back to the most recent lifestyle products (i.e., functional and/or decorative products such as housewares, apparel, accessories, holiday items, etc.) purchase you made from fair trade organizations. What were some reasons for purchasing the item? What made you like the item? Did you have any concerns or hesitations about buying the item?

Tell me about your impressions of (lifestyle) products from fair trade stores and a fair trade store itself

What reasons do you feel people would have for buying these items or not buying these items? What makes you like or dislike the items?

**In-store Education**

Tell me about your impressions of information on Artisan producers offered by fair trade organization. Was the information helpful to make decision in purchasing a product from fair trade businesses? Did you read the information when you shop in the store or on the web site?

**Internet website/catalog**

Have you ever visited the Internet websites of fair trade businesses (e.g., Ten Thousand Villages, A Greater Gift, MarketPlace: Handwork from India, etc.)?

If yes, how often do you visit the Internet websites of fair trade businesses? What did you purchase from the website?

Review a fair trade organization’s web site and a catalog. What are your impressions of the organization based on these media?

What do you think of this type of organization and what they are trying to accomplish?

As a potential customer, what do you find about the website and/or catalog that is appealing or unappealing?

What would be the major motivating factors that would encourage you to purchase a fair trade product?

Do you have any additional thoughts or feelings you would have to share regarding fair trade products, selling at retail, where serviced from or other?
Closing statement

The purpose for our meeting was to discuss a wide range of reasons young customers buy lifestyle products from fair trade businesses. Do you have any additional thoughts or feel we have missed anything in our discussion?

Thank you so much for your participation in this focus group study. Your options have been more helpful.
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APPENDIX C: E-MAIL INVITATION LETTER
TITLE: A Few Questions about Fair Trade

Dear Student Consumer,

We are asking for a few minutes of your time to complete a brief survey about your views and attitudes about fair trade. If you help out with our study, you will have a chance to win one of ten gift cards to a local business.

This study is being conducted by the Textiles and Clothing Program at Iowa State University. We really want to know what you think about fair trade and its products whether or not you have purchased fair trade products. You are invited to participate in this research study, because the information you provide will be very valuable for fair trade retailers and artisan producers to understand their young consumers and reach them with better products and services.

We would greatly appreciate you taking approximately 10 minutes of your time to fill out this survey. All responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential. All identifying information that you provide for a gift certificate will be stored separately from your response and removed immediately after the drawing. There is no penalty or loss to you for not completing the survey or if you begin the survey but wish to withdraw and discontinue.

Thank you so much for your help in this important undertaking.

Please click this link (____________) to take the survey.

If you have any question about this study, please feel free to contact Yoon Jin Ma (yoonjin@iastate.edu; yjma@ilstu.edu), Dr. Linda Niehlm (niehlm@iastate.edu), or Dr. Mary Littrell (mlittrel@cahs.colostate.edu) by e-mail.

Sincerely,

Yoon Jin Ma
Doctoral Candidate
Textiles & Clothing
Iowa State University
yoonjin@iastate.edu

Linda Niehlm, PhD.
Textiles & Clothing
Iowa State University
niehlm@iastate.edu

Mary Littrell, PhD.
Professor and Head
Design & Merchandising
Colorado State University
mlittrel@cahs.colostate.edu
APPENDIX D: WEB QUESTIONNAIRE
FAIR TRADE SURVEY
Winter 2006

Thank you for participating in our survey about young consumers’ shopping for fair trade products. This study is being conducted by the Textiles and Clothing Program at Iowa State University.

Completion of the survey will take approximately 10 minutes. All responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential.

You may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time without penalty or loss. You can skip any question you have trouble answering for any reason.

To thank you for your time, you will have a chance to win one of ten gift certificates for your commodity shopping simply by participating in this survey. All identifying information that you provide for a gift certificate will be stored separately from your response and removed immediately after drawing. By submitting your responses below, you indicate that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

For further information about the study, please contact by email Yoon Jin Ma (yoonjin@iastate.edu), Dr. Linda Niehm (niehmlin@iastate.edu), or Dr. Mary Littrell (mlittrel@cahs.colostate.edu).

Thank you for your participation!!

In this survey, we ask you questions about your personal values and about your views and attitudes regarding fair trade and its products. We really want to know what you think. Please complete this survey whether or not you have purchased fair trade products. There is no right or wrong answer. If you wish to change an answer, click on your new answer choice and the previous answer will disappear.

Before moving to the next step, please read the definition of Fair Trade below, which is important for completing this survey.

Fair Trade:

Fair trade is a trading partnership in which:

- workers are paid a fair wage,
- work is conducted in safe, clean conditions, and
- the environment is protected.

Fair trade products are sold through fair trade specialty stores (e.g., Worldly Goods, Ten Thousand Villages), mail order catalogs, and Internet shopping sites.

This study is about a variety of fair trade products such as clothing, household products, paper products, and holiday items. It does **NOT** address fair trade FOOD products.

### Section A: Guiding Principles in Your Life

Please rate the following statements based on their importance in your life, where:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equality (equal opportunity for all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A world at peace (free of war and conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unity with nature (fitting into nature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social justice (correcting injustice, care for the weak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Broad-minded (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Protecting the environment (preserving nature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inner harmony (at peace with myself)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section B: Your Knowledge about Fair Trade

1. Had you ever heard of the term "Fair Trade" before this study?
   - [ ] a) No
   - [ ] b) Yes

2. Where have you heard about "Fair Trade"? Please check all that apply.
   - [ ] a) Never heard of fair trade before

Section C: Your Shopping Experience with Fair Trade Non-food Products

1a. Have you ever visited a fair trade retail store?

- a) No
- b) Yes

1b. If yes, how often have you visited during the past 2 years? -- pull down --

2a. Have you ever browsed the Internet shopping sites for fair trade non-food products?

- a) No
- b) Yes

2b. If yes, how often have you browsed during the past 2 years? -- pull down --

3a. Have you ever purchased fair trade non-food products?

- a) No
- b) Yes

3b. If yes, how often have you purchased during the past 2 years? -- pull down --

4. What types of fair trade non-food products did you previously purchase? Please check all that apply.

- a) Never purchased fair trade non-food products
- b) Clothing
- c) Jewelry
- d) Apparel accessories (e.g., bags, scarves, belts, etc.)
- e) Household textiles (e.g., table cloths, bedcovers, pillows, etc.)
5. For which occasions do you most commonly purchase fair trade non-food products? Please check all that apply.

- [ ] a) Never purchased
- [ ] b) For everyday use
- [ ] c) For special occasion (e.g., holiday season)
- [ ] d) Gift
- [ ] e) Others, specify:

6. What was the amount of money you spent on fair trade non-food shopping during the past 12 months?

$ __________

---

**Section D: Your Beliefs about Fair Trade Non-food Products**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please answer whether or not you have purchased fair trade products. Remember to respond only in terms of fair trade non-food products.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
4 = Neutral  
7 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Purchasing fair trade products will help the workers who produced the product to be fairly paid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sales people in a fair trade retail store are knowledgeable about fair trade products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair trade products are hand-crafted rather than machine produced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My purchase will help to alleviate poverty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fair trade products are of high quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section E: Your Attitudes about Fair Trade Non-food Products

1. I am confident that if I wanted to I could purchase fair trade non-food products.

2-5. Please mark the number which best describes your feelings about purchasing fair trade non-food products in each of the following examples.

6. Some people who are important to me purchase fair trade non-food products.

7. For me to purchase fair trade non-food products is:

8. Some people I care about think that purchase fair trade non-food products.
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8. I feel that I am expected to purchase fair trade non-food products.

10. Whether or not I purchase fair trade non-food products is completely up to me.

Section F: Purchasing Fair Trade Non-food Products

How do friends and others important to you influence your decisions to purchase fair trade products? Please complete this section whether or not you have purchased fair trade non-food products before.

1. My friends ______ purchase fair trade non-food products.

2. My family members think that I ______ purchase fair trade non-food products.

3. My faith-based group thinks that I ______ purchase fair trade non-food products.

Section G: Motivation to Purchase Fair Trade Non-food Products

Please answer each of the following questions by checking the number that best describes you.

1. Generally speaking, how much do you care about what your friends do?
2. Generally speaking, how much do you care about what your family members think you should do?

3. Generally speaking, how much do you care about what your faith-based group thinks you should do?

### Section H: Ease of Purchasing Fair Trade Non-food Products

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 4 = Neutral
- 7 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My income right now does not allow me to purchase fair trade non-food products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fair trade non-food products are available for purchase at a retail store(s) where I live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is hard to find the types of fair trade non-food products that interest me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not know where to buy fair trade non-food products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section I: Ease of Purchasing Fair Trade Non-food Products (continued)

Please indicate whether the following factors make your purchase decision for fair trade non-food products easier or more difficult.

1. My income right now would make it difficult for me to purchase fair trade non-food products.
products.

2. The lack of availability of fair trade products at a retail store(s) where I live would make it difficult for me to purchase non-food fair trade products.

3. The variety of non-food merchandise in fair trade stores would make it difficult for me to purchase fair trade non-food products.

4. The lack of information regarding where to buy fair trade products would make it difficult for me to purchase fair trade non-food products.

---

**Section J: Purchase Intention**

Please check the number that best represents your purchase intention for a fair trade product.

1. I intend to purchase a fair trade non-food product within the next six months.

2. I will try to purchase a fair trade non-food product within the next six months.

---

**Section K: Your Background**

Please answer the following questions or check the items below.
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1. What is your gender?
   - [ ] a) Female
   - [ ] b) Male

2. How old are you? __________ years

3. What is your ethnicity or ethnic identity?
   - [ ] a) Asian American
   - [ ] b) Black or African American
   - [ ] c) Hispanic or Latino
   - [ ] d) Native American
   - [ ] e) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   - [ ] f) White or European
   - [ ] g) Mixed/Bi-racial
   - [ ] h) Other, specify: ____________________________

4. What is your marital status?
   - [ ] a) Single
   - [ ] b) Married

5. What is your major? ____________________________

6. What college do you attend? -- pull down --

7. What is your year in school?
   - [ ] a) Freshman
   - [ ] b) Sophomore
   - [ ] c) Junior
   - [ ] d) Senior
   - [ ] e) Masters student
   - [ ] f) Doctoral student
   - [ ] g) Special student

8. What was your family household income before taxes in 2005?
   - [ ] a) Less than $10,000
   - [ ] b) $10,000 to $24,999
   - [ ] c) $25,000 to $49,999
   - [ ] d) $50,000 to $74,999
   - [ ] e) $75,000 to $99,999
   - [ ] f) $100,000 to $149,999
   - [ ] g) $150,000 and over

9. How much do you spend annually on non-food items (i.e., housewares, apparel, accessories, and holiday items)?

   ( ) a) Less than $250
   ( ) b) $250 to $499
   ( ) c) $500 to $749
   ( ) d) $750 to $999
   ( ) e) $1,000 to $1,499
   ( ) f) $1,500 to $1,999
   ( ) g) $2,000 and over

10. Where do you currently live? Please check one below.

   ( ) a) City (population over 100,000)
   ( ) b) Larger town (50,000 to 100,000)
   ( ) c) Medium town (10,000 to 49,999)
   ( ) d) Small town (2,500 to 9,999)
   ( ) e) A village or rural area (less than 2,500)

11. Where is your hometown? Please check one below.

   ( ) a) City (population over 100,000)
   ( ) b) Larger town (50,000 to 100,000)
   ( ) c) Medium town (10,000 to 49,999)
   ( ) d) Small town (2,500 to 9,999)
   ( ) e) A village or rural area (less than 2,500)

After you submit this questionnaire, you may enter a drawing for a gift certificate.
APPENDIX E: E-MAIL FOLLOW-UP LETTER
TITLE: Follow-up letter: A Few Questions about Fair Trade

Dear Student Consumer,

About one week ago, we sent you an online survey via e-mail seeking your opinions about fair trade and its products. If you already responded to the survey, please accept our sincere thanks. If you not, we hope you will do so as soon as possible, as we value your opinions as a future young fair trade consumer.

This is a research study, conducted by researchers in the Textiles and Clothing Program at Iowa State University. We really want to know what you think about fair trade and its products whether you have purchased fair trade products or not.

As we mentioned before, all responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential. All identifying information that you provide for a gift certificate will be stored separately from your response and removed immediately after drawing. There is no penalty or loss to you for not completing the survey or if you begin the survey but wish to withdraw and discontinue. To show our appreciation for your participation of the online survey, you will have a chance to win one of ten gift cards to a local business.

The online survey is available for you at _______________________________________

If you have any question about this study, please feel free to contact one of the researchers listed below. Thank you very much for your participation.

Sincerely,

Yoon Jin Ma
Doctoral Candidate
Textiles & Clothing
Iowa State University
yoonjin@iastate.edu
yima@iastate.edu

Linda Niehlm, PhD.
Assistant Professor
Textiles & Clothing
Iowa State University
niehlm@iastate.edu

Mary Littrell, PhD.
Professor and Head
Design & Merchandising
Colorado State University
mlittrel@cahs.colostate.edu
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